



European Energy Poverty: Agenda Co-Creation and Knowledge Innovation

Core Group meeting

24th September 2018

Hotel Holiday
Zmaja od Bosne 4
Sarajevo 71000
Bosnia and Herzegovina

Minutes by Sergio Tirado Herrero, Ioanna Tantanasi, Ute Dubois, Stefan Bouzarovski



In attendance: Assimakopoulos, Margarita Niki (EL), Dubois, Ute (FR), Großman, Katrin (DE), Jigla, George (RO), Katsoulakos, Nikolas (EL), Robic, Slavica (HR), Sareen, Siddhart (NO), Thomson, Harriet (UK), Tirado-Herrero, Sergio (ES).

STSM

Nikolas has prepared a report on the STSMs. The first call was completed (6 mission). Currently, the second call is ongoing: two missions have been completed and there is one final report. The report of Anaïs Varo is still missing: Anaïs wants to present tomorrow her work. Next deadlines are 1st October and 1st November. Theoretical limit is 3,500 €. Question is whether more missions could be financed with a lower threshold. There was an issue with the platform which has now been solved.

Slavica addressed the possibility of an underspend, and suggested the CG should think about reallocations eg. Meetings/ workshops/study trips.

George also reminder the CG about recent conversations on an edited volume.

Sid mentioned that in another COST action, COST has financed a MOOC associated with a published book (the authors recorded a video of their contribution), which could be something the CG could consider as a suggested output.

Harriet replied to Sid's suggestion that the cost for an open access edited book is around 10,000 Euros.

George reminded the CG that the Bucharest conference is 22nd-24th January which is mainly targeted at ECR.

Nikolas brought the discussion around project dissemination activities. He reported back to the CG that members doing STSMs are in the process of writing up papers. He suggested the CG communicate with them to establish the stage and state their papers are in.

SCM – Science Communication Manager

The Facebook page has been reported to be working. It was suggested to all CG members that an equally effort should be invested in boosting and promoting it. It should be set up before having the deliverables. It was further suggested that the Facebook group should be used to start sharing further news and Action activities.

The edited volume would be part of this dissemination → EPOV network of experts could be used to distribute it online too.

It was suggested that the ACTION needs to have policy briefs (ie. short documents for decision makers). It was further suggested all CG members should take the time to translate it in their national languages and further disseminate it in their networks.

Deadlines are in November for the briefs.

Sergio reported back to the CG about a discussion on the policy briefs → The idea being to have a two pages policy brief.

George responded suggesting that certain deliverables have to be lengthier: ie. if you go for six pages, you take out two pages.

Harriet argued that two pages may be too short, but four might be better. She mentioned that in the initial proposal, the CG talked about having an internal website. Question in the CG: Did Stefan talk about that?



Sergio further suggested that it would be good to have all the documents in the same place.

Harriet focusing on the EPOV network of experts, suggested that we could add events, write a blogpost, and also write an email or newsletter on your behalf.

Sergio also suggested to consider the following avenues: fuel poverty research network (FPRN)/ Energy & social science network (EASSN)/ sustainability transitions network (STRN).

Harriet put forward a format of policy brief for WG2 (length : 4-6 pages, one to two paragraphs on each point). With the following points to consider:

- What do we know about EP in COST countries?
- What indicators currently available
- What key gaps
- What structural factors underlie these gaps
- How can different stakeholders help address these gaps?

Slavica further suggested the CG use the day of tomorrow (25/10/18) to agree on the policy brief.

Katrin reported on her WG's agreed format:

- Context: why tackling EP, specific problems and failures of existing policies and measures
- Policy recommendations for better and more efficient EP abatement.

George suggested to consider the following points for the recipients of the policy brief → the language should be accessible to all kinds of decision makers (have an informative role – input for journalists). He mentioned that if we have a 6 pages document then it will be possible to narrow it down. Each team in each country should have a database of potential targets for dissemination. This is up to each country to do it.

Harriet then wrapped up the discussion by pointing out the CG's agreement on the following structure: Context / key gaps / way forward.

WG lead reports

Sergio and Harriet had a discussion on the potential of setting up a training school. There are four schools: two in grant period 2, two in grant period 3.

The key question would be: Is it going to be separate training schools (2-3 days each) or a common one (5 days)? A specific training on indicators could be provided. For WG3, the training would be to work on the practical side of implementing EP reduction activities. Bringing together academic and non-academic people.

Sid suggested to consider the elements that are important and cannot be measured: eg. what a measurement achieves and what it doesn't. The discussion the evolved around energy transitions and what kind of use of technologies.

Harriet suggested to ask people working on a case to bring together two topics. She further posed the question whether the target would be only PhD students and researchers, or whether it would also include practitioners.

Sid then mentioned that the budget could go up to 1500 €. People eligible should either be researchers or employees at legal entities having a clear association with research. He further suggested that if the CG wants to have practitioners, they then could be invited as trainers.

Slavica contributed by suggesting that for most NGOs, research is included in their statutes. There are many practitioners who would be very interested in participating in that summer school. She then put forward the idea of a joint training school.

Suggested Timing for a joint Training School: end of May 2019 or until mid-June 2019? If this is the case, then we should invite participants in January or February the latest, before moving on to developing the agenda, the speakers etc.

WG2:

Harriet mentioned the European Social Survey → a non-Eurostat social survey (EU funded, not linked to national statistical offices).

EPOV applied in January (unsuccessful), idea to apply again in next January. The idea is to propose a whole module. 300,000 respondents all over the EU. This would be part of WG2. We need at least 2-3 people from more countries.

The application is in two stage: stage 1 is a shortlisting stage (4 pages, give the rationale of the module), then stage 2 consists in submitting the full list of questions.

WG4:

Katrin kindly asked whether it is possible to ask WG members to ask all the participants to contribute an output for WG4? (with Anaïs → highlighting in 5 minutes some very innovative practices in participants' countries).

Ute and Margarita discussed about the extension of call for participants to EP-pedia to other Engager members and call for suggestions of names of EP experts.

Sarajevo meeting 25/10/18 planning

During the WG meetings, it was suggested WGs should come up with the three points for the policy briefs.

Discussion on what could be the future activities: there are still significant possibilities to organize events and/or get funding for dissemination for example before the end of the next budget period.

During the meeting of 25th September:

- WG presentations: need to mention the need for WG members' contribution on EP-pedia and on the experts list
- After morning breakout groups: Katrin, Ute & Margarita would ask people to contribute (sending them the links, distributing forms)
- End of afternoon: check who has replied / contributed.

Future Events:

- Bucharest conference in January -3 day event:
 - Day 1: policy oriented on the first day (EE in the post-communist landscape + one person from IEA and relevant people from Brussels).
 - Day 2: academic component: two panels, each half a day.
 - Day 3: field trips, that need to be set up. There is a discussion about the budget. There will be an external financing.
- Upcoming activities: Katrin proposed a writing retreat (to work on future deliverables, common projects). She also highlighted the need for a fundamental discussion on the CG's aims with this project.