



European Energy Poverty: Agenda Co-Creation and Knowledge Innovation

Third Management Committee meeting

25th September 2018

Hotel Holiday
Zmaja od Bosne 4
Sarajevo 71000
Bosnia and Herzegovina

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

Tour de table, introductions

MC Members present:

Abu Hamed, Tareq (IL), Alterman, Rachele (IL), Anisimova, Natalie (CZ), Assimakopoulos, Margarita Niki (EL), Borén, Thomas (SE), Dokupilova, Dusana (SK), Dubois, Ute (FR), Feldmar, Nora (HU), Gouveia, João Pedro (PT), Großman, Katrin (DE), Guyet, Rachel (FR), Hivzievendic, Jasna (BA), Horta, Ana (PT), Jigla, George (RO), Katsoulakos, Nikolas (EL), Kopeva, Diana (BG), Kovačević, Nataša (ME), Kyprianou, Ioanna (CY), Lipovac, Milan (RS), Laakso, Senja (FI), Mikalauskiene, Renata (MT), Nierop, Sam (NL), Norvaisiene, Rosita (LT), Ojamäe, Liis (EE), Palombo, Massimo (IT), Roarty, Charlie (IE), Robic, Slavica (HR), Sagan, Iwona (PL), Sareen, Siddharth (NO), Serghides, Despina (CY), Sokolowski, Jakub (PL), Tesanovic, Majda (BA), Thomson, Harriet (UK), Tirado-Herrero, Sergio (ES), Tkalec, Tomislav (SI), Ucal, Meltem (TR), Varo Barranco, Anaïs (ES).

MC Guests present:

Imamovic, Fuad (BA), Ruiz, Nestor (BA)

Apologies:

Stefan BOUZAROVSKI, Françoise BARTIAUX, Eleonora GAYDAROVA, Alireza AFSHARI, Samira RAHNAMA, Nevena SMILEVSKA, Philipp BIERMANN, Szalai GABRIELLA, Orsolya FÜLÖP, Tareq ABU HAMED, Maya NEGEV, Massimo PALOMBO, Paola VALBONESI, Lina MURAUŠKAITE, Rosita NORVAISIENE, Brian AZZOPARDI, Jasna SEKULOVIĆ, Sanja ORLANDIĆ, Liviu CHELCEA, Pedja MILOSAVLJEVIC, Milan LIPOVAC, Richard FILCAK, Neil SIMCOCK.

Presentations from Invited Speakers

1. Representative of Toplane Sarajevo – Theme on District Heating (DH):

Largest DH System in BiH. No cogeneration in boiler plants. Remote control in 40% plants, plan to have them all under remote control management. 140 boiler plants. 83 km distribution network. Main fuel is natural gas, alternative fuel oil. Goals: increase energy, reduction in total energy consumption.

Projects:

1. Lab for calibration of heat metres
2. Installation of meter in every building

Details and Plans:

- Investments planned in the future: new boiler plant, refurbishing, etc. New boiler plant in Alipasi is currently being constructed.
- Emissions below maximum emission thresholds for NO_x, SO_x, CO₂. Toplane Sarajevo does not pollute air in Sarajevo.
- Strategic plans: to connect as many possible buildings to DH, replace connections to small boilers to large boiler houses, DH for schools and other institutions, schools have small boilers but poor maintenance, they want to provide DH.

Questions and discussions:

- *In a few years' timeframe, how do you improve EE and how does it reflect on citizen energy bills?*

We have a lot of small boiler houses (in schools, universities) don't know how to use, don't what mean rules, EE, what they have to do. Not enough people who can follow the EE technology,

invest in those boiler houses. We want to collect all of them, to help all of them to reduce air pollution. When I started working in Toplane our electricity costs was 3 million KM per season 20 years ago. We have reduced it to half. We have invested in our equipment, in our people. And we now have more assets, more boilers. We now pay 700k EUR per season. Our pollution level is lower, we have done analysis and are available. Political history of price of natural gas, we pay the same price as small consumers. Three years ago we had new price. For 15 years we didn't change our price of DH. The price of electricity has increased a lot in the same period. We have done a lot to reduce our costs. Price for consumers is not determined by us, it is regulated by the government of kanton Sarajevo.

- *What is the average price for a 50 sqm?*

For my 80 sqm apartment, costs 100 KM per month approximately but prices in winter are different, so it is 1,400 KM per year.

- *What is the percentage of losses in the system?*

Transportation losses are about 10% in our distribution network. This new boiler Alpasin most, German boilers and burners, very good equipment.

- *Tendencies: customers withdrawing in Sarajevo. Are people also withdrawing in Banja Luka and Tuzla?*

In last year's we had 200,000 new sqm of consumers. The Alpasin most 20MW is for the new area in Otokar. Prices are higher in Sarajevo are double as compared to Tuzla or Banja Luka.

2. Representative from Swiss Caritas

EE key projects of Caritas Switzerland in BiH. Present in BiH since after the war.

Situation in BiH: inefficient combustion of energy, too many ambitious pre-plans, EP (EP), high unemployment and missing professionals for EE and RES. Two entities, 14 kantons in one entity. Each kanton is its own country. This makes for a very complex context.

Lots of pilot and demonstration projects since 2007:

3. Thermal insulation of 80 private houses, pioneering project: energy and financial savings
4. Installation of biomass boiler in school following an ESCO model
5. Energy advisory for citizens in Tuzla and Sarajevo
6. Pilot project in 4 buildings with 3-5 households unable to pay their energy bills.
7. Workshops on EE or vocational school teachers in collaboration with unemployment agency.
8. EP project in Zedlo kanton:
 - Recruited 30 youth trained as energy advisors coming from two local municipalities (Zenica and Zavedovici).
 - Created a model that replicables in the whole country.
 - Visited households, leaving a brochure and other material.
 - Donated a kit (bulb, thermometer)
 - The advisor conducted further research.
 - Findings of the project: poor or missing insulation, 1.5 TV per households, 1.6 fridge but old appliances using much electricity. Average cost per household is 115 KM per household for heating and electricity. 62% of households do not heat the whole apartment area. We visit households and check bills after 6 months, the progress we see: 90% households take care about saving energy, 66% hholds reduced energy bills, 70% have wished to replace appliances, 12,3% wish to purchase new and more efficient devices, 15.2% hholds buy LED bulbs; some hholds installed thermal insulation. After 6 months reduction 6.2 Km reduction from 53.4 only from changing behaviour and LED bulbs. Energy advisory is a constructive avenue road

to reduce EP and consumption generally. They established a model to identify energy poor households. Their proposition is that spending more than 10% means EP, 74% households in Zedlo kanton in in EP according to this criterion.

- Policy proposals: VAT reduction, closer collaboration, more energy advisory.

Questions and discussions:

- *How are your model/indicators to define an EP household?*

To define EP we start from Brenda Boardman's definition.

[Member's response] We face the same problems in Poland, suggestion to be a bit careful when applying this definition.



Figure 1: From our third ENGAGER COST Management Committee meeting in Sarajevo discussing energy poverty. With our Vice-Chair Slavica Robic acting as replacement-Chair to Prof. Stefan Bouzarovski.

REPORT FROM THE VICE-CHAIR

Vice-Chair Slavica Robic kindly asked participants to send a note to the organisers and Action Chair if they are not attending. Bearing in mind ENGAGER's quorum of more than 17 representatives from COST countries.

Vice-Chair Slavica Robic notes MC decisions taken by e-vote so far:

1. Reduce to 7 calendar days the reimbursement claim period for all Action meetings (27 March 2018)
2. To give Action Chair a mandate to modify the WBP without MC approval for budget amounts below 20,000 Euros (27 March 2018)
3. 'To set the accommodation allowance for forthcoming ENGAGER meetings in Leicester and Sarajevo to 100 Euro per person per night (14 May 2018)

4. To confirm the nomination of George Jigla for the post of Science Communication Manager, and resultingly a member of ENGAGER's Core Group (22 May 2018)
5. To authorise the Action Chair (or, alternatively, the Action Vice Chair) to issue Inclusiveness Target Country conference grants and Dissemination grants, in line with the COST Vademecum, and in consultation with the Action's Core Group (22 May 2018).

Presentation of the COST Action and key actions by Vice-Chair Slavica Robic.

Total spend in the budgeting period: €172k, underspend of just €2k.

Questions and discussions:

- *Do we want to have dissemination grants open to non-MC members?*
To be discussed.

WG1 report by Ute Dubois, Margarita Assimakopoulos

Ute Dubois announcement for two WG1 projects:

- EP-pedia: contributions on topics/countries for the state-of-the art report. Contribute with a 2-3 page content that will potentially go into a book.
- EP experts in your country to send a 10 or 15-minute questionnaire survey.

Activities:

- EP-pedia project: report to be ready by spring 2019. Topics/countries matrix: Please email Ute with an indication where you would like to contribute.
- Barometer – survey with country 'experts', practitioners or concerned items: items about key topics and debates in each country, on which elements have countries set up policies. Aim now is to populate the database of experts.

Particulars:

- Format of EP-pedia
 - Perspective on EP in the policy debate
 - Perspective on EP in the research sector
- The survey, called "The Barometer" is a questionnaire that can be completed in 10-15 minutes, related to the following:
 - How is EP discussed in each country
 - Opinion on EP drivers in each country
 - Opinion on EP policies in each country
- What is needed now for the Barometer
 - Extend the database of experts
 - Set up the online survey and send it to potential respondents

WG2 report by Siddharth Sareen

Activities:

- Dublin 2018 meeting to consolidate language and goals.
- One academic paper submitted to 'Energy and buildings'.
- Policy brief on indicators: proposed format in bullet point overview. Three main sections:
 - o Context
 - What do we know about energy poverty on COST countries
 - What indicators and data are available

- Key gaps
What are the gaps in data/ indicators
What structural factors underpin these gaps
- Way forward
How different stakeholders can help address these gaps.

A mechanism that can help is the “European Social Survey”.

Proposed focus and format, May 2019 to April 2020:

- Involve ENGAGER members and key invitees as resources persons
- Target advanced PhDs and ECRs
- Contribute to “moving beyond the state of the art”
- Generate ideas for stakeholder engagement
- Enhance ENGAGER network
- Opportunity for a new data collection mechanism: rotating module of the European Social Survey.
- “Engaging European Energy Poverty: Research for Impact” -Potential date: Summer 2019, Potential location: Barcelona, Spain.

WG3 report by Sergio Tirado

Activities:

- This WG has to create a space for dialogue among different stakeholders regarding EP.
- In the first MC meeting in Athens the basic points and questions regarding the work of WG3 were discussed. Emphasis should be given on bringing academic/ research knowledge to practice.
- The main aim now is the organization of a training school (possibly in cooperation with WG2) maybe in Barcelona in summer 2019. Moreover, a policy brief will be prepared for delivery in November 2018.

Note: WG3 has 25 members with limited activity so far since the structure of ENGAGER includes WG3’s deliverables later on.

WG4 report by Katrin Grossman

Activities:

- Year 1 Innovation check of existing strategies. This will be the topic of Paris Workshop together with WG1, leading to the deliverables (STSM report, case study and policy brief)
- Years 2-4:
 - Discuss EP in relation to the bigger picture of economic systems right to energy, justice, visions
 - Make smart technologies, renewables, energy efficiency just
 - Foster cross-sectoral approaches/ tackle EP through urban planning

Questions and Discussions:

- *What is innovative in existing policies?*
- This is a main question, for which the input of ENGAGER members and other persons interested is necessary. A link will be sent.

SCM report George Jigla

Activities:

- Presentation of the website, Twitter feed, Facebook page: info about events, activities, articles. All participants were encouraged to use #energypoverty #fuelpoverty @EngagerCOST when using social media.

There are three main communication channels for ENGAGER project:

- Webpage
- Facebook
- Twitter

What will be communicated about:

- Research/ publications within the action
- Relevant research outside the action
- Events within the action
- Events/ presentations outside the action
- News/ actions/ projects of relevant stakeholders
- Other interesting stuff

Who do we target:

- Decision makers at home (local/ national)
- EY decision makers
- Businesses, companies, industries, practitioners
- Other researchers in EP and connected fields
- The media/ general public

What kind of material

- Publications
- Deliverables
- Newspapers/ magazine articles
- Blog posts
- Flyers
- Relevant websites
- Newsletter

Who can communicate

- For official matters: chair, CG, SCM, Grant Manager
- Everyone!

STSM report by Nikolas Katsoulakos

Activities:

- Defining STSM: Networking and exchange of researchers.
- Particular attention to ECRs up to 10 years after PhD and to ICT priority countries.
- Under first round:
 - 6 STSM with a total budget of approx. 10,000 EUR until August 2018.
 - Many ICT countries involved.
 - Mostly related to objective 1 and 2.
 - Second call with ongoing dates: 2 missions completed. 2 more applications expected. Related to WG1, 2 and 4.

Experience of an STSM by Anaïs Varó:

- In the middle of research stay from 1st of September until October 5th.
- Work with Sam Nierop at Ecofys.
- Criteria for assessing innovation being developed.
- Expected to have 6 STSMs completed at the end of budget period 2 (March 2018).

Ms Varó kindly asked participants to encourage their colleagues, especially ECRs. Letter of support from home and host institutions needed.

BREAKOUT GROUPS

1. Links with other initiatives and state of the art /conferences, workshops, travel grants, etc. (Slavica /Sergio)

- Paris meeting suggested layout:
 - Day 1: workshop on innovative approaches, short presentations discussions. Places will be open to other non-WG1 and WG4 members. 35 people answered positively, 40 places. 20 euros food and 120 euros hotel is too little for Paris.
 - Day 2: make progress on the deliverables of WG1 and WG4.
- Writing retreat suggested by Katrin Grossman in Germany:
Encourage participants to try and change hosting countries as much as possible.
- Ideas for Bucharest conference fieldtrips:
 - Military district with old communist buildings, no insulation: has there been any urban regeneration?
 - Homeless initiatives?
 - District heating plans?
 - Could be water be added?
 - Geothermal energy and renewable energy systems. Integration of solar PV in vulnerable households?
 - Green energy certificates in buildings: financialization?
 - New type of government arrangements, partnerships, financial schemes?
 - Roma people?
 - Collaboration with the University of Bucharest – for day 1?
- For additional events in budget period 1:
 - Small event targeted to university students in BiH from selected degrees: electrical engineering, medicine, [Nestor Ruiz]. [Question: Can we pay travel costs to participants?]

2. Outreach and dissemination (George)

Ideas about online communication: when we start having outputs:

- Translate policy briefs and other non-strictly academic outputs from English into local languages.

3. STSM (Nikolas)

Mr Katsoulakos discussed the connection between STSM reports and outcomes of the COST Action.

BREAKOUT WG MEETINGS

WG1 reported by Ute Dubois

Longer term interest for WG1:

- The question of regions in EP analysis: identifying regions with similar problems

- Instruments: the importance of policy coordination across domains
- Learning from 'worst' practices

Discussion: overlapping with WG2

WG2 report by Joao Gouveia

The discussion was mainly focused on the policy brief (PB) structure and inputs that need to be included to be delivered by the end of November.

Longer term interest for WG2:

- Ambition to have information about all countries – starting with 5-6 countries.
- Volunteers from all COST countries, importance of different disciplinary backgrounds.

1. Overview:

- The discussion started with some participants stating that could be useful to have a brief review or presentation of the definition of EP. It was concluded that this was potentially under WG1 scope and that herein, the focus should be on multidimensional indicators or indicators that are commonly used on each country.
- Common agreement over the importance of highlighting in the PB the development or future use of a multidimensional indicator that integrates several dimensions of EP in comparison to individual (and Proxy) indicators being used so far, that are not helpful to support policy and action at a national and local levels. It was suggested that could be interesting to highlight what is already being done on this issue, showcasing a couple of examples: e.g. Portuguese case.

2. Context:

- Literature Review on EP in COST countries & the associated existing indicators and data. It was proposed that a deep literature review should be conducted to support the policy brief on what do we know about EP in COST countries and what indicators and data sources are potentially available in each country/region (municipality).
- Develop a matrix (google forms) to support this data collection. The rows could be the list of countries and columns should include different indicators types (income, elderly people, energy consumption data, data on buildings, etc.) and spatial resolution data availability (e.g. only country, regional, municipal, neighborhood).
- This review could inform both the policy brief; and a later WG2 deliverable/research paper. Both the Portuguese and Polish colleagues already have or will be doing in the short term a review on this for their countries.
- Beyond state-of-the-art as presented in EPOV or the EU SILC. Literature review should accommodate indicators/raw data on energy consumption, buildings characteristics, climate, socio economic that would serve as a basis for further work on developing a multidimensional index that could be replicated for different countries/regions. Examples of data sources: Household Budget Survey, energy performance certificates, energy statistics, Census.
- Elucidate main data gaps in each country/different spatial scales. Literature review will also allow to clearly understand what are the main data gaps in each country and at different spatial scales and will also enable to evaluate which stakeholders should be include for moving forward.
- Commence Literature review for WG2 country representatives. It can then be expanded to all COST participants.

3. Future Activities/Recommendations:

- Next year's (2019 and/or 2020) activities should include a WG2 hands-on working meeting for thinking about the multidimensional indicator. This will be relevant only after a deep review of what is currently available of indicators, data and variables relevant to EP.
- It was recommended that WG2 should have a similar table with all the participants as done under WG1 (include name, e-mail, photo and core expertise).
- Recommended to do a review of the registered persons on WG2 within all COST participants, to see if anyone else wants to participate.
- WG4 suggested to evaluate the possibility of a 50/50 indicator (e.g. save 50 tons of CO₂ and save 50€). Due to time restrictions, at the meeting, this needs further discussion to evaluate what was meant by this idea.

WG3 report by Sergio Tirado

Joint WG2/WG3 training school proposed Barcelona in late May-early June 2019 in Barcelona. Need to break the wall between academic/non-academic knowledge and approaches. Proposal to physically get out of the university and hold the course in a non-academic building. Discussion about where to put the thematic emphasis

WG4 report by Katrin Grossman

Over the summer, three groups were active doing a literature review on innovation regarding EP alleviation policies, a group worked on innovation criteria regarding policies, and a third group developed an outline for the policy brief. All this will feed into the deliverables. A sample of policies should be analyzed by using the criteria proposed. Anais Varo has made a significant contribution through her STSM at Ecofys with Sam Nierop to the criteria development. For the selection of policies, the MC was asked to highlight three innovative initiatives through a little online google form, this will also be posted to the members list, so that we have an expert selection instead of a desk selection of policies to include in the review.

Future Activities/ three deliverables by end of November:

- STSM report
- Paper in evaluating innovation in policies
- Policy brief (state of the art, gaps etc.) – there will be a common structure/ format for the policy briefs for all WGs

Presentation of the work of Anais:

- The innovative criteria are divided into two main axes, namely technology and governance
- The axes are further categorized into dimensions and subdimensions
- The subdimensions are shortly described
- A scale is used to evaluate how innovative various policies are (now the scale is from -5 to 5, it is proposed to change into -3 to 3)
- Anais states whether there is an imbalance between the technology and the governance axis
- There is a plan-B. In case the evaluation is not successful, qualitative analysis is going to be made.

Points discussed:

- Delineating the concept of policy: it seems broad, agreement to have a low threshold for including something as an innovative strategy starting from local initiatives, we will choose policies according to what experts think to be innovative policies, see above.

- Who does the evaluation? (Two options)
 - a) Evaluation is done with a questionnaire by a number of experts, but this will lead to inconsistent results.
 - b) Evaluation done by Anais, however it was argued that she does not have full insight and local knowledge.

The optimum way to evaluate policies as innovative: if possible, Anais will do the evaluation and then discuss with experts or have them revise her evaluation, so we mix the consistency of one person doing the evaluations across policies/initiatives and the in-depth knowledge of local experts.

- Gap between policy and its implementation: is relevant, but to evaluate even the outcome of policies is simply not doable in the time given.
- A good starting point for next year could be examining the failure of policies which aim at alleviation of EP, but fail or produce counter-effects. To identify these, we can again have an international panel of experts who can express their opinions; this could be done in cooperation with WG1 (who also thought about analyzing bad practices during their breakout session).
- Highlight that certain policies may be innovative in a specific country and non-innovative in another.
- Side benefits, like CO2 emission reduction can be added to the matrix, (Anais: eco-innovation), but it will be not for this step, suggestion to WG2 to think of a 50/50 indicator: 50 Euro saved for a household/ 50 t CO2 saved)
- Look for projects that can support scale up of pilot projects/ initiatives.
- Possibility to have another STSM regarding the ranking of policies, or work on further steps outside the scope and timeframe of this STSM.
- As for the draft for the deliverable “case studies”, a rough draft will include the potential for scientific papers gathered through the work of the three groups during summer (see above), in three points: describe existing landscape of policies, identify the gaps (if possible including some matrix exercise with the innovation criteria), highlight innovative strategies.
- In the Paris meeting: examine the state of the art achieved and decide about the focus of a paper first-authored by Anais and then maybe identify more potential for further common publications.

FUTURE STEPS

1. Paris workshop 22-23 October 2018.
2. Bucharest conference 22-24 January 2019.
3. WG2/WG3 training school in spring 2018/2019 (next budget period).
4. Please send Chair ASAP ideas for additional events.