



**Project n. 05/134**  
**Grant Agreement n. EIE/05/134/SI2.419988**  
**Project Acronym: SEIPLLED**

**FIRST TECHNICAL INTERIM PROGRESS REPORT**

(Reporting Period 01-01-2006 – 31/12/2006)

Report drafted by: M. Antinucci, 05 February 2007

Report revised by: R. Verhagen, 20 March 2007



<b>1</b>	<b>Project objectives and major achievements during the reporting period</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Project objectives, (the role of the project in the context of the current state-of-the-art)	3
1.2	Logical development of the work	3
1.3	Summary of activities, (summarise the achievement for the reporting period, such as work performed and the main results of the period)	4
1.4	Identified problems and corrective action taken – ( <i>If any, comment on the most important problems during the period explaining also the corrective actions undertaken</i> )	5
1.5	Consortium management in the period	5
1.6	List of Participants	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Work Package Evaluation Scheme: progress towards W.P. objective</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1	Work Package 1 : Project management	7
2.1	Work Package 2: Methodological development and tools	8
2.2	Work Package 3: Policy tools and aids at local level	9
2.3	Work Package 4: Stakeholders involvement and enlargement	10
2.4	Work Package 5: Contribution to the planning process.	12
2.5	Work Package 6: Sustainability assessment of achieved solutions	13
2.6	Work Package 7: Specific dissemination activities	14
2.7	Work Package 8: Common dissemination activities	15
<b>3</b>	<b>Tables</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	Time Schedule – <b>Revisions in red</b>	18
3.2	Overview table on the indicative state of advancement (in %) of the budget expenditure per partner and per work package	19
3.4	Performance Indicators- Annex 1 to the progress report: Overview of the current status of deliverables, based on the List of Deliverables	22
<b>4</b>	<b>Template fact sheet</b>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>5</b>	<b>LIST OF ANNEXES</b>	<b>28</b>

## 1 Project objectives and major achievements during the reporting period

### 1.1 Project objectives, (the role of the project in the context of the current state-of-the-art)

The SEIPLED concept arises from the BACCHUS project, funded by SAVE II, which had identified a general framework for sustainable energy project inclusion in SF programmes and described possible concrete routes for implementation, using the human resources available in 12 different working groups at regional level, in 11 different Member States (MS), totalling 24 partners. Good practices from SAVE and other projects have been promoted and disseminated ([www.bacchus.aeidl.be](http://www.bacchus.aeidl.be)). The envisaged next step is to demonstrate that the identified routes are viable in practice by energy agencies, able to involve local development experts in new projects, coherent with the depicted strategy.

The SEIPLED general objective is to demonstrate locally, and define in more general terms, that sustainable energy investment project plans can be brought up to the level of implementation, by careful technical, economic and financial design. SEIPLED wants to clarify that the connection between sustainable energy investment projects with the others national/regional funds can boost a positive local economic development impact. It wants moreover to demonstrate the viability of integrated projects, where the sustainable energy dimension reinforces local development aspects (new jobs, new enterprises, added value for farmers), in the frame of larger scale plans.

The specific objectives are therefore:

- Demonstrating the viability of integrated projects, where the sustainable energy dimension reinforces local development aspects (new jobs, new enterprises, added value for farmers,).
- Disseminate the approach to all EU energy agencies and in 64 external already active contacts, mainly in new MS.

### 1.2 Logical development of the work

The planning methodology was developed in WP2 (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,...). All case study reports were examined on these items and were checked for compatibility and integration among them. The first draft of the methodology report requested a number of adjustments, in order to make it more coherent with the high aims that had been set in the project description.

A likewise procedure has been followed for the WP3 report on policy aids and tools. The tools used to obtain the same goal in the partner countries all differ, which complicated the drawing up of a synthesis report. Based upon the outcomes of WP2 and WP3 and both the analysis and synthesis report, the guidelines on policy tools and aids list the conclusions per country. Due to the very different approaches and regulatory, administrative and socio-economic parameters in the partner regions, it has not been feasible to systematically compare the policy tools and financial aid regimes, but through the synthetic format used to produce the individual reports, the guidelines allow a comprehensive and structured overview.

The involvement of local stakeholders characterises the planning process (WP4). Hard to convince to participate and persuade that the aim of the project goes beyond the local case study, the stakeholders are generally reluctant to take part in meetings of this kind. All the same, their participation has already been of importance, even if not always the participation was as expected. Their role sorts out to be that of collaborator and “puncher”, which makes communicating not

easier, but surely has a high stimulating effect. But many are still sceptic and instantly negative towards a global (sustainable) approach and see it as a chimera.

In Austria EAJ has started a study on how to approach (and to convince) the stakeholders and the local administrations and raise their interest in sustainable energy projects. In some cases their gained knowledge in this field booked positive results. Even if they are aware that there is still a long way to go, they are enthusiastic to go deeper in to this matter and sure that this is a very good tool for the enlargement of sustainable energy projects. The overall idea is that a ‘psychological’ study can be of great help in increasing the interest of the stakeholders and thus the realisation of the development of sustainable energy projects.

The involvement of about 80 external contacts is tested as an innovative dissemination /replication tool in WP7. All partners have submitted a list of external contacts, to which a Newsletter was directly sent by SOFENA and were invited to respond filling in a questionnaire. The feedback in general has not been very satisfactory. This has led to the decision, during the third project meeting, to change this strategy trying to contact them directly by the partner having identified them, and insist, strongly but gently, to provide feedback.

### **1.3 Summary of activities, (summarise the achievement for the reporting period, such as work performed and the main results of the period)**

The activity started after the Kick-off meeting with the definition of the local strategy, the selection of the financial local tools, and the integration of proposals in the local economic development plans. This activity involved a local advisory group, which expressed opinions, gave advice and contributed to the proposed project plans. 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, received within the expected deadline – M 6, were evaluated by an economist, revised versions produced, and the conclusive summary report prepared almost to its final version (a first draft was already discussed at the Kaunas meeting at M 6). In the months following the Kaunas meeting, the partners have answered to the request of the economist to complete the reports with demographic, socio-economic and energy parameters.

The first draft of the WP2 reports was used by all partners, as expected by the project strategy, to favour the discussion at the Advisory Group meeting, within the first six months.

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), from M 13 to M 6, 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 were produced in a first draft version by June. Their evaluation, and the production of the synthesis report, was distributed (M 11, one month later than expected) and additional information was received (M 11). The final draft was presented at the Judenburg meeting - M12 - and the content has been discussed. In order to be able to finalise the guidelines, additional information on the calculation of the CO2 savings coefficient and employment (without these a comparison would be impossible) of all partners was requested. Once provided, the guidelines were developed. The final draft was produced at M 13

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. meeting minutes have been reported.

The expected dissemination activities have been fully accomplished: the website is published, the first newsletter was sent on M 6, and the second is in preparation.

The planning phase is now running and starts to provide project plans, announced through the project website and communicated to the active contacts, kept regularly informed during all project steps.

The dissemination phase extends the findings and pilot financing scheme into a nation – wide plan. The know-how achieved with the elaboration of schemes, replicable into other districts, will be transferred to all EU local energy agencies and already involves more directly at least 64 external already active contacts, most of them in new MS

One aspect of the dissemination approach is innovative: every partner will establish a continuous exchange between itself and five to ten selected contacts during the project, in which all contacts will receive and react to documents, learn methodologies and have possible help for future replication, becoming not merely a dissemination box but also a feedback treasure. All the partners of the previous project “BACCHUS” have also be targeted, amounting to 24 organisations in 11 countries, as long as the partners of the related project “Energy 4 cohesion”. The Bulgarian energy agency co-ordinated this phase.

#### **1.4 Identified problems and corrective action taken – ( *If any, comment on the most important problems during the period explaining also the corrective actions undertaken* )**

The analysis of the WP 2 reports by the economist has produced the need of modifications and additions to most reports. This action produced a slight delay in obtaining the final versions (but the draft versions were timely available on the SEIPLED web site, WP2 page.

When reading the fiirst version of the WP3 report, it was acknowledged that it presented a very differentiated picture of the policy tools and aids in each region, without an easy comparison or interpretation; to allow a more effective reading, it was decided to add a final chapter with advantage/disadvantage considerations on the available policy and tools for each single country.

The attempt to merge WP2 and WP3 report in common guidelines produces a very complex and long report, unsuitable for distribution by newsletter to the external contacts, as foreseen in WP7. A shorter and more communicative version of the guidelines is therefore in preparation, for easier dissemination purpose.

The reactions to the first newsletter was very poor. This newsletter was actually only a presentation of the project, therefore it is understandable that the recipients did not spend time in answering the enclosed questions, declaring availability to continue the contact. A change of strategy is nevertheless advisable, therefore at the meeting in Judenburg (M12) it was decided that the next newsletter will be sent directly by the partners to each of their personal contacts, with more tailored suggestions for a replication.

#### **1.5 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 third project meeting has been held at Judenburg in month 12, in absence of two of the partners who had a superposition with other meetings to attend to. Notwithstanding this absences, the information gathered, the arguments tackled and the actions agreed upon have always been satisfactory. Some might need more steering than others but the overall co-operation has been quite

well. The intention however is to increase the effort and to establish frequent exchange or briefings between the partners.

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 an exchange of the list of external partners for dissemination (80 for SEIPLED, 160 for Energy4Cohesion). This E4C list has been added to the list of addresses to which the first Newsletter was sent.

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 full time participation of REOC has been well accepted by all project partners, leading to the collection of all material needed for an 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 itself, 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.

The Energy Agency Judenburg has changed its official name: from “Energieagentur Judenburg-Knittelfeld-Murau” to “Energieagentur Obersteiermark”. Due to an unforeseen increase of the WP3 and WP4 activities the EAJ Agency also forwarded a request for a budget change.

Ecuba had initially foreseen a subcontract for WP2 and WP3. One of Ecuba’s Staff consultants has taken over the task of analysing the Reports produced in WP2 and 3. Reason for Ecuba to ask for a reallocation of the staff costs as well as the subcontracting costs.

All three partners have furthermore shifted other minor sums (e.g. audit costs, that are not needed as an external auditor is not obligatory in this project).

The Contract Amendment procedure was officially started in September and forwarded. The EIE project officer was contacted for guidance and suggestions. The partner change should not have been an obstacle according to his opinion, nor would the change of name be. The budget change requests asked for further explanation and at the end of November all material required by the EIE project officer had been presented.

## 1.6 List of Participants

Partic. Role*	Partic. N°	Participant name	Participant short name	Country
CO	1	ECUBA srl	ECUBA	IT
CB	2	B. & S.U. Beratungs-und Service-Gesellschaft Umwelt mbH	B.&S.U.	DE
CB	3	Energy Agency of Obersteiermark	E.A.J.	AU
CB	4	Renewable Energy Office for Cornwall	REOC	UK
CB	5	Lithuanian Energy institute	L.E.I.	LT
CB	6	ANATOLIKI S.A. - Regional Energy Agency of Central Macedonia	REACM	GR
CB	7	Sofia Energy Agency - SOFENA	SOFENA	BG

\* CO = Co-ordinator or beneficiary

CB = Co-beneficiary

## 2 Work Package Evaluation Scheme: progress towards W.P. objective

### 2.1 Work Package 1 : Project management

<b>N° of work package: 1</b>	<b>Project management</b>
<b>Duration in months:24</b> <b>From: 01/01/2006 To: 31/12/2007</b>	<b>Leader of the work package: Ecuba</b>
<b>Total person-hours of work: 590</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 66.666 (staff, overheads, other costs and travels for project meetings). WP coordination is charged on single WPs.</b>
Description:	
<b>W.P. 1 Objectives</b>	<b>Progress towards work package objectives</b>
<b>1.1 Administrative co-ordination</b> T1.1 1: Contract management with the EU and the partnership	An amendment to the grant agreement has been forwarded (September 2007) regarding budget shift and change of partner. Minor changes have been communicated.
T1.1.2: Communication with the EU and with the partnership	Fact sheets and project slides were produced and sent to the EU at project start and revised at month 6.
T1.1.3 Drawing up of a 6-month progress reports,	The first progress report has been drawn up 30 <sup>th</sup> July

interim report, final report and cost statements	2006 and is available on the website.
T1.1.4 Organisation of Management meetings (Kick off meeting and management meetings at M1, M6, M12; M18, M24) on the basis of what is necessary to cope with the proposal objectives.	The following meetings have been held: Kick-off meeting in Bologna, 25 <sup>th</sup> January 2006; second meeting in Kaunas, 15 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup> June 2006; third meeting in Judenburg, 4 <sup>th</sup> -5 <sup>th</sup> December 2006.
<b>1.2 Network management</b>	Partners are frequently contacted, a regular exchange on the state of art has been established.
T1.2.1. Supervision of WP leaders' work.	
T1.2.2 Organisation and coordination of project meetings, production of minutes and action lists; definition of the main aspect of co-operation.	See minutes of the Bologna kick-off meeting, Kaunas and Judenburg meeting on <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a>
T1.2.3 Assistance to the development of the network local nodes and coordination of the international contacts for dissemination.	Ecuba has supervised the proper networking activities, under responsibility of SOFENA, which distributed an easy to use contact list.  Ecuba has collected other international contacts and purposed useful way to involve them in relation to specific project objectives (Bacchus partners, Energy4Cohesion partners).
<b>Outcome</b> of WP1: smooth project management. <b>Deliverables</b> of WP1: 6-month progress reports, interim and final report.	D6: The first progress report have been carried out following every partner contribution and suggestions on 30 <sup>th</sup> July 2006. Interim report is here under submission.

## 2.1 Work Package 2: Methodological development and tools

<b>N° of work package: 2</b>	<b>Methodological development and tools</b>
<b>Duration in months: 8</b> <b>From: 01/01/2006</b> <b>To: 31/07/2006</b>	<b>Leader of the work package: ECUBA</b>
<b>Total person-hours of work: 990</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 44.804 all included</b>
Description: WP2 is an initial step to set in operation as quickly as possible the partnership. To this aim, each partner will be requested after kick-off to define its local approach, identify the local conditions, barriers, stakeholders, planning steps and describe expected activities. In the following meeting the envisaged solutions will be compared, and a common assessment paper produced.	
<b>W.P. 2 Objectives</b>	<b>Progress towards work package objectives</b>
T2.1. Production of a common format at the kick-off meeting.	A common format was produced ( <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled/">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled/</a> ).
T2.2. Filling of the common format and discussion of results at the 2nd project meeting. A common discussion will facilitate understanding and produce a more uniform presentation.	The format has been completed by all before the second meeting. A synthesis report lead to the introduction of more specific economic and energy parameters.
T2.3 Production of an extended national report on the	Every partner have provided a detailed extended

proposed approach in national language.	national report, explaining their own methodology and giving useful hints about getting best results, from every national approach (you can see the available reports at: <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a> ).
<p><b>Outcome</b> of WP2: At the end of the WP2 all partners will have clarified their approaches, set them in written form, specified the planning of the activities to be carried out at local level, and achieved convergence with the other partners in terms of overall strategy. The WP 2 deliverable will lead to a better and, if possible, a full understanding of the different approaches in the single countries and the policy tools that are available, indicating weakness and strength of the actual situations. It will be distributed to the active contacts (annexed to the newsletter n.1) so that they will be able, for the first time, to receive SEIPLED info and to react, as specified below in role of partners. It will be also disseminated through the website.</p> <p><b>Deliverables</b> of WP2: Common synthesis report on methodology with individual filled formats. N.6 extended national reports on methodology (disseminated at national level). The report will clearly show the starting point obtained by BACCHUS and the steps forward produced by SEIPLED.</p>	<p>WP2 reports by all partners, including national reports, have been produced.</p> <p>The first SEIPLED Newsletter has been produced and sent to the contacts.</p> <p>A “common synthesis report” (CSR1) (produced by Mariagrazia Mazza, Economist and staff member of Ecuba) evidenced several shortcomings in the data collection. All partners were strongly invited to add statistic, economic and energy parameters in order to create a solid document. The CSR1 Is attached as ANNEX A1 to deliverable D1 (D01.A1-CSR1-ECU-WP2-190407).</p> <p>WP2 deliverables (D1, Reports on Methodology Approach (RMA)) are downloadable from the website <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a>.</p> <p>N.6 National Methodology Reports (NMR, Deliverable D2) are downloadable from the website <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a>.</p>
<b>Management meeting:</b>	

## 2.2 Work Package 3: Policy tools and aids at local level

<b>N° of work package: 3</b>	<b>Policy tools and aids at local level</b>
<b>Duration in months: 8</b> <b>From: 01/06/2006.</b> <b>To: 31/01/2007</b>	<b>Leader of the work package: B&amp;SU</b>
<b>Total person-hours of work: 1060</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 52.595</b>
<p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>BACCHUS identified the EU energy policies and compared them with the Local Development and other sectoral policies, showing the limited interaction and results. The BACCHUS local working groups verified the situation in some specific sectors, suggesting some possible approaches, but without affording concrete proposals. WP3 identifies and compares the available local policy tools and other forms of financial aids in the selected areas of intervention.</p>	

W.P. 3 Objectives	Progress towards work package objectives
<p>T3.1. Production of a common synthesis format which will allow a synthetic presentation of the national and regional legislative tools, of local administrative procedures (development plans, operational programmes, collection of individual projects, consensus achievement) and of existing incentives applicable to development projects based on sustainable energy. Connections between centralised and local decision making will be afforded.</p>	<p>A WP3 common format has been produced (<a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled...">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled...</a>). Relative legislative rules to the several local case studies were identified, as well as tools (or the absence) for financing.</p>
<p>T3.2. Completion of the format by partners and general discussion to achieve a revision and uniform presentation.</p>	<p>6 WP3 documents have been produced (<a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a>) on national policy tools and aids. These documents are annexed to Deliverable D3, under Annex D03.A1 to A6.</p>
<p>T3.3. Assembly of the format, production of common guidelines, and production of 6 policy national reports in national language for national dissemination.</p>	<p>A common synthesis report (CSR2) of WP2 and WP3 has been drawn up, that resulted in a separate advantage/disadvantage report for each single country. A first draft of a communicative version of the guidelines is prepared, for easier dissemination purpose (D3).</p> <p>LEI has also presented a feasibility study of which a summary in English is included (LSR) and annexed to D3 (D03.A3-LSR-LEI-311206). This document is also downloadable from the website <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a>.</p>
<p><b>Outcome</b> of this WP3: presentation and discussion of the various local policy tools and aids.</p> <p><b>Deliverables</b> of WP3: Guidelines with description of individual policy tools and aids. N. 6 national policy reports in national language for regional/national dissemination. These deliverables will be merged with those of WP 2 for practical purpose, leaving the separation of the two WPs for project management reasons (anticipate the production of deliverables in the early project phase). The report will clearly show the starting point obtained by BACCHUS and the steps forward produced by SEIPLED.</p>	<p>A synthesis report of WP3 has been drawn up evidencing the difficulty in establishing common based measures and methods so the decision was made to add a final chapter with advantage/disadvantage considerations for each single country.</p> <p>Documents produced:</p> <p>D3 – Guidelines (GPA)</p> <p>Annexes to D3:</p> <p>D03.A11 to D03.A16 – Methodology Reports (RMA)</p> <p>D03.A2 – Common Synthesis Report (CSR2)</p> <p>D03.A3 – LEI Summary Report (LSR)</p>

### 2.3 Work Package 4: Stakeholders involvement and enlargement

<b>N° of work package: 4</b>	<b>Stakeholders involvement and enlargement</b>
<b>Duration in months: 12</b>	<b>Leader of the work package: REACM</b>

<b>From: 01/03/2006</b>	
<b>To: 31/10/2007</b>	
<b>Total person-hours of work: 650</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 30.897</b>
<p><b>Description:</b></p> <p>WP4 foresees the creation of a local advisory group, involving the relevant agencies and stakeholders of local development. An involvement of the external contacts starts from here, keeping them informed of work progresses.</p> <p>The advisory group involves beyond the local partners (having both energy and local development skills) also the local stakeholders (administrative bodies responsible for policy and aids, economic actors, social organisations and energy/development consulting or other agencies).</p>	
<b>W.P. 4 Objectives</b>	<b>Progress towards work package objectives</b>
T.4.1. Identification and invitation of local stakeholders.	Stakeholders were identified, contacted and invited to participate in the Advisory Group meetings. REOC was not able to reach this target, but an AG meeting has been set in the beginning of January 2007.
T.4.2. Development of Advisory Group meetings	<p>The participants of the Advisory Groups have shown much interest, co-operation and willingness towards this initiative. Positive results have been booked regarding the co-operation of the different stakeholders (<a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled...">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled...</a>).</p> <p>Ecuba (1) – 13<sup>th</sup> July 2006</p> <p>BSU (3) – 4<sup>th</sup> April / 7<sup>th</sup> June / 20<sup>th</sup> November 2006</p> <p>EAJ (1) – 9<sup>th</sup> November 2006</p> <p>REOC – scheduled in Jan.2007</p> <p>ANATOLIKI (1) – 19th September 2006</p> <p>LEI (1) – 16<sup>th</sup> June 2006</p> <p>The minutes of the meetings are produced under D5 (MAG). The Advisory Group Members (AGL) are annexed hereto.</p> <p>These documents are downloadable from the website <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a>.</p>
T.4.3. Periodical transmission of information to the external contacts.	A first Newsletter was sent in June 2006, downloadable from the website <a href="http://www.ecuba.it/seipled">http://www.ecuba.it/seipled</a> .
<p><b>Outcome</b> of WP4: Involvement of local actors and decision makers in the sustainable energy project. Consensus on the possible economic achievements obtainable by sustainable energy projects.</p> <p><b>Deliverables</b> of WP4: n.6 minutes of Advisory Group meetings, at least 4 newsletter editions.</p> <p>The local Advisory Groups will meet at least four times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>at month 8, to evaluate the methodology reports (WP 2)</li> </ul>	N. 3 minutes are available at the website.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• at month 14, to evaluate the report on policies and aids (WP 3).</li> <li>• at month 18, to evaluate the planning dossiers of the projects, before the regional workshop (WP 5)</li> <li>• at month 22, to evaluate the sustainability assessments (WP 6).</li> </ul>	
--	--

## 2.4 Work Package 5: Contribution to the planning process.

<b>N° of work package: 5</b>	<b>Contribution to the planning process.</b>
<b>Duration in months: 12, from M7 to M18.</b> <b>From: 01/07/2006</b> <b>To: 30/06/2007</b>	<b>Leader of the work package: EAJ</b>
<b>Total person-hours of work: 2590</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 116.886</b>
<b>Description</b> <p>This WP5 supplies support for the local development of the projects. Normally the work covered by SEIPLD complements those aspects of the design not sufficiently covered by the internal design (co-funded by local funds), regarding integration of energy and development. Each partner will develop the selected project and produce a project dossier. No commercial activity will be included: partner's studies will be developed for public organisations and no private projects will be supported by SEIPLD.</p>	
<b>W.P. 5 Objectives</b>	<b>Progress towards work package objectives</b>
T5.1. Planning.	Work in progress. EAJ worked continuously on the planning process, and on the case studies. Also REOC has done preliminary work.
T5.2 Pilot plans.	A first study was produced by LEI on biogas development at national level in Lithuania. The copy was analysed by EAJ according to its experience on biogas plants in Styria, and comments sent back to LEI.
T5.3 Economic evaluation.	
<b>Outcome</b> of this work package: Fully developed project plans. <b>Deliverables</b> of this work package: N. 6 techno-economical planning dossiers. All dossiers will be made publicly available and downloadable from the website.	

## 2.5 Work Package 6: Sustainability assessment of achieved solutions

<b>N° of work package: 6</b>	<b>Sustainability assessment of achieved solutions</b>
<b>Duration in months: 5, from M19 to M23.</b> <b>From: 01/07/2007</b> <b>To: 31/11/2007</b>	<b>Leader of the work package: LEI</b>
<b>Total person-hours of work: 2690</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 123.376</b>
<p><b>Description</b></p> <p>Evaluation of the overall sustainability of the technical and organisational solutions planned in the previous WPs. Each assessment will regard the whole planning, not single projects, considering the business-as-usual perspective and comparing it with an ex-ante evaluation of the impact due to the whole package of interventions. The approach defined in the Directive 2001/42/EC on <b>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</b> will be followed. SEA is defined as “a systematic process for evaluating and anticipating the consequences of decisions, taken prior to the project stage. Its purpose is to ensure that environmental considerations and alternatives are addressed as early as possible and on a par with economic and social factors in policy, plan and programme development”.</p> <p>A deep involvement of stakeholders will be assured.</p>	
<b>W.P. 6 Objectives</b>	<b>Progress towards work package objectives</b>
T6.1.Economic sustainability	WP Not started yet.
T6.2 Environmental sustainability.	WP Not started yet.
T6.3 Social sustainability.	WP Not started yet.
<p><b>Outcome</b> of this work package: The WP 6 will provide n.6 examples of SEA applied to energy project plans, in the domain of local economic development programmes, useful for energy agencies and for DG TREN.</p> <p><b>Deliverables</b> of this work package:</p> <p>N. 6 working papers containing each the main parts of a SEA:</p> <p>(a) an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</p> <p>(b) the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;</p> <p>(c) the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;</p> <p>(d) any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;</p> <p>(e) the environmental protection objectives,</p>	<p>Even if this WP has not officially started, REOC and EAJ have done preliminary activities as the matter is quite complex.</p>

<p>established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;</p> <p>(f) the likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors;</p> <p>(g) the measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;</p> <p>(h) an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;</p> <p>(i) a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring;</p> <p>(j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.</p>	
---	--

## 2.6 Work Package 7: Specific dissemination activities

<b>N° of work package: 7</b>	<b>Specific dissemination activities</b>
<b>Duration in months: from M12 to M24.</b> <b>From: 01/07/2007</b> <b>To: 31/12/2007</b>	<b>Leader of the work package: SOFENA</b>
<b>Total person-hours of work: 2593</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 144.822 euro.</b>
<b>Description</b> <p>The general target group for the dissemination is represented by all EU <b>local/regional energy agencies</b>, and, through the energy agencies, the existing regional development agencies in contact with energy agencies, or other local development institutions, operating in all EU Member States. There are 381 national/regional/local energy agencies in the Managenergy website. The partners will develop a website and propose to link it to the ManagEnergy website, to have a better visibility. The website will continue to be maintained for 2 years after the end of the project, connected to the Ecuba website (<a href="http://www.ecuba.it">www.ecuba.it</a>).</p>	
<b>W.P. 7 Objectives</b>	<b>Progress towards work package objectives</b>
T7.1.	Seipled website has been developed with a typical tree framework and it is easy to navigate, choosing

<p>N.5 PP presentations (1 per meeting) published in the website (deliverable D 13).</p>	<p>different key words access. This scheme allows a wide perspective view on overall project themes: the project, reports, references and links. Looking inside more deeply, it is possible to find a section for consulting specific work package tasks and a <b>reserved area</b> that allows every partner to share and compare the project progresses and download or read documents.</p> <p>The home page has been divided in to the following sections: The Project; Reports; References; Links; Languages.</p> <p>The Project section is sub-divided in The Partners (short description of the project partners), Work Packages (short description of WP's with links to the documents produced), Work in Progress (same description as Work Package with regular up date of state of art – drafts and final version of report and deliverables), Regional Case Studies (description of Local Case studies), Reserved Area (available to European Commission, partners and selected group of visitors and a down load area).</p> <p>Newsletter N.1 (D12, NWL) has been drawn up and sent to a list of contacts (see list). A number of 86 companies/agencies (active contacts, the list is annexed to D12 – D12.A1) were contacted through Newsletter Nr.1</p> <p>A draft for a flier has already been developed but is still to be finalised.</p>
<p>T7.2 N. 6 posters for partners project plans presentation in English (deliverable D 11),</p>	
<p>T7.3 N. 1000 copies flier for project presentation in English (deliverable D10). Supporting material: photographic images of the projects, interviews and press releases at workshops.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome</b> of this work package: Spread of the methodological approach in EU MS. <b>Deliverables</b> of this work package: Dissemination tools</p>	

## 2.7 Work Package 8: Common dissemination activities

<p><b>N° of work package: 8</b></p>	<p><b>Common dissemination activities</b></p>
<p><b>Duration in months: 24</b></p>	<p><b>Leader of the work package: ECUBA</b></p>
<p><b>From: 01/01/2006</b></p>	

<b>To: 31/12/2007</b>	
<b>Total person-hours of work: 171</b>	<b>Total costs in EUR: 7.704</b>
<b>Description of the work:</b>	
<b>W.P. 8 Objectives</b>	<b>Progress towards work package objectives</b>
Task 8.1: Contribution, upon request of the Commission, to the development of online information systems under EC management.	Website address, slides and fact sheets regularly updated and transmitted.
Task 8.2: Participation, upon request of the Commission, at contractors' meetings and conferences in association with the IEE and other relevant programmes, EU-wide exhibitions, etc.	
Task 8.3: Contribution, upon request of the Commission, to the preparation of common presentation material related to IEE actions.	
Task 8.4 – Cooperation with project 103 Energy4Cohesion.	Newsletter N.1 has been drawn up and sent to the Energy4cohesion co-ordinator. Exchange of addresses / contacts lists.
<p><b>Outcome of this work package:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input to the development of the online information systems.</li> <li>• Participation in contractors' meetings, conferences in association with the IEE and other relevant programmes, EU-wide exhibitions, etc.</li> <li>• Contribution to brochures and other media, web-sites, newsletters etc. on the IEE actions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Deliverables of this work package:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstracts including regular updates</li> <li>• Project presentations including slide packages, presentations, written abstracts, posters, dissemination material etc.</li> <li>• Presentational material including abstracts, visuals including photographic material, interviews.</li> </ul>	

