



A 3.1 Internal report

CONSTITUTION OF LOCAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY WORK GROUPS

Project No #R060



EUROPEAN
REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
FUND



The Act Now! Project (Action for Energy Efficiency in Baltic Cities) is supported by the European Union in the Interreg Baltic Sea Region Program. The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Commission. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein. The Act Now! Project duration is October 2017 – September 2020.

Act Now! website www.actnow-baltic.eu

Contact:

ProjectZero

Alsion 2 DK 6400 Sonderborg

Denmark

Email: post@projectzero.dk

Author: Peter Rathje, Vivian Kroell



EUROPEAN
REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
FUND



Internal Report Act Now

Work Package 3 Implementation of Capacity Buildings Schemes,

GoA1 Constitution of Local Energy Efficiency Work Groups

Table of content

Preamble.....	4
Participating municipalities in the project Act Now	
Methodology - Information about the questionnaires.....	5
Questionnaire 1 Identify the key stakeholders	
Questionnaire 2 The implementation process	
Methodology	
Report of questionnaire 1 Identify the key Stakeholders.....	5
Municipality chosen focus area	
Conclusion at questionnaire 1	
Total answers at focus areas (table)	
Report of questionnaire 2 The implementation process.....	15
1.1 How did you select the participants?	
2.0 How was the first meeting	
3.0 What will be the focus of the second and third meeting?	
4.0 What kind of challenges did you experience during these meetings?	
5.0 What are your recommendations to other municipalities planning to establish work groups?	
Local Energy Efficiency Work Groups.....	24
Questionnaire - time schedule for distribution/feedback.....	30
Appendix: Questionnaire 1 Identify the stakeholders	
Identify the stakeholders - comments	

Preamble

This report describes the implementation process for the Local Energy Efficiency work-Groups, referred to as **LEEG**.

In the project Act Now, the LEEG are implemented in all participating municipalities and in municipalities, which are affiliated as associated organizations to expert partners. Local energy efficiency work groups will work as a new transversal instrument in each of the municipalities. Beside their role as local coordinating teams, they serve as an institutional link between the local authorities and other stakeholders.

In the development of a method, to help the municipalities to arrive at the establishment of LEEG, a questionnaire has been prepared and sent to the municipalities respectively in the spring of 2018 and in the autumn of 2018. The questionnaire sent in the spring is in this report named questionnaire 1 and the supplemented questionnaire sent in the fall, named questionnaire 2.

There have been some changes during the period. One of the associated organizations in the project Act Now has collaborated with two municipalities at the start of the project. This collaboration has ended and has been replaced by a collaboration with a new municipality. It means, that there are 11 answers at questionnaire 1 and 9 answers at questionnaire 2.

It has no influence on the quality of the result of the questionnaires. ProjectZero Denmark is not the municipal administration, but a public private partnership, supporting the city-councils ambition to become carbon neutral by 2029.

Participating municipalities in the project Act Now

Germany	Bremerhaven
Finland	Ylivieska Region, Sievi
Latvia	Gulbene
Poland	Gdynia
Lithuania	Silute
Estonia	Elva
Russia	Kaliningrad
Sweden	Vöfab
Sweden	Ljungbybostäder AB
Sweden	Mönsteraas
Denmark	Sonderborg

Methodology - information about the questionnaires

Questionnaire 1: Identify the key stakeholders

The first questionnaire helps the municipalities to identify the key stakeholders. The questions are simple and the results can be quantified.

The questionnaire shows the municipalities choice of focus area. A comparison has been made between the municipalities to clarify whether there is a connection between the choice of focus area and the working method the municipality has used for the designation of key stakeholders.

Reporting of questionnaire 1 includes analysis of the answers and results in a conclusion after each question.

Questionnaire 2: The implementation process

In questionnaire 2, the municipalities are asked to describe the actual process of establishing LEEG, the first 3 meetings held with the LEEG and their recommendation to other municipalities. The results of questionnaire 2 are qualitative, that means, that the results cannot be measured as the results in questionnaire 1, but must be described in words

Reporting of questionnaire 2 is therefore available, partly as a summary of the municipalities' answers, and partly as quotations of the municipalities' answers.

Methodology

The description of the method used, and the description of the results in the two questionnaires calculated quantitatively and qualitatively and the recommendation, together constitute a possible method, to be used by other municipalities outside the Act Now project.

It is a purpose of the Act Now project to develop and describe a method for establishing LEEG.

In the following, the results of questionnaire 1 and 2 will be reviewed.

Report of questionnaire 1: Identify the key stakeholders

Questionnaire 1 is divided into 4 main topics with simple questions that are answered with a check mark.

The topics with questions are:

Organization

Who is responsible for establishing the LEEG?

4 possibilities for answering

A defined mission statement

Have you already defined the mission for your LEEG?

2 possibilities for answering

Expected challenges working with your local project

Define your expected main task working with your selected local project

6 possibilities for answering

Key stakeholders

Who are the key stakeholders to make your workgroup successful - potentially persons from? :
 11 possibilities for answering

In some cases, municipalities have supplemented the answers with comments.

The questionnaire ends with the request for appointment of a list of the specific stakeholders in the Local Energy Efficiency work Groups LEEG.

The answers in questionnaire 1 are gathered in a table. Comments is marked in the table and comments appear in another document.

The table and the comments are attached as an appendix and is named:
Questionnaire 1 Identify the key stakeholders.

The Comments document is named:
Identify the key stakeholders - comments

Municipality chosen focus area

Germany	Bremerhaven: Municipal buildings, Private house-owners / rental houses
Finland	Ylivieska Region, Sievi: Municipal buildings, Private house-owners / rental houses
Latvia	Gulbene: Municipal buildings
Poland	Gdynia: Municipal buildings
Lithuania	Silute: Municipal buildings
Estonia	Elva: Municipal buildings
Russia	Kaliningrad: Municipal buildings, Private house-owners / rental houses
Sweden	Vöfab: Municipal buildings, Commercial buildings
Sweden	Ljungbybostäder AB: Commercial buildings, Rental houses
Sweden	Mönsteraas: Municipal buildings
Denmark	Sonderborg: Private house-owners

Conclusion at questionnaire 1

11 municipalities have answered the questionnaire.

Out of 11 municipalities

6 municipalities have chosen only one focus area

5 municipalities have chosen two to three focus areas.

6 with 1 focus area

5 out of these has chosen municipal buildings

1 has chosen private house-owners

5 with 2-3 focus areas

3 have chosen municipal buildings, private house owners, rental houses
 1 has chosen municipal buildings, commercial buildings,
 1 has chosen commercial buildings, rental houses

Municipal buildings are chosen by 9 municipalities.

In regards to the municipalities who have chosen 2-3 focus areas it is not possible to see in the questionnaire, whether the answer is for all the chosen focus areas or only for one focus area.

Questions

The questions from questionnaire 1 are shown in 5 tables below.

After each table is a conclusion in italics.

Following the conclusion, a brief summary follows, which underlies the conclusion.

Answers

The answers in questionnaire 1 are gathered in a table in an appendix to the Internal report. Comments is marked in the table and comments appear in extension of the table.

Questions and answers questionnaire 1

1.1 Who is responsible for establishing the Local Energy Efficiency workgroup?

Project expert partner
Project tandem partner
The municipality
Others

Project expert partner chosen by 6 municipalities

In six municipalities the project expert partner is responsible.

Four of these six municipalities have chosen municipal buildings

Two of these four municipalities have also chosen others topics

One commercial building and one private houses, rental houses.

The other two of the six municipalities,

one has chosen commercial buildings, rental houses and

one has chosen private house owners.

Project tandem partner chosen by 3 municipalities

In three municipalities the project tandem partner is responsible.

All three municipalities have chosen the topic Municipality buildings,

one of these three has also chosen private house owners, rental houses.

The municipality chosen by 4 municipalities

In four municipalities, it is the municipality who is responsible.

All four municipalities have chosen the topic Municipal buildings,

One of these have also chosen private house, rental houses

and in one of these four municipalities, both the project partner and the municipality are responsible.

One of the four municipality has also noted as a comment, "that mostly it is the municipality in cooperation with the tandem partner."

The conclusion is that: there is no correlation between the chosen focus area and who is responsible.

1.2 Have you already defined the mission for your local Energy Efficiency workgroup?

Yes
No

Nine municipalities answer no, seven of these have chosen Municipal buildings
Two answer yes, they have chosen different topics.

*The conclusion is that: only a very few have defined a mission for the local workgroup.
In relation to establish a LEEG, an evaluation could proof it would be usefull to be more aware of the mission or if it would be better to discuss a mission in cooperation with the members of the workgroup.
Some notes that they use the application Act Now, so they don't need their own specific mission.*

1.3 Define your expected main challenges working with your selected local project

Knowledge about the energy standard in the selected buildings
Data/information in general about the buildings
How to approach and engage the owners of the buildings
How to approach and engage the users of the buildings
Funding challenges
Others /please describe

Only four municipalities don't expect challenges related to the "knowledge about the energy standard in the selected buildings". In relation to our project Act Now it is interesting because, that subject is basic knowledge in order to work with energy efficiency. These four municipalities must have a good starting point.

Out of the four, three have chosen a mix of focus areas and one only the focus area municipal buildings. About the other 7 municipalities, that expect challenges to the "knowledge about the energy standard in the selected buildings", 6 have chosen municipal buildings two of these also other focus areas and the last of the seven the focus area private home owners.

8 municipalities expect main challenges about "engage the owners of the buildings" six of these eight have chosen other focus areas than municipal buildings, they have contact to owners. But the choice in two of these eight municipalities are only municipality buildings.

It is understandable, that municipalities with the choice only municipal buildings don't see "engage owners" as a main challenge in this project Act Now. To explain the choice of the two last municipalities, we need more information.

Other main challenges, that are noted in the comments to the question, is investigation and if necessary e.g. organizational changes in the municipal administration.

The conclusion is that: there is a strong mutual understanding between the different municipalities even if the chosen focus areas are different.

But any way it is worth noting, that four do not expect challenges related to the “knowledge about the energy standard in the selected buildings”. Three of these four municipalities are from the same country. And three (but not the exactly the same three) have chosen a mix of municipal buildings and other focus areas. This conclusion could indicate, that there is already a good knowledge of the energy standard in the focus areas, they have chosen, which is a mix of different focus areas or that access to the information is readily available.

1.4 Who are the important key stakeholders to make your workgroup successful?

The municipality
Energy system operators
Public utilities
Construction companies
Banks and financing institutions
Real Estate
Scientific institutions and technical experts
Housing companies
Building owners
Users of the building
Others

The questionnaire suggests 10 different key stakeholders and one not specified.

The most crucial stakeholder is the municipality, all eleven municipalities has identified this stakeholder.

The stakeholders that more than six municipalities have identified as important are: The Municipality, Building owners, Energy systems operators, Users of the building, Real estate and Housing companies.

Eight municipalities have identified the “Building owners” as an important stakeholder.

Five of these eight municipalities have chosen focus areas, where private house owners/rental houses and commercial buildings, are relevant, the three other municipalities have only chosen municipal buildings.

It is complicated to reach a simple conclusion. Meanwhile it is logical, that stakeholders such as “Buildings owners” are important for the focus areas as private house owners/rental houses, and commercial buildings. More information is needed to explain why private owners are important to the three municipalities, that have only chosen the focus area municipality buildings.

The four municipalities who have chosen only the focus area Municipal buildings, all identified stakeholders are: The municipality, Users of the buildings, Housing companies, Public utilities, Energy system operators, Real Estate, Construction companies, Scientific institutions and technical experts, Bank and financing institutes.

Two municipalities, selected group 3, have not chosen “The municipal buildings”. Their choice is private house owners and commercial buildings, rental houses.

Their main stakeholders are somewhat different in comparison with the other municipalities. The three most important stakeholders, when we disregard the municipality as a stakeholder, are Construction companies, Buildings owners, Real Estate. The other stakeholders they have identified are Banks and financing institutions, Energy system operators, Public utilities,

The statistical basis is of course limited, but it is interesting, may be not surprising, that the most important key stakeholders are different, compared to group 1 and 2.

Only 4 municipalities have identified “Scientific institutions and technical experts” as an important stakeholder, they already have a cooperation with these institutions, may be through the project Act Now. In a way it is interesting why the 7 municipality do not choose “Scientific institutions and technical experts”, do they have this expertise already? Or is it because they, just now in the very beginning of the project, are not aware of the need?

The conclusion is that:

The first and most chosen stakeholder for everybody is the municipality.

For the municipality, with the choice municipal buildings, it is common sense, and for other municipalities who has other focus areas than municipal buildings, the municipality anyway, is the authority for planning, buildings and energy, and in many situations an important partner and adviser.

The three next chosen stakeholders for all the municipalities together in the same group, are the Buildings owners, the Users of the buildings and the Energy operators.

It is remarkable, that among all 11 municipalities, only four have chosen scientific institutions and technical experts as an important stakeholder.

The recommendations even if the statistical basis is limited are gathered on three selected groups:

- 1. All eleven municipalities regardless of which focus areas they have chosen*
- 2. Five municipalities who have chosen only own buildings*
- 3. Two municipalities who have chosen only private house owners and commercial buildings/ rental houses*

The most important key stakeholder for everybody is the municipality!

Other key stakeholders in this study are:

Among all eleven municipalities

the next three stakeholders can be:

- Buildings owners*
- Energy systems operators*
- Users of the buildings*

Municipalities who have chosen only own buildings

the next three stakeholders can be:

- Users of the building*
- Housing companies*
- Public utilities*

Municipalities who have chosen, only private house owners and commercial buildings/rental houses

the following three stakeholders can be:

- Construction companies,*
- Buildings owners*
- Real Estate*

1.5 Energy Efficiency workgroup members

Total members
Type 1
Type 2
Type 3
Type 4

The definition of the 4 types is shown in appendix 1 named: Questionnaire 1 Identify the key stakeholders.

The conclusion is that: to designate members for a LEEG is for several municipalities, a process that takes time.

This conclusion is based at some comments from the municipalities during the process, some expect that the LEEG will be changed or will be developed parallel with the development and the conclusions of the challenges in the project ACT Now - five municipalities note that.

The LEEG have between 7-14 stakeholders, 78% of the stakeholders are type 2 and 3.

In the 11 LEEG, there are between 7-14 stakeholders.

Most of the stakeholders are type 2 and type 3, that account for 78% of all stakeholders.

Five municipalities have comments to the list of the work group. They note that the list for the workgroups is yet not finished, e.g. they will start with a small group and later there will be more stakeholders.

There is no clear connection between the chosen focus area and the number and background of stakeholders in the LEEG.

There is a variation between 7-14 members of the working group.

The connection between the answers in 1.4 Who are the important key stakeholders to make your workgroup successful and 1.5 Energy Efficiency workgroup the choice of members is right now not very logical. Maybe this will change over time.

In a way it looks as if the important stakeholders who are designate in 1.4 are not fully represented in the list for the stakeholders in 1.5. The expected change in LEEG that some municipalities inform, can change the composition of LEEG and, to a greater extent, in the longer term fulfill the wishes they can have for the key stakeholders.

The following table 1 shows the 11 municipalities answers to Questionnaire 1.

Germany	Bremerhaven: Municipal buildings, Private house-owners / rental houses	○
Finland	Ylivieska Region, Sievi: Municipal buildings, Private house-owners / rental houses	○
Latvia	Gulbene: Municipal buildings	○
Poland	Gdynia: Municipal buildings	○
Lithuania	Silute: Municipal buildings	○
Estonia	Elva: Municipal buildings	○
Russia	Kaliningrad: Municipal buildings, Private house-owners / rental houses	○
Sweden	Vöfab: Municipal buildings, Commercial buildings	○
Sweden	Ljungbybostäder AB: Commercial buildings, Rental houses	○
Sweden	Mönsteraas: Municipal buildings	○
Denmark	Sonderborg: Private house-owners	○

Total answers at focus areas	
0.0 FOCUS AREA	LEGEND
Municipal buildings, Private house owners/rental houses	○
Municipal buildings, Commercial buildings	○
Municipal buildings	○
Commercial buildings/rental houses	○
Private house owners	○
House association / public house	not represented
1.1 Who is responsible for establishing the LEEG?	
Project expert partner	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Project tandem partner	○ ○ ○
The municipality	○ ○ ○ ○
Others	○
1.2 Have you already defined the mission for your LEEG?	
yes	○ ○
no	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

1.3 Define your expected main challenges working with your selected local project	
Knowledge about the energy standard in the selected buildings	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Data/information in general about the buildings	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
How to approach and engage the owners of the buildings	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
How to approach and engage the users of the buildings	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Funding challenges	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Others /please describe	○ ○ ○

1.4 Who are the important key stakeholders to make your workgroup successful ?	
The municipality	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Energy system operators	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Public utilities	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Construction companies	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Banks and financing institutions	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Real Estate	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Scientific institutions and technical experts	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Housing companies	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Building owners	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Users of the building	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
Others	○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Report of questionnaire 2: The implementation process

Questionnaire 2 contains 5 main questions.

- 1.0 How did you approach the working group challenge?
 - 1.1 How did you select the participants?
 - 1.2 How did you contact the participants?
 - 1.3 What were your arguments to convince the participants?
 - 1.4 How did they respond to your invitation?
 - 1.5 How are your general experiences with this first step of the process?
- 2.0 How was the first meeting?
 - 2.1 What was the expected outcome?
 - 2.2 Did you receive this outcome?
- 3.0 What will be the focus of the second and the third meeting?
- 4.0 What kind of challenges did you experience during these meetings?
- 5.0 What are your recommendations to other municipalities planning to establish work groups?

The following description is a summary of all the 11 municipalities answers at the 5 questions, partly as a combination of the answers, and partly as quotes from the answers. Quotes are marked with "xxxx".

1.0 How did you approach the working group challenge?

1.1 How did you select the participants?

Already existing workgroups

In some municipalities there already are various working groups. They work with many related aspects to energy or climate as energy renovation, energy efficiency, energy planning, EPAP (Energy Policy Work Program), SEAP (Strategy Energy Action Plan), and transport. The participants in these workgroups can be employers from municipal administrative units, e.g. building management, town planning, environmental protection, local municipal partners, e.g. for supply and disposal, director of the local network distributor, regional administrations, companies to promote energy efficiency and district heating and managers of the local housing association.

These already existing workgroups will as a new LEEG in the project Act Now often be supplemented with new participants selected based on a reflection of the key challenges and the aim for best persons on the board.

New workgroups

Different ways of selection participants are used. Some examples 1-6 are:

#1

One way of selection is to have focus at already known challenges e.g. one of the aims for the LEEG will be to develop a SEAP (Strategic Energy Action Plan), that means that there will be participations from

employers in the municipality collecting data, servicing the systems, calculating tariffs and assigning tasks to employers.

#2

Another method that has been used is to ask yourself some questions as: How does the municipality respond to citizens questions about retrofit of existing homes and construction of new homes?

- How do we convert more oil- and gas burners in private homes to existing green district heating networks in urban areas?
- How do we convert more oil- and gas burners in private rural homes to heat pumps?
- In this way your answers will tell you what kind of person you need in your work group.

#3

The selection based on main criteria as:

- relationship to the field of energy in municipality,
- human interest in energy efficiency and environmental protection;
- areas of competence of the employee and its necessity in the working group;
- executive director attraction to make decisions at the top management level.

#4

Specific selections often made between only quite few delegates from the municipality, e.g. the mayor, or a technical manager and the expert partner.

Interviews of specific persons, to clarify their capacities in energy saving etc. their interest and motivation for the project.

Others quite specific examples of the selection are:

- estate manager,
- technical director,
- headmaster and other professional persons of pilot buildings,
- political representatives,
- authorities of financing,
- regional council/energy manager,
- Chamber of Commerce and Federation of Finnish Enterprises
- professionals of the other municipalities in the region.

#5

As a result of a general administrative reform, where several smaller municipalities have been gathered in a new big municipality, this new municipality have given priority to ensuring that participants in the working group represent a wide range of interests from all over the new municipality e.g.

- users of public buildings,
- operators of public utilities,
- local administrators and
- people responsible for regional development

#6

Normally the participants from Act Now participate in the workgroup as a secretary.

1.2 How did you contact the participants?

Meeting

Organized a meeting in order to discuss issues related to establishing a Local Energy Efficiency work LEEG, with participants in already existing workgroups, with representatives of other municipalities, and local heat -and energy providers.

Postal mail

Organizations or companies that are closely related to the municipality and have an activity overlap with the public services of general interest were contacted by postal mail for participation. The organizations were asked to send each a representative with the greatest possible decision-making authority.

Personal contact or telephone contact

In order to ensure that the participant understand what will be the LEEG's role, to check out interest in working with the issues and to ensure that it is the right person for the LEEG. Followed up by sending info about Act Now.

As a rule, contact via the representatives of the city administration and partners of the international projects.

1.3 What were your arguments to convince the participants?

"A more detailed overview of the activities planned in their municipality, encouraged them to join in and contribute with their knowledge and expertise."

"It was important to highlight, that by participating in Act Now and thus forming the LEEG it will lead to increasing knowledge and understanding about energy management and energy monitoring in buildings. Moreover, it would be smoother to create a working method for energy efficiency in buildings."

"The possibility to participate in trainings, learning to identify energy savings potential and most efficient available measures, how to use planning and funding models to apply for public funding schemes."

"Showing how much budget could be saved for now is the first argument that works."

"Before establishing the LEEG, some people were invited for a meeting at the municipality to create interest for the project Act Now. The meeting was well attended and an extensive discussion about regional energy efficiency issues and other challenges followed. The participants were motivated."

"It was not necessary to look for arguments to convince the good of creation of such a team."

"There was no need in convincing them, as the problem of the need to introduce energy saving system is announced on national level."

"Climate protection and energy efficiency as the goal of the town as an integral part of the town" was an argument in the invitation.

1.4 How did they respond to your invitation?

"The participants were excited to participate and improve working with energy efficiency in the municipality."

“All the institutions contacted responded to the accusation, but the responses to the invitations differed. Thus, city planning and building management decide to ensure their participation in the working group by department heads from the technical level without greater decision-making authority.”

“We did not have one single rejection. A few people though apologized, that due to very busy daily schedule they might not be able to participate in all meetings.”

“... Moreover, they had a wide experience and a potential suggestions and smart ideas to take Mönsterass (municipality) to a higher energy efficient level.”

“All participants immediately agreed to participate.”

“The home-owner segment challenges were discussed with the former chairman of the citizen engagement group. He accepted the proposed “home-owner working-group” challenge to become the new chairman of the home-owner segment working group”.

“Other invited participants accepted and were very positive, e.g. one of the participants involved other from the department in the municipality, and another invited participant has accurate the same challenge on top of his own priority list as the challenge for the workgroup.”

“Some of them accepted the invitation, some didn't, so we have started with those who are really interested in the topic.”

1.5 How are your general experiences with this first step of the process?

The most municipalities have had positive experiences e.g. were the participants very excited to participate and improved working with energy efficiency in the municipality and that the target group had good ideas, that can be developed in the project.

Some answers very short, that the first step has been very positive.

Other answers, that they gained experience of what the LEEG participants need for working with the challenges.

One municipality remarks, that the positive reaction may be is easier in smaller cities because people are not used to be involved in work groups, so they are a very positive for the invitation.

Another municipality hope to be able to inspire the whole region and stimulate the discussions about the challenges related to the climate.

The municipality's corporation and involvement in the LEEG is important.

It is necessary to be able to document how much money can be saved, that is an argument, that works for the decision makers, or else you have challenges at this point too.

2.0 How was the first meeting?

2.1 What was the expected outcome?

Everyone answers that the first meeting has been a positive experience.

Everyone has shown a great deal of commitment and there have been some good discussions about the challenges, that the LEEG need to address.

There is a difference in how the first meeting has elapsed in the different municipalities This is due to, among other things, that in some municipalities, not previously citizens and business life has been involved in work groups, while in other municipalities work groups have already been existing for several years. That means, that the agenda and the expectations for this first meeting, of course, must be different.

For some municipalities, the first meeting has been more concentrated on the establishment of the LEEG, the participants have been presented to each other, the Act Now project has been reviewed, and the framework for and the roles in the working group is discussed etc.

But there have also been discussions and information about energy efficiency, energy monitoring and control systems, and decisions has been made for future actions and discussions for the second meeting.

Other municipalities have had specific tasks to get started at the first meeting. E.g. audit of existing energy plans, adoption of priority list of municipal property for the purpose of implementing energy management or energy monitoring, information on best practices in the field of energy efficiency, energy movement and control systems. They have discussed how to achieve greater energy efficiency in e.g. transport, as well as challenges in the field of energy in general have been discussed. A special management method has been used in order to discuss opportunities and challenges.

Some discussions with emphasis on information, others focus on decisions about future tasks and others with emphasis on the method of involvement in the specific challenges and the cooperation in the LEEG.

Problems in the municipality were discussed e.g. needs for changing the legislation, changes of procedure in the managing maintenance of public buildings use of energy and discussion about the municipal strategy, specific goals and cooperation with stakeholders to integrate the whole organization and personnel in Energy efficiency where held.

An interesting topic was about, how to increase the interest of the public for energy efficiency issues in the society.

You can conclude, that in general there is an understanding for the challenges to develop energy management systems.

2.2 Did you receive this outcome?

All expected outcomes have been achieved, this is the general experience from majority of the municipalities

But there has also been a little skepticism (noticed by some municipalities) and it seems, it is due to the lack of money.

Everyone has shown a great deal of commitment and there have been some good discussions about the challenges, that the LEEG need to address.

The outcome was e.g. to get information about status and future improvements. Decisions have been made about future actions.

A very fine quote from one municipality:

“ We were surprised with the deep interest of the invited people to make things move for the better and their enthusiasm to be actively involved, to contribute and to learn new things. So, the first meeting gave us much more than we had expected and already the first discussion of possible further activities gave us valuable input.”

3.0 What will be the focus of the second and third meeting?

At the second and the third meeting the discussions have been more specific with focus at the following key issues:

- The need to update municipal strategic document.
- Create a work plan.
- Organization of LEEG in the public utilities.
- Tools, information and solutions.
- Information on the current status, analysis of result for the energy saving activities, problem of controlling and recording energy consumption in housing, the utility sector and the municipal organization.
- Key measures for municipal energy efficiency.
- An attempt to make the work group a discussion and advisory forum for current regional energy efficiency problems.
- To move the debate on real decisions to a higher political level.
- Investments for measurements of the pilot buildings.
- Working group list of participants and leader were defined and some of their projects were put into action.
- In-depth analysis of the current situation.
- How to inform the citizens.
- Create a motivation program in the municipality so, that the financial resources saved in the institution remain in the institution.
- Models for cooperation with other authorities and non-governmental organizations and multi apartment building management organizations.
- One municipality has chosen to cooperate with LEEG on the program for the three workshops in project Act Now, both in the preparations and the follow-up.
- Planning after the 3. meeting to have a clear vision for the energy efficiency.

4.0 What kind of challenges did you experience during these meetings?

Below is listed the received feedback, reflecting that the municipalities are at very different stages of the same journey:

“Important to document the progress and feedback, promptly distributed minutes from the meetings “

“Detailed documentation of agreements and responsibilities”

“You need to be specific about the expectations and the support given to secure that the participants will spend necessary time. Ideally the participants should only join the discussions and provide their insights and ideas.”

“The challenge is to get new energy efficiency investments.”

“It seems to be key to service the participants best possible, ideally with more than one (already busy) support person from the project Act Now / the municipality.”

“To address and persuade representatives of the organization about the need to participate in the working group”

“Agree with financiers about creating a motivation program”

“Creating the best model for informing the public about energy efficiency issues”

“It might be tricky to take all ideas and suggestions of the working group members on board.”

“Timely compilation and dissemination of minutes of the meeting to all working group members keeps things and morale under control”

“Mutual respect is of crucial importance”

“People of wrong or different background and without previous experience may misunderstand the topic and cause many problems. Personal explanations take time and may not give the expected result”

“At local level group meeting are very compact.”

“An important challenge is to convince local municipalities to participate and to choose issues which are of common interest for municipalities and local companies”

“A moderation of the discussion round, which has a good sense for local politics and proven experience for municipal energy efficiency issues in addition to moderate abilities, is indispensable.”

“Almost impossible to bring the representatives of the district heating and the network operator into a forward-looking cooperation.”

“There were no major challenges, just silent doubt about this work group's ability to change anything”

“Lack of understanding of the need for continuity of the process of managing energy saving among representatives of municipal organizations, since budget financing does not allow them to implement energy saving measures in full.”

5.0 What are your recommendations to other municipalities planning to establish work groups?

Below follows the 11 municipalities recommendations, which are quotes from the municipalities' answers to the questionnaire, marked with “xxx”.

The quotes are organized and assembled under some headings to facilitate understanding and to create an overview.

#1 - What to be aware of before starting the LEEG

“At the start the composition of the LEEG should be well thought out and the main issues could be:

- which segment of buildings and systems will be discussed,
- how many people you want in a team,
- to evaluate what people should be involved in order to involve all the key players in the planning process, who then decide on the implementation.”

“It is necessary to understand how much energy efficiency and energy generation are understood by the members of the working group so that everything can be understood when discussions begin.”

“We asked for proposals what kind of energy efficiency action the municipality has been done and what kind of motivation they have to participate in the project as a pilot.”

“The most important recommendation at this point is a need to assess the regional needs and issues which are important for regional development and wellbeing of citizens. The citizens and their needs should stay in focus of all activities.”

“Arrange strong arguments why it is important to participate and include decision maker.”

#2 – Management of the LEEG

“Engage an external expert, who can intervene as moderator and at the right moment as a consultant in the course of discussions.”

“It seems to be key, to service the participants best possible, ideally with more than one (already busy) support person from the PZ company.”

“You need to be specific about the expectations and the support given to secure that the participants will spend necessary time. Ideally the participants should only join the discussions and provide their insights and ideas.”

#3 - How to motivate

“Allow the participants to be outside their normal comfort-zone as the first meetings should be creative and openminded”

“Also well prepared meetings and discussions cause people to be more involved, and open about their ideas and problems. They allow to share experiences and to propose suitable solutions. Keeping people involved also helps to establish a long-living group. More frequent meetings help to identify and solve issues before they grow into bigger regional threats.”

“Talk to people, listen to people and keep them very well informed.”

“It’s necessary to elaborate a motivation system for LEEG members, which will depend on the result of the operation of energy management system”

#4 - Political support

“Before beginning with establishing a working group, the political decision should be reached, which allows the administration to work in the desired manner.”

#5 - Knowledge in the work group

“Achieve a good mix between technically skilled personnel and decision makers in the work group”

“It is necessary to understand how much energy efficiency and energy generation are understood by the members of the working group so that everything can be understood when discussions begin.”

“It is very important that the members of the working group have a basic understanding of what energy efficiency is, what is energy management, at least some of them should have some experience with building owners and have some understanding of their interests, motivating factors and readiness to go for changes.”

#6 - Documentation

“Discussions need to be documented in order to be able to look back at the decisions and tasks that have been made.”

“Important to document the progress and feedback, promptly distributed minutes from the meetings.”

Local Energy Efficiency Work Groups

Table of content

Municipality Local Energy Efficiency work groups

- 1.1 Magistrate of the City of Bremerhaven/Klima Municipality, Germany
- 1.2 Association of Ylivieska Region and Sievi Municipality, Finland
- 1.3 Gulbene Municipality, Latvia
- 1.4 Municipality of Gdynia, Poland
- 1.5 Silute District Municipality Administration, Lithuania
- 1.6 Elva Municipality, Estonia
- 1.7 Municipal partner Vöfab Municipality, Sweden
- 1.8 Municipal partner Ljungbybostäder AB, Sweden
- 1.9 Municipal partner Mönsteraas Municipal, Sweden
- 2.0 ProjectZero, Sonderborg Municipality, Denmark
- 2.1 Kaliningrad, Russia

1.1 Magistrate of the City of Bremerhaven/Klima Municipality, Germany

Partner no. 1			
Name	organization	title	role
anonymized	BEG (Waste District Heating)		Type 1
anonymized	Wesernetz GmbH (energy net)		Type 2
anonymized	Seestadt Immobilien		Type 3
anonymized	Städtische Wohnungsbaugesellschaft mbH		Type 3
anonymized	Magistratsdirektor		Type 4
anonymized	Dezernat für Straßen und Brückenbau		Type 2
anonymized	Dezernat für Umwelt		Type 3
anonymized	European Energy Award Berater		Type 1
anonymized	Umweltschutzamt		Type 2

1.2 Association of Ylivieska Region and Sievi Municipality, Finland

partner no: 16			
Name	organization	title	role

anonymized	Sievi municipality	Chair of municipality council	Politician/type 3
anonymized representative	Sievi municipality	Technical director of municipality expert/owner's	type 2
anonymized	Sievi municipality	Real estate manager	Expert/type 2
anonymized	Centria	Lector/energy expert	Coaching person/tp. 2
anonymized	Centria	Lector/energy expert	Coaching person/tp. 2
anonymized expertise	Centria	Laboratory engineer, Principal of measurement	type 2
anonymized	Sievi/Jussinpekan school	Headmaster	Building type 1
anonymized	Local energy company/Korpelan voima		Heat type
anonymized	Chamber of commerce	Representant for	type 4
anonymized	Federation of enterprise	Representant for	type 4
anonymized	Regional Council	Provincial energy	type 1
anonymized	Schneider Electrician	Expert of commerce energy	system type 2
Not nominated yet	Motiva/Tekes/public financing organization		Financing exp./type 2
anonymized	Association of Ylivieska Region	Tandem partner	coordinator/type 2

We have started a job with a small group at municipal level and when we'll get action plan and some results ready, we'll arrange a larger group meeting.

It could be some changes among the members of the group. Our small active group are at 6 members.

1.3 Gulbene Municipality, Latvia

partner no: 13			
Name	Organization	Title	Role
anonymized	Gulbene Municipality	Energy Manager in the Development and Project department	Plan energy efficiency and make a statistic. Keep track of energy performance and plan system rebuilding. Organization of employee training and working group meetings.
anonymized	Gulbene Municipality	Executive director of the municipality	Top management of the planning process. Delegation of responsibilities in the implementation of the energy plan (Type 2) .
anonymized	Gulbene Municipality	Head of Development and Project department	Attracting financial resources for implementation of projects and energy efficiency plans. Monitoring of the implementation and management of construction projects (Type 2) .
anonymized	Gulbene Municipality	Communal Engineer in the Gulbene Town Government	Technical support for systems survey and rehabilitation and management planning. Providing practical information about systems (Type 2) .
anonymized	Gulbene Municipality	Financial economist in the Financial and economic department	Linking energy plans with financial resources. Funding planning and energy tariff calculations. Generating Statistics in the Financial Sector on Energy Planning (Type 3)
anonymized	Gulbene Municipality	Senior Personnel Specialist in the Administrative Legal department	Linking energy-efficient initiatives and staff with their implementation. Informing staff on energy efficiency issues. Creating minutes of working group meetings (Type 2) .
anonymized	Gulbene Municipality	Water and Waste Management Specialist	Collection and transfer of water and electricity data to the supplier for billing. Communication

		in the Property Management department.	with communal engineers in the parishes (Type 2).
--	--	----------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------

1.4 Municipality of Gdynia, Poland

partner no: 6+ 9+10			
Name	organization	title	role
anonymized	Urząd Miasta Gdyni	Project Manager	Type 2
anonymized	Urząd Miasta Gdyni	Head of Energy Department	Type 3
anonymized	Urząd Miasta Gdyni	Deputy Mayor	Type 3
anonymized	OMGGS	Energy and Environment Coord.	Type 2
anonymized	IMP PAN	Project Manager	Type 2
anonymized	IMP PAN	Senior Specialist	Technical
anonymized	IMP PAN	Senior Specialist	Technical
OPEC representative	OPEC	Local heat provider	Type 2
anonymized	Energa	Local Energy provider	Type 2
anonymized	PGE Energia Ciepła	Energy group	Type 3

1.5 Silute District Municipality Administration, Lithuania

partner no: 11			
Name	organization	title	role
anonymized	Administration of Silute District Municipality	Chief specialist	Type 2
anonymized	JSC "Šilutė Heating Networks"	Deputy Director Heat Networks	Type 2
anonymized	JSC "Šilutė waters"	Head of Production Department	Type 3
anonymized	JSC „Šilutė housing“	Director	Type 3
anonymized (confirmation)	Šilutė District Municipality	Member of the Council (waiting on their confirmation)	Type 3
anonymized	"Šilutė furniture" (waiting for their confirmation)		Type 3
anonymized	"Credit Union of Šilutė"(waiting for their confirmation)		Type 3

1.6 Elva Municipality, Estonia

Partner no: 14			
Name	organization	title	role
anonymized	Elva Varahalduse OÜ	director	Type 2
anonymized	Elva Soojus OÜ	director	Type 2
anonymized	Otepää RFural Municipality	head of department	Type 1
anonymized	Elva Rural Municipality	head of unit	Type 3
anonymized	LETEK	head of the board	Type 2
anonymized	Elva Rural Municipality (Puhja)	senior specialist	Type 2
anonymized	Elva Rural Municipality	Deputy Mayor	Type 3

anonymized	Elva Rural Municipality	Board Member	Type 3
anonymized	Elva Rural Municipality	Project Manager	Type 2
anonymized	LETEK	Project Manager	Type 2
anonymized	Termopilt OÜ	director	Type 2

1.7 Municipal partner Vöfab Municipality, Sweden

partner no: 5			
Name	organization	title	role
anonymized	Vöfab	Building system manager	Type 2
anonymized	Energikontor Sydost AB	Project manager	Type 1
anonymized	Energikontor Sydost AB	Project manager	Type 1
anonymized	Växjö Kommun	Energy planner	Type 3
anonymized	Växjö kommun	Environmental coordinator	Type 3
anonymized	Växjö Energi AB		Type 3
anonymized	User of the buildings		Type 3
And there will be more participants...			

1.8 Municipality partner Ljungbybostäder AB, Sweden

partner no: 5			
Name	organization	title	role
anonymized	Ljungbybostäder AB	Operating manager	Type 2
anonymized	Energikontor Sydost AB	Project manager	Type 1
anonymized	Energikontor Sydost AB	Project manager	Type 1
anonymized	Ljungby Kommun	Environmental Strategist	Type 3
anonymized	Ljungby Kommun	Project manager	Type 3
anonymized	Ljungby Energi AB	Managing director	Type 3
anonymized		Representative for residents	Type 3
And there will be more participants...			

1.9 Municipality partner Mönsterås, Sweden

partner no 5			
Name	organization	title	role
Anonymized	Mönsterås municipality	Property manager	Type 2
Anonymized	Mönsterås municipality	managing director	Type 2
Anonymized	Mönsterås Utveckling AB	Construction engineer	Type 3
Anonymized	ÅF	Energy expert	Type 1
Anonymized	Mönsterås Bostäder	Managing director	Type 2
Anonymized	Mönsterås municipality	Property manager	Type 3
Anonymized	Mönsterås municipality	Operating Technician	Type 3
Anonymized	Mönsterås municipality	Investigation officer	Type 3
Anonymized	Mönsterås Bostäder AB	Service manager	Type 3
Anonymized	Energikontor sydost	project manager	Type 2

Anonymized	Energikontor sydost	project manager	Type 2
Anonymized	Energikontor sydost	project manager	Type 2

2.0 Sonderborg Municipality (ProjectZero), Denmark

partner no 8			
Nam	organization	title	role
anonymized Group-leader	Broager Sparekasse	Vice-director	type 2
anonymized	Arbejdernes landsbank	branch manager financial expert	type 2
anonymized	EUC Syd	Vice-director	type 2
anonymized	JKA-arkitekterne	owner, architect	type 3
anonymized	Home real estate	owner real estate	type 3
anonymized	Thybo Kølleteknik	manager heating solutions	type 3
anonymized	Davidsen	manager do-it-yourself market	type 3
anonymized	Møldrup El	Owner, installation company	type 3
anonymized	SIB	co-owner, building construction	type 3
anonymized	area development, Sonderborg Municipality		type 3
anonymized	building authority, Sonderborg Municipality manager, district heating		type 2
anonymized	ProjectZero	director (secretary)	type 2

2.1 Municipal Kaliningrad, Russia

Partner no: 18			
Name	organization	title	role
Administration of the City district "Kaliningrad City", acting deputy head of the head of the administration, acting chairman of the municipal services committee. Type 3: have big influence and opportunity to affect important decisions in the project.			
Administration of the City district "Kaliningrad City", head of the housing and municipal services directorate, deputy head of municipal services committee, Type 3: have big influence and opportunity to affect important decisions in the project.			
Administration of the City district "Kaliningrad City", consultant of the environment protection department of the housing and municipal services directorate, of municipal services committee, Type 2: have big influence on the project and important that they actively participate. They have professional expertise.			
Municipal enterprise «Kaliningradteploset» (Kaliningrad district heating grid), first deputy director, Type 1: have a little possibility or no possibility for making decisions for the project, but it is necessary that they participate.			

Municipal enterprise «Kaliningradteploset» (Kaliningrad district heating grid), Deputy sales director, Type 2: have big influence on the project and important that they actively participate. They have professional expertise.
Municipal services enterprise «Vodokanal» (Water services company), Deputy commercial director, Type 2: have big influence on the project and important that they actively participate. They have professional expertise.
Municipal services enterprise «Vodokanal» (Water services company), Head of production and technical department, Type 2: have big influence on the project and important that they actively participate. They have professional expertise.
OOO «Energy efficiency centre», chief specialist Type 2: have big influence on the project and important that they actively participate. They have professional expertise.
Kaliningrad Energy Saving Association, Executive director, Type 4: Have no possibility to affect important decisions in the project, and their complicity in the project is not necessary.

The four different types of stakeholders, definitions

Type 1

have a little possibility or no possibility for making decisions for the project, but it is necessary that they participate, can be users of e.g. the building

Type 2

have big influence on the project and important that they active participate. They have professional expertise. Employees e.g. in the internal organization or in an important interest group.

Type 3

have big influence and opportunity to affect important decisions in the project, but they do not need deliver effort or resources to the project. It is very important for the realization of the project not to forget these people. Can be a director in the municipality or a powerful interest group.

Type 4

have no possibility to affect important decisions in the project, and their complicity in the project is not necessary. But during the project they must be carefully informed because they can suddenly be a threat for the project, e.g. the newspapers can influence the project to high extent.

Questionnaire - time schedule for distribution/feedback

Constitution of local energy efficiency work groups

Questionnaire 1 was sent 03. June 2018 with deadline 18. June 2018

Partner No.	institution	nationality	responded
10	The Szewalski Institute	Poland	29.06
12	Riga Technical University	Latvia	12.06
15	South-Estonian Centre of Renewable Energy (MTÜ LETEK)	Estonia	14.06
11	Silute District Municipality	Lithuania	15.06
1	Magistrate of the City of Bremerhaven	Germany	19.06
5	Energy Agency for South East Sweden	Sweden	11.06
5	Energy Agency for South East Sweden	Sweden	11.06
16	Ylivieska Region	Finland	14.06
8	ProjectZero/Sonderborg	Denmark	12.06

Questionnaire 2 was distributed 04. September 2018 with deadline 22. September 2018

Partner No.	Institution	Nationality	Received
10	The Szewalski Institute	Poland	29.09
12	Riga Technical University	Latvia	03.09
15	South-Estonian Centre of Renewable Energy (MTÜ LETEK)	Estonia	05.10
11	Silute District Municipality	Lithuania	01.09
1	Magistrate of the City of Bremerhaven	Germany	20.09.
5	Energy Agency for South East Sweden	Sweden	information 17.09
16	Ylivieska Region	Finland	17.09
8	ProjectZero	Denmark	02.09

Due to onboarding challenges with the associated municipalities, two partners have submitted their questionnaire-answers after the deadline

5	Energy Agency for South East Sweden	Sweden	2018/2019
18	Kaliningrad	Russia	2018/2019

Appendix

Questionnaire 1

Schedule Identify the key stakeholders

Text Identify the key stakeholder's comments

