

# Evaluation and Monitoring for the EU Directive on Energy End-Use Efficiency and Energy Services

## Reports from National Workshops

### SHORT SUMMARY

**Author:**

**Adam Gula**

AGH-UST

22 April 2008

evaluate  
energy savings<sup>EU</sup>

coordinated by



**Wuppertal Institute**  
for Climate, Environment  
and Energy

supported by

**Intelligent Energy**  Europe

## **Background**

As required by the project's work programme, national workshops on ESD evaluation and monitoring issues were organised by the EMEEES consortium in 12 Member States between December 2007 and early March 2008. These events – each convening between 13 and 41 representatives of relevant national stakeholder – were considered as very helpful, since they provided feedback on the project's work and preliminary results from a Member States perspective. The workshops also revealed a need for further information and training in many EU countries.

Short reports summarising the main conclusions have been created and distributed internally. This synthesis report summarises the central conclusions drawn from all events

## **General Remarks**

### **Relevance**

A general conclusion which can be drawn from the reports on the National Workshops is that the work of EMEEES received positive reaction and feedback. In general, the project was considered to be on the right track and stakeholders were interested in following the developments within EMEEES. The effort undertaken was seen as a difficult task, yet very important and useful, especially for administration representatives who were often neither aware of the difficulties of evaluation and monitoring for the ESD nor of the ongoing discussions about this matter.

The need to support the national governments in coping with the complicated issue of monitoring and evaluation for the Directive was emphasised. In general, it is expected that the effort (both financially and in terms of human resources) needed for the measurement and verification of savings will be extensive, which led to a question whether there were any figures (existing or to be developed) on the expected evaluation effort (in person-months).

### **Bottom-up**

The reports indicate that the proposed **3-level / 4-steps** approach was broadly accepted at the National Workshops, or at least there was no (strong) opposition to the EMEEES proposal, which was praised as pragmatic. There were only some concerns regarding the difference between level 2 and 3, and the use of level 1, which may be difficult due to large national variations.

The concept of the default values was generally seen as a good approach and good basis for discussion. Still, it was pointed out that care should be taken, as default values may be too detached from the values in concrete projects.

### **Top-down**

The issues related to the top-down methods were very extensively discussed in the French, Dutch and Finnish workshops, while rather sporadic comments can be found in the reports from the other National Workshops. Some particular remarks include, e.g: (i) the arbitrary nature of some elements used in the calculations (DE, IT), (ii) the accuracy of the regression analysis results (FI), or the complexity of the calculations (EE, LV).

## **Accuracy**

The level of accuracy of the evaluation methods was considered to be only of medium importance by participants in workshops, in which this was discussed, whereas the harmonisation of methods, and thus comparability between MS was rated as very relevant. It was pointed out that calculation methods provide only rough estimates, while yet they need to be able to demonstrate savings which are of the order of about 9% (or, on average, about 1% per year of implementation) of annual consumption. This has raised some practical concerns that the general complexity of the calculation approach and methods entails a growing risk that the EMEEES project results will only have an academic merit. However, it was also pointed out that even rough estimates will help improve the allocation of public money to different promotion schemes.

Two Finnish ministries criticised the guiding principle in the project which they considered to be the “minimisation of savings”: they felt that whenever there was a choice to be made in the project, the choice taken was the one leading to smaller ESD savings. On the other hand, at the French workshop, the principle of defining *conservative* default values was globally accepted, since it provides an incentive to perform national (level 2) or programme-specific (level 3) evaluations.

## **Acceptability**

The acceptability of savings towards the ESD target was broadly discussed. It was pointed out that all savings are valuable and the calculation methods should not become an impediment to energy efficiency improvements, which are the principal objective of the ESD. In particular, excluding economically viable actions by categorising them as “autonomous savings” or “free rider impact” appeared not sensible to a number of participants. A ministerial representative noticed that additionality was never discussed as a criterion for acceptable ESD savings. He stated that there was no such thing as “autonomous progress”, since all progress requires decision-making and energy efficiency improvement measures. It was also pointed out that it was virtually impossible both to map the reasons, which had led to the implementation of certain end-use actions, and to identify an unambiguous autonomous trend, which could be removed. The suggestion of correcting for autonomous progress was not well accepted by some participants, in particular those representing governments.

Concerning this issue, it should be pointed out that the EMEEES project did not make any suggestion on whether to exclude autonomous energy savings or not, but decided to clearly present the two alternatives – all energy savings or energy savings additional to the baseline – and how both could be calculated. Commission staff had asked the project to assess possibilities to evaluate free-rider effects, but this issue has always been presented with a caveat about its applicability.

## **Early energy savings**

This issue was lively debated at several National Workshops. In the Finnish/Estonian workshop it was stated that the approach which minimises early energy savings is in conflict with one of the profound principles of ESD negotiations. The Finnish Ministry of Environment stated that early actions should be accounted for from the point of implementation.

There were also objections (Austria) to the proposal to use EU-wide average values of 2008 as the baseline for Early Actions. It was stated that this proposal would penalise

countries that had made considerable efforts in the past. Generally, there was agreement among participants that the choice of the baseline for early actions was a very important point in the method development, and that their early efforts should be recognised appropriately. On the other hand, in the Italian workshop, choosing the 2008 baseline as a reference to estimate early energy savings was seen as a good compromise in order to avoid penalising MS that were active in energy efficiency before 2008, since the levels of energy efficiency they have reached should already be better than the EU average.

**Table. Description of the events - A Summary**

**(1) Country, (2) Date, (3) Location, (4) Number of Participants, (5) Organiser**

Country	Date	Location	Number of participants	Organiser
FI, EE	01.02.2008	Helsinki	34	Motiva Oy
FR	22.01.2008	Paris-Bercy	25	Ademe, Armines, EDF
NL	13.02.2007	Eindhoven	19	SenterNovem
AT, SI, SK, HU, CZ	22.01.2008	Vienna	27	AEA
DE	06.12.2007	Bonn	33	WI, Fraunhofer
IT	29.01.2008	Roma	12	eERG
PL	27.02.2008	Warsaw	31	AGH-UST, KISE
UK, IR	05.03.2008	London	15	Defra
LV	18.01.2008	Riga	42	Ekodoma
LT	05.02.2008	Vilnius	35	Ekodoma
PT	11.01.2008	Lisbon	13	ISR-UC
SE	06.03.2008	Stockholm	>30	STEM