



Project n. 05/134

Grant Agreement n. EIE/05/134/SI2.419988

Project Acronym: SEIPLD

FIRST TECHNICAL PROGRESS REPORT

(Reporting Period 01-01-2006 - 30/06/2006)

Report drafted by: M. Antinucci, 15 July 2006

Revised by: R. Verhagen, 31 July 2006



1. Project objectives and major achievements during the reporting period
--

1.1 Project objectives – Give an overview of general project objectives, explain the role of the project in the context of the current state-of-the-art

The ambitious EU energy policy objectives cannot be achieved relying only on the resources finalised to sustainable energy programmes. One of the possible ways to enhance the rate of investments in sustainable energy is to involve the resources finalised to local economic development, coming from regional, national and European funds (mainly the Structural Funds).

Unfortunately this is not a common case. One of the barriers is the lack of experience of energy agencies in developing plans and programmes in cooperation with the regional economic development experts, suitable for insertion in the regional planning documents. Therefore, this project develops six case studies where a sustainable energy target is made coherent with a local economic development plan, mobilising financial resources from Structural Funds or other similar channels.

The main relevance of the six case studies is in the methodology (socio-economic analysis, typical development objectives, insertion in regional development programmes, clustering of financial tools, evaluation of the possible and most effective aid regimes for private organisations,...). The involvement of local stakeholders characterises the planning process.

The involvement of about 80 external contacts is tested as an innovative dissemination /replication tool.

1.2 Summary of activities and results for the reporting period – Summarise the achievements for the reporting period, such as work performed and the main results of the period

In the first six months of activities the main achieved result has been the production of the six “methodology and tools” reports (WP 2), where each partner has described in sufficient detail the selected case study, considering not only the sustainable energy but also the local economic development characteristics. The six reports have been evaluated by an economist, revised versions produced, and the conclusive summary report prepared almost to its final version (first draft discussed at the Kaunas meeting).

This result allowed all partners to produce useful material for the discussion at the Advisory Group meeting, within the first six months, as expected by the project strategy. The production of the next six reports on “Policy and aid systems”, composing the second part of the case study presentation (WP 3), has been anticipated (decision at the Bologna kick-off meeting), in order to help a fruitful discussion in the A.G. meetings: this goal has been achieved and all six “Policy and aid systems” reports are available, at least in draft version. Their evaluation, and the production of the synthesis report, will be available within the expected deadline (M 10).

The reports in national language have been produced only when required by the A.G. meetings (Saxony, Emilia-Romagna, Lithuania), others will follow. Three A.G. meetings have been already reported.

The expected dissemination activities have been fully accomplished: the website is published and the first newsletter is ready for transmission to the target group.

1.3 Identified problems and corrective action taken – If any, comment on the most important problems during the period explaining also the corrective actions undertaken

The need of having sufficient material for the Advisory Group meetings has required an acceleration in producing the WP3 reports. The corrective action has been successful, as three meetings have been held at month 6 using the full information.

The analysis of the WP 2 reports by the economist has produced the need of modifications and additions to most reports. This phase will produce a slight delay in obtaining the final versions (but the draft versions are already available on the SEIPLED web site, WP2 page, with restricted access).

2. Consortium management in the period
--

The kick off meeting was held in month 1 with the attendance of the EIE project officer, producing a very useful initial review on project features and procedures. One partner could not participate for force majeure reasons. The consortium management has been smooth and the timing respected. The second project meeting has been held in Kaunas at month 6, but two partners were missing, one for internal difficulties (see below) and the second for a family emergency.

The co-operation with the EIE project “Energy4Cohesion” has produced a link between web sites, an exchange of partner’s addresses for the distribution of the newsletters, and a possible exchange of the list of external partners for dissemination (80 for SEIPLED, 160 for Energy4Cohesion).

A problem occurred in Cornwall, concerning the responsibility as official beneficiary. The organisation REOC operates in the SEIPLED project jointly with the economic development agency Cornwall Enterprise, and the latter was selected as beneficiary and signed the Grant Agreement. Now Cornwall Enterprise decided to withdraw on 30 June 2006. REOC has officially proposed to take upon itself directly the financial responsibility as beneficiary and official SEIPLED partner.

The Contract Amendment procedures will start at the end of July with a letter to the project officer.

The Energy Agency Judenburg has changed its official name: from “Energieagentur Judenburg-Knittelfeld-Murau” to “Energieagentur Obersteiermark”. This change will be proposed too in the Contract Amendment.

A budget change was requested by B&SU, exceeding the threshold of 10%. This is due to the following problem.

B&SU operated in the project with the support and co-financing of the Saxon Ministry for Environment and Agriculture. The organisation Saxon Agency for Environment and Geology, was integrated in the project by subcontracting, particularly in WP 5, with 17.500 €. Now the situation changed to the effect that the Saxon Agency does not have the human resources at the moment and has asked B&SU to assume its tasks. In addition, due to internal administrative procedures, not the Saxon Ministry but the subordinated body, the Saxon Agency for Environment and Geology, has mandated B&SU to carry out the project on behalf of Saxony (with co-financing). For this reason, the Agency cannot be subcontractor of B.&S.U. anyway.

This budget change will also be proposed for the Contract Amendment. The details on the budget change will be transmitted to the project officer at the end of July.

3. Progress of each work package in the period

3.1 Progress on work plan against initial objectives – Compare in a few lines the activities planned to the achievements made, work package by work package; identify partners involved

The status of implementation of each work package (WP) is referred to the WP planning, as described in the Contract Annex 1, Project Work Programme.

<i>WP n</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>WP leader</i>	<i>Type¹</i>	<i>Duration²</i>	<i>Deliverables</i>
WP1	<i>Project management</i>	ECUBA		M 0-24	6-month progress reports, interim and final reports.

ECUBA organised the Kick-off meeting in Bologna (25 January 2006) and produced the meeting Minutes. The administrative manager was appointed (R. Verhagen of ECUBA) and the Steering Committee officialised. Most administrative issues were discussed and agreed. All WP leaders have been appointed.

The first advance was received from EC and distributed to all partners within the agreed time frame.

The second project meeting was held in Kaunas, Lithuania, on June 15 and 16, 2006, under the organisational responsibility of LEI. The minutes were produced and distributed by ECUBA.

WP2	<i>Methodological development and tools</i>	ECUBA	C + S	M 1-8	Report with 6 comparative formats. N.6 national reports.
-----	---	-------	-------	-------	--

The WP2 report format was produced by ECUBA and distributed at the Kick-off meeting.

All partners produced the WP2 report within the month of May 2006. Some extra information was required to improve the homogeneity of the reports and then a final version will be produced at the end of August.

The updated versions of the WP2 reports are available in the reserved area of the website.

A version in national language was produced by each partner as a tool for the Advisory Committee activity and further use according to regional or national planning procedures.

The WP2 draft synthesis report was prepared by Mariagrazia Mazza, economist, based on the six reports. The synthesis report was presented at the Kaunas meeting in June. Several comments were reported in the synthesis report, requiring a further effort by the partners in producing data and elaborations more suitable for a local economic development plan. After the Kaunas meeting some partners have already provided the required additional information, so that an updated version of the synthesis report will be available on the project website before the end of August.

¹ C = Common activities, S = Specific activities

² M means Month. Start month, means from the first day of the month. End month means by the last day of the month.

WP3	<i>Policy tools and aids at local level.</i>	B&SU	C + S	M 6-14	<i>Report with 6 comparative formats. N.6 national reports</i>
-----	--	------	-------	--------	--

B&SU produced a standard format for the production of the WP3 report, and distributed it at the end of April.

The first four WP3 reports were already available and presented at the Kaunas meeting, another one was produced in July and the last one is expected before August. The summary report has therefore not yet been elaborated.

The draft versions of the WP3 reports are available in the reserved area of the website.

WP4	<i>Stakeholders' involvement and enlargement.</i>	REACM	S	M 3-24	<i>Minutes of meetings (6 x 4)</i>
-----	---	-------	---	--------	------------------------------------

The six Advisory Groups have been defined and the participants officially appointed.

ECUBA held the first AG meeting on June 14th, produced and published the minutes. The meeting allowed the definition of the priorities required by the three public organisations developing “Ecologically Structured Productive Areas”(APEA) as pilot experiences. Among the possible financing opportunities, some promising perspectives are coming from the new 2007-2013 Emilia-Romagna Operational programme in phase of development, and from the regional funds dedicated to SMEs and craft industries (8 M€).

LEI held the first AG meeting on June 26th, which was attended also by all SEIPLED partners who had convened in Kaunas for the second project meeting. J. Barnthaler of EAJ presented the Austrian experience on biogas systems, which was particularly useful for the planning of the biogas measure foreseen by LEI in Lithuania. The case study will be partially modified according to the directions received by the AG at this meeting (management of biogas systems by agricultural associations, mixing animal manure with large proportion of vegetal crops). LEI will produce a plan for biogas development at national level, instead of the limited study foreseen initially in the Silute region.

B&SU held two AG meetings, a more general meeting in Dresden on April 4th and a specific working group at the Saxon State Ministry for Environment and Agriculture on June 07th. The meeting on energy efficiency in industry and trade was attended by 16 people and introduced new concepts, like the “Energy Consultant” certification, the guidelines for funding, and the proposal of a preliminary version and pilot testing phase of the “Saxon Certificate for Energy Performance” in 2007. The smaller working group on the “Energy Parameter” discussed specifically the SEIPLED objectives, assigning tasks for studying bonus/incentive schemes, organising preparatory work on the promotion guideline and proposing that the Saxon Certificate for Energy Performance in Industrial Sectors and respectively energy consultancy / energy check be introduced as binding condition for requesting subsidies.

The other three AG meeting in Cornwall, Styria and Macedonia are still to be convened.

WP5	<i>Contribution to the planning process</i>	EAJ	<i>S (plan) C (support, advice and exchange of experiences)</i>	M 3 - 20	<i>N. 6 pilot plans. Plans for the integration of sustainable energy issues in SF support schemes.</i>
-----	---	-----	---	----------	--

The planning phase is already started in Emilia Romagna, where an economic-financial study was requested by the AG, concerning the advantages of a district heating with a CHP generator for the enterprises willing to locate themselves in a standard APEA. The study should also indicate the business opportunities for the energy producer and distributor.

LEI has committed to the selected subcontractor the plan for biogas exploitation at national scale.

B&SU is working with the Saxon Energy Efficiency Centre on the development of the “Saxon Certificate for Energy Performance” .

The other partners are also in the starting phase.

WP6	<i>Sustainability assessment of achieved solutions</i>	LEI	C	M 18 -24	<i>Guidelines of intervention and policy aspects</i>
-----	--	-----	---	----------	--

This WP is not started yet.

WP7	<i>Network development and Dissemination.</i>	SOFENA	<i>S (regional/national level and visits to 5 contacts); C (website, new MS action)</i>	M 1 -24	<i>Newsletter to at least N. 100 external contacts, website, N. 21 visits, N.6 national workshops.</i>
-----	---	--------	---	---------	--

The website is online: www.ecuba.it/seipled. To enter the reserved area (for partner’s use only), the ID is “seipled” and the password is “energy”.

The newsletter n.1 is ready and will be sent at the end of July to n. 58 external contacts and to n. 26 partners of the Energy4Cohesion project.

WP8	<i>Common Dissemination.</i>	ECUBA	C	M 1 -24	
-----	------------------------------	-------	---	---------	--

Ecuba has developed all the requested common dissemination materials. Updated versions of the slides and of the template factsheet are here enclosed.

3.2 Deviations from the project work plan – If any, identify the nature and the reason for the deviation, identify partners involved, clarify impacts on the activities and deliverables planned, present the plan to get back on the track

There are no deviations from the project workplan to be mentioned.

3.3 Up-date of time schedule – showing the original version together with any changes to the timing

There are no major changes to be reported. See Annex III.

3.4 List of deliverables – showing any expected changes to the delivery dates. See Annex 1

No significant changes in the deliverable delivery dates are detected.

4. Progress regarding performance indicators

Assess performance indicators planned against results and impacts achieved so far

Performance indicator	Quantification*	Related work package and/or deliverable N°	Results and impacts so far
Production of formats on methodology.	n. 6	WP 2	n.6 achieved reports
Production of the formats on available policies and aids.	n. 6	WP 3	n.6 achieved draft reports
Production of policy guidelines in national language;	n.6	WP 3	
Production of common policy guidelines in English;	n. 1	WP 3	
Activation of the Advisory groups.	n. 10 relevant participants in 6 advisory groups	WP 4	N. 3 A.G. achieved meetings;
Production of the technical, economic and environmental planning dossiers.	n. 6	WP 5	
Expected total amount invested in the pilot projects, when financed;	5.5 Meuro	WP 5	
Influence of the expected quantitative	At least 3 %	WP 5	

results on regional targets for RES percentage (doubling), energy efficiency yearly improvement (1%) and CO2 removal (-6.5% of 1990 level)	contribution		
Production of sustainability assessments of the pilot projects;	n. 6	WP 6	
Number of external contacts identified by the partners	At least 5 x 6 = 30	WP 7	N. 48 identified external contacts
Number of external contacts identified by the Dissemination leader	At least 10	WP 7	N. 10 identified external contacts
Number of visits made by partners to the external contacts	At least 21	WP 7	
Officials of Region taking part in the regional workshops	At least one per workshop	WP 7	
Number of participants in the regional workshops	At least 40 per region	WP 7	
Number of visitors to the web-site	300 in the first year of operation.	WP 7	