



INTELLIGENT  
ENERGY  
EUROPE  
FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE



REPORT

# WP 3: Report on the evaluation of the support provided for the development of a SEAP

WP leader:

Austrian Energy Agency (AEA)

Vienna, April 2012



AUSTRIAN ENERGY AGENCY

## **Project consortium**

B.&S.U. Beratungs- und Service-Gesellschaft Umwelt mbH(BSU) – Germany

Krajowa Agencja Poszanowania Energii S.A. (KAPE) – Poland

Energikontor Sydost AB (ESS) – Sweden

Energy Consulting Network (ECNet) – Denmark

SPES Consulting Srl (SPES) – Italy

Agenzia per l'Energia e lo Sviluppo Sostenibile di Modena (AESS) – Italy

Gradbeni inštitut ZRMK, d.o.o. (ZRMK) – Slovenia

Středisko pro efektivní využívání energie, o.p.s. (SEVEn) – Czech Republic

Bond Beter Leefmilieu Vlaanderen (BBL) – Belgium

Severn Wye Energy Agency (SWEA) – England

Austrian Energy Agency (AEA) – Austria

Agência para a Energia (ADENE) – Portugal

**Project coordinator:** B.&S.U. Beratungs- und Service-Gesellschaft Umwelt mbH

The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

## Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
<b>1 Austria .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP.....	5
1.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	6
1.3 Country specific conclusions .....	8
<b>2 Belgium .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP.....	9
2.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	11
2.3 Country specific conclusions .....	12
<b>3 Czech Republic.....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP .....	13
3.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	13
3.3 Country specific conclusions .....	14
<b>4 Denmark.....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	16
4.2 Country specific conclusions .....	17
<b>5 Germany.....</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP.....	18
5.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	19
5.3 Country specific conclusions .....	21
<b>6 Italy .....</b>	<b>22</b>
6.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP.....	22
6.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	24
6.3 Country specific conclusions .....	26
<b>7 Poland.....</b>	<b>27</b>
7.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP.....	27
7.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	28
7.3 Country specific conclusions .....	29
<b>8 Portugal.....</b>	<b>31</b>
8.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP.....	31
8.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	33
8.3 Country specific conclusions .....	34

<b>9</b>	<b>Slovenia</b> .....	<b>36</b>
9.1	Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP .....	36
9.2	Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	37
9.3	Country specific conclusions.....	39
<b>10</b>	<b>Sweden</b> .....	<b>40</b>
10.1	Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP .....	40
10.2	Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	41
10.3	Country specific conclusions.....	42
<b>11</b>	<b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....	<b>44</b>
11.1	Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP .....	44
11.2	Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs .....	46
11.3	Country specific conclusions.....	48
<b>12</b>	<b>Overall Summary</b> .....	<b>49</b>
	<b>Annex</b> .....	<b>50</b>

## Introduction

The report on the evaluation of the support provided for the development of the Sustainable Energy Action Plan (SEAP) reviews the support given to cities that have joined the Covenant of Mayors (CoM). The evaluation of the individual support was carried out in the first quarter of 2012, whereas the seminars were evaluated right after they took place. The evaluation shall help the come2CoM project partners to improve and standardise the support offered to cities.

The report reviews the support provided individually and through seminars in all 11 project countries. To carry out the review, the Austrian Energy Agency as Work Package 3 leader developed a questionnaire as well as an evaluation template for the evaluation results (see Annex). The questionnaire was translated into the national language of each project partner. It was handed out by the project partners to city representatives individually supported as well as during the seminars. The evaluation results together with the support methods were described by the project partners and compiled by the Austrian Energy Agency in this report.

The results of the support provided have to be considered against the background that the questionnaire comprised questions relevant to all fields of SEAP development. However, not all questions were addressed within the individual consultations nor within the seminars, therefore in some cases some results are less satisfactory than others.

Regarding the individual support, the city representatives were asked whether:

- Suitable methodologies for SEAP development were presented to municipalities,
- Municipalities were guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for SEAP development,
- Assistance in defining energy efficiency and CO<sub>2</sub>-targets was offered,
- Priorities and key actions were recommended,
- Advice on how to integrate the SEAP into administrative structures was given,
- Assistance in time and financial planning was offered,
- Information on financial support was offered and
- Information on monitoring of the work progress was offered;

The questions for evaluating the support provided through seminars focused on whether:

- The participants were satisfied with the organisation of the seminars,
- The seminar corresponded to the participants expectations,
- Different methodologies and CO<sub>2</sub> emission tools were presented,
- Key steps for SEAP elaboration and implementation were presented,
- The seminar was helpful to select a suitable methodology for SEAP development and
- Information on financial support was offered.



# 1 Austria

## 1.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

In Austria, the following approaches were pursued to develop the Sustainable Energy Actions Plans (SEAPs) in the framework of the come2CoM-project:

1. Application of the European Energy Award© Methodology (afterwards called e5 methodology) in order to develop the SEAP and build on synergies between the two methodologies,
2. Application of existing methodologies related to the development of local energy concepts to develop the SEAP and build on synergies between the two methodologies.

In total, six SEAPs were developed in Austria for the municipalities of Bleiburg, Bregenz, Gabersdorf, Laxenburg, Saalfelden and Schwaz. All six municipalities have in common that data on the energy production and consumption of their municipality was available to a large extent at the time the SEAP was developed. All six municipalities had already earlier made a status-quo analysis of their energy situation which could be used for the Baseline Emission Inventory (BEI). Where no data was available, regional statistical data had to be used or adapted to local conditions based on experts' estimations.

The support for SEAP development was offered to the municipalities by the Austrian Energy Agency's subcontractors in the come2CoM project, Climate Alliance Austria and the regional managers of the e5 programme (e5 is the Austrian Label for the European Energy Award©). The support they offered to their municipalities was regarded as helpful and professional.

The satisfaction with the approaches demonstrated for preparing the SEAPs and with the guidance offered in choosing an appropriate methodology was rather high. Most of the municipalities find the chosen methodology applicable and suitable for existing local energy plans and programmes. The municipalities were also rather satisfied with the assistance they received in defining energy efficiency and CO<sub>2</sub> targets as well as key actions and priorities. They were less satisfied with the advice they were given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders. This is probably due to the fact that no supporting structure was established in Austria in the past years; Climate Alliance Austria has become a supporting structure only recently.

Depending on the degree of completion of the SEAP, the advice received on how to integrate the SEAP into administrative structures, to communicate the SEAP internally and externally and on how to arrange the time and financial planning was perceived as satisfactory or not quite satisfactory, respectively. The information received on financial mechanisms available was perceived as rather dissatisfactory, due to the fact that financial support is in general seldom available for municipalities. Finally, the information given on how to monitor the work progress was perceived as very satisfactory by two municipalities and rather unsatisfactory by three municipalities.

Table 1: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Austria

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respon- dents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	80%	20%	0%	0%	5 (=100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	60%	40%	0%	0%	5 (=100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	20%	60%	20%	0%	5 (=100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	40%	60%	0%	0%	5 (=100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	40%	60%	0%	0%	5 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	0%	40%	60%	0%	5 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	0%	60%	40%	0%	5 (=100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	20%	20%	60%	0%	5 (=100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	0%	20%	80%	0%	5 (=100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	20%	40%	40%	0%	5 (=100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	40%	0%	60%	0%	5 (=100%)

## 1.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The two SEAP seminars in Austria took place on 28<sup>th</sup> of June 2011 and 30<sup>th</sup> of November 2011.

In the first SEAP seminar an overview of the CoM and the requirements of the SEAP were presented by the Austrian project partner. The different requirements of a municipality signing up to the CoM (e.g. overall strategy, BEI, SEAP etc.) were discussed. Some practical information was given by the mayor of Munderfing. He explained why Munderfing joined the CoM and how they developed the SEAP. As the e5 project managers (who advise more than 100 e5 municipalities in Austria and also act as subcontractors in the come2CoM project) were the main target group of the first seminar, an important point of discussion was how to apply the e5 tools to the development of a SEAP.

The second SEAP seminar started with news about the CoM presented by a representative of Climate Alliance Europe. Afterwards the participants learned about CoM relevant projects in Austria (such as NET CoM and BEAM21) and how they can make use of them. Then the experiences of the municipality of Laxenburg (CoM signatory) with the CoM and the SEAP development were presented. The SEAP of Laxenburg is based on a local energy concept, and the advantages and disadvantages of this approach were discussed. In the afternoon a representative of the “Kommunalkredit Public Consulting” informed the participants about financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs, followed by a discussion about SEAP development. The SEAP development discussion was started by a representative of the Climate Alliance Europe who explained the main cornerstones of a SEAP. Then 3 e5 programme managers described their experiences with the SEAP development based on the examples of Bregenz, Saalfelden and Gabersdorf.

According to the evaluation results (see the table below), 90% of the participants were very satisfied and 10% were satisfied with the general organisation of the SEAP seminars. Further on, the seminars very well (40%) or well (60%) satisfied the expectations of the participants. Participants especially liked the possibility to get to know other interested persons, to be able to exchange information and experiences and to discuss various issues related to the CoM. Further on, they liked the mixture of participants (representatives from small municipalities, large cities, local energy suppliers, local and regional energy agencies, Climate Alliance Austria, Climate Alliance Europe, etc. were joining the seminar) and the practical information they received. Nevertheless, some of the participants think that the flexibility in how to develop a SEAP is a bit too high and that they would appreciate more concrete guidelines from the European Commission. They are afraid that the quality of some SEAPs might be very low and this is not an incentive for e5 municipalities to join the CoM which put a lot of effort on quality standards in their e5 programme. Due to the fact that only a few Austrian municipalities joined the CoM so far, the number of methodologies and CO<sub>2</sub> emission tools presented was limited. For 21.1% of the participants this fact was not quite satisfying and they mentioned that further information on approaches from other countries would be interesting for them. That is why Mr. Miguel Morcillo, who is very well informed about different approaches used for the SEAP development in other countries, was invited to the second seminar. The information given by him was very useful for the participants. Further on, the participants were also satisfied with the practical advice they received during the seminars and they liked the information on financial mechanisms available for local authorities.

Table 2: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Austria

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respon- dents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20 (=100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20 (=100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	15.8%	63.2%	21.1%	0.0%	19 (=100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	73.7%	21.1%	5.3%	0.0%	19 (=100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable	31.3%	68.8%	0.0%	0.0%	16

methodology for our city/municipality.					(=100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20 (=100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	35.0%	40.0%	20.0%	5.0%	20 (=100%)

### 1.3 Country specific conclusions

In Austria, the CoM was barely known at the time the come2CoM project started. Only 4 municipalities had signed up to the CoM by 2010. Up until the end of the come2CoM project, the number of Austrian signatories rose to 12, though. However, it needs to be stressed that the number of new signatories would have probably been lower, if no help had been offered to municipalities interested in joining the CoM through the come2CoM project. It also needs to be said that mostly municipalities which were already engaged in local energy planning and implementation through the e5-programme joined the CoM. These are municipalities having already a local energy strategy in place as well as a good data base and a clear picture in which fields they need to set measures in order to reduce their energy consumption and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. However, the support offered to these municipalities through the Austrian Energy Agency's subcontractors was very much appreciated, also since developing a CO<sub>2</sub> balance (Baseline Emissions Inventory) as well as calculating the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction impact of measures is not part of their daily work.

The seminars organised by the Austrian Energy Agency were very much appreciated. The first seminar was dedicated to elaborating on the synergies between the CoM and the e5-methodology. It was organised in a familiar setting, gathering two representatives of the Austrian Energy Agency, the regional managers of the e5-programme and two municipality representatives. The setting allowed to discuss all remaining questions regarding the CoM, BEI and SEAP as well as synergies with the e5-programme. The second seminar was organised in a larger setting, gathering besides the Austrian Energy Agency and its subcontractors a representative from Climate Alliance Europe as well as representatives from regional energy agencies as well as municipality representatives.

To conclude, it can be said that although the CoM was conceived as a movement for introducing local energy planning into Europe's cities and municipalities, it is a very demanding process that only advanced municipalities can manage within one year after signing up. In addition, in many cases support from external experts and/or supporting structures is needed to guarantee the development of a highly qualitative SEAP. Finally, the commitment of municipality representatives is crucial for implementing the measures defined in the SEAP.

## 2 Belgium

### 2.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

#### Short overview of the support given in Belgium

From the beginning of the come2CoM project, BBL wanted to focus on a specific region where favourable conditions for the CoM could be found. At the same time, the province of Limburg expressed its ambition to become the first climate neutral province in Flanders. While consulting the province of Limburg, it became clear that it needed help to realise its ambition and that working with the Covenant of Mayor structure would be a good first step. BBL's individual support to municipalities was characterised by the following features:

- **Working with standard documents**

The province of Limburg consists of 44 municipalities and BBL wanted them all to sign up to the CoM. However, this also meant that BBL had to work in an efficient way. That is why BBL worked with a standard SEAP based on a provincial climate action plan ([www.limburg.be/webfiles/leven/milieu\\_en\\_natuur/TACO2/pdf/taco2\\_eindrapport\\_defv3.pdf](http://www.limburg.be/webfiles/leven/milieu_en_natuur/TACO2/pdf/taco2_eindrapport_defv3.pdf), **TACO2**, read more in the report on applied methodologies). This standard SEAP consists of a list of measures and actions BBL recommends for municipalities. If they want to, municipalities can add extra measures or actions. Based on the provincial climate action plan, BBL was also able to make a BEI for all municipalities.

- **Tailor made work**

It was not BBL's goal to produce 44 similar SEAPs. In order to differentiate the SEAPs and to give enough support, BBL visited all municipalities. BBL asked all municipalities to bring together a municipal steering committee (which would be responsible for the project), starring the mayor, councillors and civil servants. In these steering committees, BBL discussed the BEI and the standard SEAP (read more in the next paragraph).

- **Working step by step**

Since fulfilling the CoM requirements constitutes a lot of work and processing a lot of information, BBL visited all municipalities three times and gave relevant information step by step. In a first visit during spring 2011, BBL provided the municipalities with general information: what does BBL expect from the municipalities and what can they expect from BBL? In a second visit during autumn 2011, BBL explained all municipalities their BEI. On November 30<sup>th</sup> 2011, all municipalities of Limburg signed up to the CoM. In a third visit, going on until the end of April 2012, BBL explains municipalities the standard SEAP and how they can adapt it. If all goes well, a lot of SEAP's should be approved by June 2012.

- **Division of labour: working with partners**

BBL could not do all of the work itself. All tasks were divided as follows with the following partners.

- Province of Limburg: made a provincial action plan and a provincial BEI (**TACO2**), general communication, invitation for workshops;

- Dubolimburg: organisation promoting sustainable building in Limburg. Made all municipal BEI based on TACO2. Made a sustainable building scan and a renewable energy scan;
- Infracx: the grid operator who provided municipal energy consumption data;
- BBL: BBL made a standard SEAP based on TACO2 and supported all municipalities (by organizing 3 visits to each municipality, by workshops).

• **The force of a higher authority**

BBL stresses the importance of a higher authority, stimulating municipalities to sign up to the CoM. Meanwhile, the province of Limburg became an official Covenant Coordinator.

**Evaluation by municipalities**

By the beginning of April 2012, 23 out of 44 municipalities have evaluated BBL's support.

In general, municipalities are satisfied with the setup of the project. They knew what to expect from BBL and what BBL expected from them. They also agree with the fact that BBL's support based on the CoM is an added value for their municipal policy.

Municipalities also know what the priorities are. In particular, they assess BBL's work done for the BEI rather high. Regarding the SEAP, municipalities have more doubts. An explanation is definitely given by the timing of this evaluation. At the time of the evaluation (March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012), most of the municipalities had to organise their second steering committee (they have time until the end of April 2012 to do that) where the standard SEAP is being presented. In this steering committee, BBL provides a list of recommended measures and actions that municipalities can implement. Therefore, it is understandable that not all municipalities have a clear picture yet on which actions to implement.

More doubts arise from support provided by stakeholders, the internal structure and communication. Again, these are subjects to be dealt with in the second steering committee. Concerning the internal structure, an explanation could be that municipalities have some difficulties in working together internally. Usually every administration is used to work on its own, and not used to work with other administrations of the same municipality. BBL thinks that this explains the weak result for question 4.

Table 3: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Belgium

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
I got a general view of the project (what is the purpose, and what are everyone's expectations)	40%	60%	0%	0%	23 (=100%)
I know what all steps are we have to take (to sign CoM, to make a SEAP)	22%	65% (+ 8.5% between good and weak)	4.5%	0%	23 (=100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the	48%	52%	0%	0%	23 (=100%)

objectives.					
The BEI was presented in a clear way	26%	74%	0%	0%	23 (=100%)
We have a clear idea on what SEAP actions we have to undertake	4.5%	36.5% (+13.5% between good and weak)	45.5%	0%	22 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	9%	63.5% (+ 9.5% between good and weak)	18%	0%	22 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	4.5%	59.5% (+ 13.5% between good and weak)	23%	0%	22 (=100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	5%	50% (+ 22.5% between good and weak)	22.5%	0%	22 (=100%)

## 2.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The seminars were organised for only one purpose: to give the municipalities of Limburg a chance to prepare their municipal steering committees which BBL supported. All seminars were organised by the province of Limburg (invitations) and the partners BBL (speaker), Dubolimborg (speaker) and Infrac (venues).

- **1<sup>st</sup> seminar: May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2011 on the BEI**

In this seminar, the partners explained how the BEI for every municipality is developed, based on TACO2. 35 people attended the seminar.

- **2<sup>nd</sup> seminar: September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2011 on several supporting instruments and communication**

In this seminar, the partners explained two instruments: a sustainable building scan and a renewable energy scan. With these two instruments, a municipality can assess the potential CO<sub>2</sub> savings from sustainable building investments and investing in renewables. In this seminar, the partners also included a topic on communication: how can a municipality involve its citizens into this project. 33 people attended the seminar.

- **3<sup>rd</sup> seminar: 15 March 2012 on the SEAP**

BBL explained the standard SEAP in detail and how municipalities can adapt it. BBL also presented some possible actions to join the sustainable energy week in June. 33 people attended the workshop.

The evaluation of the seminars showed the following results:

Table 4: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Belgium

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respondents
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	14%	72%	0%	0%	14 (=100%)
The workshop helped me to prepare the steering committee and the personal visits.	15%	85%	0%	0%	13 (=100%)

Considering these results, BBL can conclude that the support was seen as very helpful. The municipalities have a clear idea of what steps they should take in elaborating a SEAP and are well prepared for a steering committee.

### 2.3 Country specific conclusions

BBL's approach worked out very well: 44 municipalities signed up to the CoM and by the end of June 2012, probably all municipalities will have an approved SEAP. However, BBL has also noticed some disadvantages in its approach and has some remarks in general about the CoM:

- Do all mayors realize what they have signed? The purpose of this proposal was to convince mayors to sign up to the CoM by offering them a lot of free support. Sometimes BBL got the impression that mayors thought that BBL will do all the work for them.
- In working step by step and giving all information step by step, municipalities tend to forget the bigger picture. Information that has been given a while ago is sometimes forgotten.
- The importance of a higher authority cannot be minimised. Without the stimulation of the province of Limburg, BBL could not have gotten these results.
- Making a BEI and a SEAP is a lot of work. BBL thinks that not every municipality has time and capacities to do such a work.

## 3 Czech Republic

### 3.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

There have no SEAPs been submitted so far in the Czech Republic. SEVEN has not supported any municipalities in SEAP development either, but put its main effort into promoting the CoM initiative while focusing on the appropriate cities. The effort taken focused on two strategies: (1) individual negotiation and (2) promotion through the National Network of Healthy Cities.

The individual negotiation mainly relied on SEVEN's network of colleagues and projects across the country: several personal consultations were carried out and the CoM was promoted or at least mentioned at some relevant local events (Energy Performance Contracting seminars, procurement seminars etc.). Usually, municipalities are very interested in reducing their costs for energy and there are a lot of projects going on with regard to energy and cost savings (e.g. insulations). However, there is little interest for initiatives like the CoM (low public demand for "green" solutions and investments without direct outputs). Due to this fact, SEVEN focused its support and promotion on the more practical advantages of becoming a signatory of the CoM. Therefore, Energy Performance Contracting was, for example, promoted as a possible measure to be included in SEAPs (i.e. measures with low investment demand).

The second strategy of support was addressing cities through the National Network of Healthy Cities, concentrating a lot on cities where the environment is an important issue. Even though the mutual partnership with the National Network of Healthy Cities started early and there were a lot of opportunities to promote the CoM, there was no direct outcome. The city of Hlinsko could be an exception, as it signed up to the CoM in 2011 and is a member of the National Network of Healthy Cities as well.

SEVEN did not support any municipality individually in SEAP development, therefore no results on the evaluation of the individual support provided can be presented.

### 3.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The main effort made consisted of promoting the CoM initiative, the SEAP development process and possible SEAP measures lowering the energy demand of the city. The focus was put on the promotion and on measures which do not require big investments such as EPC projects (Energy Performance Contracting) and possible government's funding possibilities.

There were two big conferences in Jeseník and Litoměřice in 2011, tackling climate change, the CoM and SEAP. Ms. Cicmanova from CoMO and Mr. Ondrejicka from the Energy Agency Nitra (Nitra signed up to the CoM in 2008) gave a presentation on the CoM. The value of the conference could be multiplied, as there is a webpage with the video recordings of the presentations available<sup>1</sup>. The results of the seminar taken place in Česká Lípa are shown in the table below. Due to a change in person responsible for the come2CoM project within SEVEN, no evaluation forms were handed out during the other seminars.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.pakt-starostu.cz/>

Table 5: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Czech Republic

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	44%	56%	0%	0%	9 (=100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	0%	89%	11%	0%	9 (=100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	22%	56%	22%	0%	9 (=100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	44%	33%	23%	0%	9 (=100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	11%	44%	33%	12%	9 (=100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	22%	44%	34%	0%	9 (=100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	33%	56%	11%	0%	9 (=100%)

### 3.3 Country specific conclusions

There are two important factors specific to Czech municipalities with regard to the CoM and the SEAP development process:

- municipalities are concerned about the financial benefits of the CoM above all, the **main drivers** for municipalities in reducing their carbon and energy footprint remain the **reduction of energy related costs**; thus municipalities focus primarily on measures reducing their energy costs than on measures with high investment demand and a high payback period.
- political commitment is seen as crucial for signing up to the CoM and then developing and implementing the SEAP; according to SEVEN's experiences, there is a **significant lack of this political commitment** in the Czech Republic.

## 4 Denmark

The first year of the CoM intervention in Denmark concentrated on acquisition efforts and learning of the CoM experience so far in Denmark. Most of the learning referred to RUC's SEAP assistance to municipalities in Region Zealand. Further EC Network helped with SEAP implementation in the municipality of Helsingør based on existing SEAP.

From summer 2011 EC Network proceeded to specific SEAP assistance of the four municipalities Hjørring, Ringkøbing-Skjern, Odense and Sermersooq (Greenland). This was done in cooperation with Roskilde University (RUC) in order to integrate the experience from SEAP activities in Region Zealand as well as the CoM methodology adopted for Danish conditions by RUC in the optimal way.

The main steps in the SEAP assistance comprised:

- Kick-off meeting, 19<sup>th</sup> September 2011: The overall CoM provisions were explained, the four municipalities presented their goals & intentions and a mutual workplan agreed.
- Working on the data: EC Network gathered information from each municipality and put it into a 'SEAP process paper' with recommendations on how to handle the SEAP phases.
- SEAP development workshop, 23<sup>rd</sup> –24<sup>th</sup> Nov 2011: In-depth explanation and discussion of the CoM. Drawing up SEAP preparation plan based on the 'SEAP process paper' and work plan for the individual SEAP assistance.
- Individual assistance: Undertaking specific SEAP assistance in accordance with the agreed work plan like for instance helping to prepare the BEI or definition of SEAP actions. This was done in form of visits to the municipalities or via mail/phone, as appropriate.
- SEAP evaluation workshop, 24<sup>th</sup> April 2012: The SEAP assistance was evaluated, inspiration given to invited CoM candidate signatures and discussion of the future CoM framework

At the capacity building level EC Network aimed at giving a balanced introduction to CoM and how to handle SEAP development. Thus the workshops entailed lectures on both BEI methodology as well as on how to design SEAP actions. Only monitoring aspects were less covered. The lectures were supplemented with the municipal representatives' own presentations, examples from other municipalities and experience sharing.

The individual SEAP support was organised in view of each municipality's needs. For example, the municipality of Odense mainly needed help on how to exploit renewable energy potentials in order to realise their ambitious SEAP goal, and so the assistance was oriented towards this goal.

All four municipalities have expressed great satisfaction with the SEAP assistance. In their evaluation they both appreciated the capacity building part and experience sharing at the workshops as well as the individual assistance given. It seems to take up to one year to prepare a SEAP of sufficient quality (thus the CoM timeline appears appropriate due to the experience gained). For that reason the SEAPs could not be finalised within the project period, except for Ringkøbing-Skjern where the SEAP was at an advanced stage to start with. Also the municipal representatives from Sermersooq in Greenland made a very positive evaluation. Despite this, the municipal decision makers have not yet decided upon joining the CoM, but important steps in that direction have been taken. The other municipalities are on a committed track and feel confident to meet the CoM SEAP requirements.

The response on the evaluation questionnaire looks as follows.

Table 6: : Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Denmark

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
I think that the demonstrated methodology is applicable to and suitable for our situation	67%	33%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Was the given assistance suitable in relation to the overall process of defining our SEAP	67%	33%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
How do you assess the assistance in the specific areas (like BEI or elaboration of SEAP key actions)	67%	33%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	67%	33%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
How do you assess the guidance in relation to the monitoring of the SEAP process	33%	67%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	33%	67%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)

#### 4.1 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

EC Network organised the following seminars and workshops in order to increase understanding of the CoM and motivate municipalities for 'clever' moves in that direction:

- 26<sup>th</sup> November 2010 and 1<sup>st</sup> December 2010, EC Network organised, in coordination with the Danish regions and municipalities' EU offices and the Danish Energy Agency, two seminars for municipalities in East and West part of Denmark, respectively, ultimo 2010. The seminars were hosted by the municipality of Guldborgsund and the municipality of Middelfart. The seminars provided an opportunity to present the experience so far with CoM and SEAP development, incl. the experience of the 14 municipalities in Region Zealand that made joint submission to the CoM in 2009. Not least it provided an opportunity for the municipal representatives to discuss various aspects of CoM and how it suits to their existing activities. The subsequent acquisition and specific SEAP assistance of Come2CoM was much based on the outcome of these discussions.
- 24<sup>th</sup> February 2011, a workshop was held for municipalities in the Central Denmark Region (the central belt of Jutland) in coordination with the regions EU office. 13 potentially interested municipalities participated in the workshop and entailed good learning for the municipalities concerned.
- A third seminar was organised at a more advanced stage of the project intervention. It took place in Skanderborg, 24<sup>th</sup> November 2011, at a time when the specific SEAP assistance to five DK municipalities was well underway. Thus it provided an opportunity to present the initial findings of the SEAP assistance as well as other developments. Especially the presentation of the ELENA initiative at Region Zealand where 12 municipalities are involved in energy efficient measures of public buildings for an investment level of around 50 MEUR took the audience's attention.

The evaluation table below present the evaluation of participants at the third seminar.

Table 7: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Denmark

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respondents
How did you find the event organisation	60%	40%			11 (out of 45 attendees)
How relevant was the event theme	55%	45%			11 (=100%)
How did you find the presentations under the workshop?	55%	45%			11 (=100%)
Were there any issues in relation to CoM and related topic you would have heard more about?	No		Yes		11 (=100%)
	73%		27%		
If you represent a municipality, did the seminar provide you good arguments to convince the municipal decision-makers to join the CoM?	Yes		No		11 (=100%)
	63%		37%		
Did the seminar inspire you to seek involvement in the CoM and related EU activities?	Yes		No		11 (=100%)
	90%		10%		
Do you find it relevant to organise a similar event within the coming year?	Yes		No		11 (=100%)
	90%		10%		

## 4.2 Country specific conclusions

EC Network finds the applied approach of SEAP assistance – in form of a combination of capacity building and experience sharing via workshops in conjunction with individual SEAP assistance – a high success. The involved municipalities' response confirms that statement.

It needed a lot of explanation to convince the municipalities to join the CoM. Most importantly, the municipalities wanted to feel certain on how to live up to the requirements. Come2CoM has given the municipalities an opportunity to understand these requirements and learn from existing experience in Denmark and on European level as a key factor for them to decide on joining – what they would not have done without the services of the project.

The ideal situation would be that municipalities in the Danish regions made joint submission to the CoM as the example set by Region Zealand. The Come2CoM intervention has not managed to trigger this, mainly because the Danish regions have a weak mandate in the field of sustainable energy.

Nevertheless, there have been made good achievements and lessons learnt for the future. The challenge is to put in place strong regional support structures in order to release the potential in the individual municipality and across municipalities. Enabling a strong CoM framework, including opting for better fitting of CoM development in Danish municipalities to the national framework, should be a key priority for both the national and regional/local authorities.

## 5 Germany

### 5.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

In Germany, the municipalities / cities of Berlin, Teltow, Friedrichshafen, Willich, Iserlohn, Rheinberg, Essen and Duisburg have been supported in developing and submitting their SEAPs. Until the end of the project, 4 SEAPs have been submitted (of which 2 are approved) and 4 will be finished in the next months. BSU supported 5 further municipalities with their SEAPs. These were Fürstfeldbruck, Altötting, Lörrach, Wiesloch, Limburgerhof /Böhl-Iggelheim. Help was mainly given on:

- joining the CoM (BSU provided the interested municipalities with the necessary documents to join the CoM and explained the CoM commitment to them)
- explaining to the municipalities which data are necessary to fill in the template and where to get them,
- choosing measures for the SEAP (divide them into short, mid and long-term measures and assign them to the SEAP sectors),
- determining priorities and key elements of the SEAP (e.g. long-term vision),
- quantifying CO<sub>2</sub> emissions,
- giving advice on how to set up administrative structures,
- filling in the SEAP online template
- and translating the measures for the English SEAP template.

The German partners (BSU, EA.NRW – Energy Agency of North Rhine-Westphalia) supported 8 municipalities in SEAP development, whereof 7 filled in the questionnaire. The results show that the municipalities were in general satisfied or very satisfied with the assistance given. They appreciated the assistance given as it permitted them to (nearly) finalize their SEAPs.

Table 8: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Germany

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	Weak / not quite satisfied	Insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	50%	33%	27%	0%	6 (=100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	33%	50%	27%	0%	6 (=100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	72%	14%	0%	14%	7 (=100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	60%	40%	0%	0%	5 (=100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	27%	73%	0%	0%	6 (=100%)

Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	40%	40%	20%	0%	5 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	40%	40%	20%	0%	5 (=100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	20%	20%	20%	40%	5 (=100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	25%	50%	0%	25%	6 (=100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	20%	60%	20%	0%	5 (=100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	25%	50%	25%	0%	4 (=100%)

## 5.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The German SEAP seminars took place on 16<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> March 2012.

The first seminar was held in Düsseldorf by the subcontractor Energy Agency of North Rhine-Westphalia on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2012 and supported by BSU. 10 representatives from municipalities attended the seminar. General guidelines on how to fill in a SEAP have been given. One speech from the city representatives of Aachen was held including first-hand experience. The seminar showed that exchange was appreciated a lot and that a need for such an exchange existed as the discussion was very lively. This is underlined by the results of the seminar: The municipalities which all take part in the European Energy Award felt unanimously that the CoM means a lot of extra work to them. They wonder what happens to their data they type into the online tool and think that – when it comes to publishing the SEAP – financial aspects should not appear online. Furthermore, they feel that the link between the eea® and the CoM is too weak and would like to strengthen it, meaning that more eea® data should be accepted for the CoM. They wonder as well why the interface between ECORegion and the BEI has been interrupted as now data has to be filled in manually. The CoM should implicate subsidies for the amount of work it costs to the municipalities. The conclusion of the discussion showed that in general, the CoM could complete the eea® but only if the two instruments become better connected.

The second seminar was held in Friedrichshafen in cooperation with the city of Friedrichshafen and the energy agency Ravensburg on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2012. 56 people attended the seminar, of which 38 were mayors and representatives from municipalities as well as people from different parties, NGOs and engineering companies. The seminar started with speeches from the first mayor of the city of Friedrichshafen and the minister of energy and environment from the federal state of Baden-Württemberg who concentrated on the German energy turnaround and the role of communities. Another speech was held by Climate Alliance on EU energy and climate politics after Fukushima before the focus was put on SEAP development. The aims and advantages of the CoM have been depicted as well as possibilities of support for municipalities. Several representatives from signatory cities reported their experience with the CoM and gave practical advice on how to develop a CO<sub>2</sub> emission inventory or the measures they chose. The steps municipalities take on their way to develop a SEAP have been presented and the advantages in joining the CoM for eea® communities depicted. During the discussion some city representatives gave feedback on their SEAP experience and highlighted that they wish to get more support and quicker answers from

CoMO. The comparability of the SEAPs was put into question and the “formalism” the municipalities have to handle while elaborating a SEAP was criticised. Participants and speakers clearly stated they would like to see the CoM become integrated into existing initiatives like the eea®. Furthermore, they highlighted they would like to see more interconnectedness and reliability in future. Still, the conclusion drawn at the end of the seminar was that the CoM deserves support - Improvements however are very welcome.

The analysis of the evaluation template shows that the participants were in general very satisfied or satisfied with the seminars. The organisation was evaluated as very satisfying or satisfying. The same can be stated about the expectations connected to the seminars and the presentation of the key steps necessary for elaborating a SEAP (100%). However, it has to be stated that only few handed in the questionnaire although they were asked to fill it in several times during the seminar and afterwards via e-mail. Concerning methodologies on different CO<sub>2</sub> emission tools, 40% of the participants would have liked to get more information on that as they were only quite satisfied with this point. It has to be stated though that CO<sub>2</sub> balancing was included into the programme of the second seminar with 3 referees on that topic and a following discussion round. Attendees rated the information presented on financing as good or quite satisfying (87%). However, the seminars did not focus on this topic, consequently the ratings are misleading. They show however that financing is a topic to be concentrated on in the future as municipalities mostly have few monetary resources available. On the contrary, 90% stated that the seminar helped them to find suitable methodologies for their municipalities. In both seminars, municipalities appreciated a lot the exchange of first-hand experience. 75% were very satisfied with these presentations. In summary it has to be said that the participants were satisfied or very satisfied with the seminars held and that the presentations and advice given helped them in their work on SEAPs.

Table 9: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Germany

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	75%	25%	0%	0%	12 (=100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	25%	75%	0%	0%	12 (=100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	20%	40%	40%	0%	10 (=100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	20%	80%	0%	0%	10 (=100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	30%	60%	10%	0%	10 (=100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	75%	25%	0%	0%	12 (=100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	13%	50%	37%	0%	8 (=100%)

### 5.3 Country specific conclusions

The individual support given to the German municipalities was appreciated a lot by the municipalities. In general the municipalities were satisfied or very satisfied with the assistance given.

The seminars gave a lot of room for discussion and enabled municipalities to report directly to the come2CoM partners in Germany about their experience. As indicated above it has to be stated that German municipalities in general were very satisfied with the seminars and the presentations. They appreciated amongst others the first-hand experience given, the key steps for SEAP elaboration presented, the general organisation and saw their expectations concerning the seminars fulfilled. They would have liked to get more information about financing which unfortunately was not focused on. More important however for the future of the CoM is the feedback they gave during discussions: they would like to see the CoM interlinked in a stronger way to existing initiatives like the eea®. Filling in the template should be facilitated and the link to ECORegion re-established. Questions have been asked about the comparability of the SEAPs. City representatives wondered what happened to the data they filled in online and mentioned the hope that the monitoring process should not become too time-consuming. A reporting every 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> year should be sufficient. Participants wish to get more support – from CoMO or JRC (although few distinguish between the two offices) but appreciate also the support from local actors to elaborate the SEAPs. Municipalities stated that the CoM is an initiative which deserves support – however, they would also like to see improvements.

## 6 Italy

### 6.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

The CoM initiative has been a large success in Italy and a very high number of local authorities have joined it so far. The municipalities supported by AESS in SEAP development were enthusiastic to sign up to the CoM. Some of them tried already before to draft energy policies and strategies, but since there were no national/regional guidelines and indications available on how to develop an energy action plan and no national/regional targets on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction set, they did not adopt long term and ambitious energy action plans.

Therefore, the CoM represented a good opportunity for Italian local authorities to set up an action plan together with an emission reduction target and to collect all the present and future projects, actions and initiatives related to sustainable energy development of the territory, carried on by different departments and actors in the municipality. The definition of a methodology for the monitoring of actions undertaken was also part of the process.

The Italian local authorities however were confronted with a lack of internal competence on energy planning and a lack of human resources for SEAP development. Moreover, the English language was a problem.

SPES approached several supporting structures (Province of Siena, La Spezia, Alessandria, Florence, Tuscany Region...) and the Sustainable Energy Europe Campaign office at the Ministry of Environment in order to find out how the municipalities were doing with fulfilling the CoM-requirements. All of the supporting structures were in contact with signatories who faced problems with the BEI&SEAP development.

SPES realized that the supporting structures could not live up to the expectations municipalities had regarding receiving support from them, since they were often confronted to a lack of resources themselves (personnel, financial). Therefore, the supporting structures contacted by SPES obtained free support for the municipalities interested to develop a BEI and SEAP. SPES supported them by providing them with information about the process and the methodologies and selected 12 municipalities to be "looked after" until the submission of their SEAPs.

Both, AESS as well as SPES supported the municipalities throughout the whole CoM-process:

- CoM adhesion: AESS supported the local authorities by providing them with a draft of deliberation (official resolution adopted by the council to join the Covenant) and checking that the adhesion form was correctly filled in and sent;
- Identify in the local authorities persons in charge of the project and responsible for data collection, activities organisation, SEAP development/implementation/monitoring;
- Provide the municipality with a list of data and information necessary to develop the SEAP and the BEI and support in data collection;
- Organisation of meetings with the municipal departments to evaluate the actions promoted in the last years and the opportunities and strategies until 2020;
- Development of the BEI and SEAP based on the JRC guideline;
- Definition of mid-term and long-term actions, and evaluation of the impact of the actions;

- Presentation of the SEAP to local stakeholders, city council, citizens, departments of local administration;
- Compilation of online templates.

AESS supported 11 municipalities in the SEAP development and the results of the evaluation questionnaire demonstrate the appreciation for the services provided, even if local authorities expected more support in the citizens involvement, development of a free and a user friendly tool for BEI and SEAP development, exchange of best practices and study tours to visit smart cities as well as more support in SEAP implementation and monitoring.

Table 10: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Italy (AESS)

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respon- dents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	64%	36%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	64%	36%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	55%	45%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	82%	18%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	45%	55%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	18%	82%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	27%	55%	18%	0%	11 (= 100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	27%	55%	18%	0%	11 (= 100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	55%	27%	18%	0%	11 (= 100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	73%	27%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	27%	73%	0%	0%	11 (= 100%)

The 12 municipalities technically supported by SPES were quite satisfied with the help they received. However, developing the SEAPs together with the municipalities proved to be more work than expected, not only because of the number of the cities supported (one more than foreseen), but mainly because of the lack of data and competences within the municipalities.

At the end of the project, SPES had elaborated 12 BEI, 3 MEI (monitoring emission inventory – the baseline was referred to the 1999 and the MEI evaluates the 2009 emission trend) and 12 SEAPs

of which 9 were approved within the come2CoM-project and 3 to be submitted to the City Council in May or June 2012. SPES also supported the municipalities in uploading the documentation on the CoM website (also for those ones who will do it after the project end).

One of the highlights of SPES support within the come2CoM-project is the set-up of 12 energy teams within the municipalities who will be responsible for implementing the CoM in the future.

Table 11: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Italy (SPES)

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	50%	40%	10%	0%	12 (= 100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	60%	30%	10%	0%	12 (= 100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	100%	0%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	30%	30%	40%	0%	12 (= 100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	60%	40%	0%	0%	12 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	80%	20%	0%	0%	12 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	30%	30%	40%	0%	12 (= 100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	60%	40%	0%	0%	12 (= 100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	50%	50%	0%	0%	12 (= 100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	60%	40%	0%	0%	12 (= 100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	70%	30%	0%	0%	12 (= 100%)

## 6.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The seminars organised by AESS or in which AESS participated had the goal to disseminate the experience on SEAP development:

**October 28<sup>th</sup> 2010:** Managenergy seminar on SEAP development (Bologna), 31 representatives of local authorities and consultants attended the seminar. AESS presented some SEAPs developed through Come2CoM.

**March 4<sup>th</sup> 2011:** Training course for local authorities on SEAP development (PATRES project Trieste), 28 representatives of municipalities, training course within the PATRES training course for local authorities (IEE project) to increase their knowledge in SEAP development.

**September 24<sup>th</sup> 2011:** Training course for local authorities on SEAP development (Università nel bosco, Borgo Pace – Province of Pesaro – Urbino), training course for 12 local authorities on SEAP development and implementation;

**February 9<sup>th</sup> 2012:** Energy 4 Eastern Mayors project kick-off meeting, training course for 14 attendants on SEAP development and implementation.

**February 20<sup>th</sup> 2012:** seminar on SEAP monitoring (Modena), 15 representatives of local authorities attended the seminar.

Multiple activities have been set by AESS in seminars' organisation and participation in order to train local authorities and consultants on SEAP development. The participants were very satisfied with the activities offered. However, it also has to be said that only a few participants filled in the questionnaire, even though AESS reminded them several times to do so.

Table 12: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Italy (AESS)

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	29%	71%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	14%	86%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	29%	71%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	43%	57%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	0%	100%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	14%	86%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	0%	100%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)

SPES has presented the CoM and the BEI&SEAP development methodologies in many events all around Italy and three specific seminars were organised in cooperation with supporting structures or local authorities.

*25 September 2010, Copparo:* the CoM as opportunity for local authorities (60 attendants)

*19 January 2011 during Siena energy week:* seminar on the CoM as opportunity for local authorities and four days stand to give explanations to administrators (70 local authority representatives attending)

13 April 2011, Florence: SEAP examples and methodologies (30 attendants)

19 May 2011, Florence: SEE Campaign seminar: the CoM – methodologies and financing (30 attendants)

The questionnaires distributed during the events were filled in only by 40% of the attendants.

Table 13: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Italy (SPES)

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	20%	80%	0%	0%	75 (= 100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	50%	50%	0%	0%	75 (= 100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	60%	40%	0%	0%	75 (= 100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	80%	20%	0%	0%	75 (= 100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	40%	30%	30%	0%	75 (= 100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	70%	30%	0%	0%	75 (= 100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	50%	30%	20%	0%	75 (= 100%)

### 6.3 Country specific conclusions

The individual support has been crucial in order to finalize the SEAP development in the municipalities of the Province of Modena. Without the support provided within the come2CoM project, the local authorities could not have developed their SEAPs on their own. It is therefore evident that local authorities cannot develop a SEAP without any external support and the seminars do not give enough support to local authorities, even if they can be considered as an added value for the responsible person of SEAP development in local authorities.

According to SPES, the required documentation is too much of internal work for municipalities that they cannot handle without any consultancy support. However, municipalities often lack money to pay for this support, and in addition they mostly do not receive any help from the supporting structures.

Although the signing process is quite easy, the mayor often has no idea of how much work it could take to submit the documentation and the municipal structure approach is not suitable for the CoM added work: an energy management system is very helpful in these cases, also in order to ensure the continuation of the process after submitting the SEAP. In fact, there are two “critical moments” for municipalities after signing and submitting the SEAP: the interest in the CoM is decreasing dramatically and it should be “recalled” (by the energy management system or by the CoM managing authority) to keep the cities in the process.

## 7 Poland

### 7.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

In Poland, the standard JRC guidelines were applied in the process of SEAP development within the come2CoM project.

In total, 5 municipalities received support in the course of SEAP preparation and these were Warszawa, Alwernia, Szczawnica, Rabka and Muszyna. Warsaw was already a CoM signatory and the support offered within the come2CoM project was related to perfecting the SEAP that was to be submitted to the JRC.

Alwernia, Szczawnica, Rabka and Muszyna are not signatory cities of the CoM yet. They were hesitant about taking long term obligations to CO<sub>2</sub> reduction, but did want to start up the energy planning process. Thus, they applied for support in BEI and SEAP preparation and will now consider joining the CoM.

The 6<sup>th</sup> municipality to receive individual support was Bełchatów, but the municipality has not started writing its SEAP yet. Nevertheless, several meetings took place including one with the City Hall to present the CoM and the benefits of integrated local energy planning. It is expected that Bełchatów will take action soon in this regard.

Cities that received support under come2CoM, differed significantly in their size and thus in the level of the energy planning process' complexity. Their size affected the availability of the data and the length of the planning process which ranged from 2 months to over 1 year and from single discussions to multi-department series of consultations. In all cases the support offered to municipalities was seen as helpful and professional.

The satisfaction with the approaches demonstrated for preparing the SEAPs and with the guidance offered in choosing an appropriate methodology was rather high. The majority of the municipalities consider the methodology chosen as applicable and suitable for existing local energy plans and programmes. Advice given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders was perceived as less satisfactory. In Poland, cooperation with different stakeholders including energy companies is not yet well established. In many regions, it is almost impossible to build the connections. This also results in slightly lower satisfaction with the support offered regarding internal and external SEAP communication.

The information received on financial mechanisms available was considered as very helpful. As financing opportunities are crucial for the future implementation of the plans, KAPE made sure that this aspect is presented to the supported cities, both during individual support and the seminars.

As JRC monitoring guidelines were not available at the time of project finalisation, this aspect is reflected on the evaluation of the support as the supporters were not able to present CoM future expectations.

Table 14: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Poland

<i>How would you rate the following?</i>	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respon- dents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	80%	20%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	60%	40%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	20%	60%	20%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	40%	60%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	40%	60%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	0%	40%	60%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	0%	60%	40%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	20%	20%	60%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	0%	20%	80%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	20%	40%	40%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	40%	0%	60%	0%	5 (= 100%)

## 7.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

Two SEAP seminars were organized in Poland in the course of the come2CoM project:

1. First seminar on the 20<sup>th</sup> of April 2011 in Katowice, and
2. Second seminar on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of April 2012 in Szczawnica.

The first SEAP seminar was organised in cooperation with Śląski Związek Gmin i Powiatów (Silesian Union of Municipalities and Counties) and took place on the 20<sup>th</sup> of April 2011 in Katowice. As at that time the number of Polish signatories was still significantly low, the main aim of the seminar was the presentation of the CoM as well as its energy planning process including BEI and SEAP development. Financial instruments were also presented as well as exemplary energy efficiency measures. The seminar was attended by 25 participants, representing municipalities from Silesia region.

The second seminar was organised on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of April 2012 in Szczawnica in cooperation with the Institute of Environmental Economics, Municipality of Szczawnica and Małopolska Region. The agenda of the seminar included the presentation of CoM and the SEAP development process with a short introduction to financial mechanisms. It was also dedicated to a wide range of practical experiences in the local energy planning process, including cases on the installation of RES and energy efficiency measures.

Both seminars were appreciated by the participants. 88% of the participants were very satisfied and 13% were satisfied with the organisation of the events. For the majority of the participants, the seminars corresponded to their expectations though they did have some remarks regarding future meetings and possible modifications to the agenda. As KAPE used JRC recommendations in the process of developing SEAPs, no other methodologies nor tools were presented at the meetings (no answers for these questions were collected).

The majority of the participants found the presentation of the 10 SEAP steps very satisfying or satisfying. They also appreciated the mixture of local experiences presented at the seminars. An overview of the public-oriented financial mechanisms was an important part of each seminar and according to the evaluation report, this was highly appreciated.

Table 15: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Poland

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respon- dents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	88,0%	13,0%	0,0%	0,0%	16 (= 100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	63,0%	38,0%	0,0%	0,0%	16 (= 100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0 (= 100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	75,0%	25,0%	0,0%	0,0%	16 (= 100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	13,0%	63,0%	25,0%	0,0%	16 (= 100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	50,0%	38,0%	13,0%	0,0%	16 (= 100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	63,0%	38,0%	0,0%	0,0%	16 (= 100%)

### 7.3 Country specific conclusions

At the proposal stage of the come2CoM project, there were only 4 Polish CoM signatory cities. The concept of the CoM was only known to a limited number of local leaders active in the EU arena, mostly those associated in the Polish Network Energie Cités, a first CoM supporting organisation.

Since 2010, after the project was launched, the number of signatories has risen to 30 as of the end of April 2012. This could be considered as a significant rise, but if one takes into account the size of the country and the number of municipalities – 908 communities – 30 Polish CoM signatories are still on the low side. This clearly demonstrates that the CoM is not able to reach the local governments with just a concept. It needs targeted support and associated financial measures.

Analysing the situation and the results of individual consultations, KAPE has come to the following conclusions:

- Most municipalities are unable to produce BEI and SEAP by themselves. When they join the CoM, they have no separate energy administrative structure within the municipality in place and in most cases, they subcontract creating those documents.
- The lack of resources and qualified personnel makes it impossible for less advanced municipalities to make the change with only a limited support received from external experts. With no financial resources, they were unable to move forward, themselves receiving only limited support.
- There is a general lack of knowledge regarding energy efficiency, RES and energy planning, not to mention issues like where to get the energy related data, how to process it and how to build energy teams and committees. Basic training is often needed before the energy planning process can be even started.
- On the other hand, there are municipalities already involved in environmental protection programmes and often active in international programmes with partnering cities in other EU countries. These municipalities are able to take the given know-how and process it in a constructive manner – leading to interest in CoM and taking targeted actions towards energy efficiency and CO<sub>2</sub> reduction programmes.

Although the CoM is perceived as a valuable initiative aiming at combating climate change from the local level, it is associated with a very demanding energy planning process which is difficult to manage by the majority of the municipalities without expertise or targeted support, plus under the time pressure. However, targeted support opens doors and opportunities.

In case of come2CoM, the municipalities appreciated both the seminars and the individual support. If it was not for come2CoM, the municipalities of Alwernia, Szczawnica, Muszyna and Rabka Zdrój would have not developed neither BEI nor SEAP in the nearest future.

Direct, well-targeted support will be especially crucial for the future of small and medium municipalities in the CoM.

## 8 Portugal

### 8.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

The experience of ADENE and the work with the local energy agencies shows that it is possible to achieve important results in a relatively short time in an area that represents one of the main challenges the world has to address.

In order to not reinvent the “wheel”, ADENE used two important documents for SEAP development:

1. Covenant of Mayors: How to develop a Sustainable Energy Action Plan – Guidebook
2. Joint Research Center – Specific and Technical Reports

In Portugal, the first municipality that showed interest in receiving support through the come2CoM-project in SEAP development was Loures. In November 2010, a meeting was held with the municipal team responsible for implementing the CoM in order to advise it on the main steps to take.

The second municipality advised on the CoM process was the municipality of Agueda. ADENE developed the specifications for a company to develop the SEAP. However, ADENE was never requested to support this company in the development of the SEAP.

From May 2011 on, ADENE met with the local energy agency ENERAREA in order to find two new municipalities to join the CoM within the come2CoM-project duration. The municipalities:

- Manteigas
- Figueira de Castelo Rodrigo

showed interest in joining the CoM. However, these two potential municipalities only wanted to sign up to the CoM if the outcome of the SEAP concluded that they have the capacity to implement the measures and goals traced.

Due to the cooperation between ADENE and ENERAREA, three more municipalities that had already signed up to the CoM asked for support in BEI and SEAP development. These are:

- Pinhel
- Guarda
- Belmonte

After meetings with these municipalities, ADENE decided to set up a working group and invited all these municipalities to be part of it.

Unfortunately, the municipality of Belmonte left this working group because it decided internally that it does not have the money and capacity to continue the CoM process.

The strategy to motivate the municipalities that constituted the working group was:

1. Have ADENE and ENERAREA as leader of this working group;
2. Organise monthly meetings in order to evaluate the work done;
3. Facilitate know-how transfer between the municipalities through the working group.

The BEI was the first step to take and finish, but in some municipalities developing the BEI was very challenging since hardly any data was available. However, in February 2012, all the municipalities had completed their BEI and have started to work on the measures to implement.

Developing the SEAPs on the basis of the document “How to develop a Sustainable Energy Action Plan”, ADENE translated parts of the document into Portuguese, presented the main features of the document chapter by chapter in detail and gathered all the measures and results shown on the CoM webpage for Portugal in an Excel document and provided all this information to the working group.

This information was very important, because it enabled the municipalities to follow a structure and showed what measures and sectors should be "attacked" and what are the cost and results of their implementation.

So, this information allowed the working group to implement measures appropriate to the situation of each municipality.

Currently, the working group is analyzing the measures that are going to be selected by each municipality and evaluating if the emission reduction target can be reached with the measures chosen.

In November 2011, two new signatories joined the CoM thanks to the efforts taken by ADENE and IRRADIARE, a private company with whom ADENE also collaborated in the come2CoM project. The two new signatories are:

- Ourém
- Faro

However, only Faro decided to develop the SEAP, since Ourém had not adapted its administrative structure to the CoM yet. The first step was the development of the BEI (baseline year 2009). Once, the BEI was developed, the measures were defined in order to achieve the reduction target of at least 20% by 2020.

All the measures which form the SEAP were defined taking into consideration the economic situation of the country and of the municipality. Scenarios were developed forecasting the energy consumption of the municipality with as well as without implementation of the measures.

Table 16: Conclusions after SEAP of Faro completed

MEASURES IMPACT	REDUCTION
Energy consumption	20,9%
CO <sub>2</sub> emissions	20,6%
Energy bill reduction (2010 prices)	22,0%

Faro's SEAP was completed within the come2CoM project duration. The conclusions to be drawn from the completion of the SEAP are quite satisfactory.

In March 2012, the municipality of Batalha invited ADENE to present the come2CoM project, to inform about the CoM and disperse remaining doubts about this initiative as well as to present guidelines and some good examples. This meeting was attended by the mayor of Batalha and local energy agencies (that represent different municipalities). Unfortunately, ADENE could not convince the municipality of Batalha to sign up to the CoM, since the municipality is confronted with financial difficulties.

In total, ADENE supported five municipalities in SEAP development. The results of the evaluation of the questionnaire demonstrate that the supported given to the municipalities was very helpful as well all the documentation given by ADENE to the municipalities for the development of all the work.

Table 17: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Portugal

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	Weak / not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	0%	100%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	0%	100%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	0%	100%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	0%	80%	20%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	0%	100%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	0%	80%	20%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	0%	80%	20%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	0%	0%	100%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	20%	0%	80%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	0%	20%	80%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	0%	20%	80%	0%	5 (= 100%)

## 8.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The first seminar where come2CoM was presented, took place in November 2010. It was prepared by the local energy agency of Cascais in the scope of the project ENESCOM.

At the end of the seminar, the municipality Loures decided to seek support through the come2CoM project. However, as previously mentioned, the assistance was only to explain the main steps on how to develop the BEI and SEAP.

ADENE also presented the come2CoM-project during two seminars at São Pedro do Estoril and Bombarral cities in the scope of other projects.

In April 2011 ADENE organized two seminars in Abrantes and Beja. In total, approximately 120 people participated in these two seminars.

In order to make the seminars more attractive and interesting, the programmes were divided into two parts. The first part was more theoretical, to present the come2CoM project and methodologies for the development of the BEI. The second part was more practical, with examples from other cities that had already signed up to the CoM – examples of national and international cities, explaining good examples of some measures to be implemented. These seminars helped to convince two new cities to join the CoM (Faro and Ourém).

ADENE further organised one seminar in Brussels in March 2012 which aimed to present the Faro SEAP as well as to present the come2CoM project and the development of SEAPs in other come2CoM partner countries.

At last, in April 2012 ADENE presented the come2CoM project in the UrbaVerde fair. ADENE also has been involved in the organisation of the seminar that took place inside of this fair: "The 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of Mayors". No participant list is provided for the UrbaVerde seminar, since it was organised as a free fair and free entry in the seminar (without a subscription list).

In general, the seminars allowed to explain what the CoM is, to present the come2CoM project, clarify doubts, present methodologies, measures and good examples (national and international), as well enabling the transfer of knowledge between municipalities as well from the stakeholders.

Table 18: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Portugal

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	0%	100%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	0%	80%	20%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	0%	20%	80%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	20%	60%	20%	0%	5 (= 100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	0%	20%	80%	0%	5 (= 100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	0%	100%	0%	0%	5 (= 100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	0%	60%	20%	20%	5 (= 100%)

### 8.3 Country specific conclusions

The two main conclusions drawn from the experience with the CoM within the come2CoM project are that (1) that many municipalities sign up to the CoM without knowing what they are actually

committing to, and (2) municipalities are reluctant to join since they are afraid of the commitments of the CoM.

The main problems of the municipalities that wish to join the CoM or have already joined are:

1. Organization within the municipality;
2. Lack of data;
3. Lack of communication between stakeholders and between municipalities that have already submitted their SEAP;
4. Lack of knowledge, especially in the field of energy efficiency;
5. Financial support.

However, most of these difficulties were overcome by the support given and by the translated documents. Despite the work done, only one SEAP was developed and finalized within the come2CoM project duration.

The development of the SEAP of Faro is a successful example of initiating local energy planning, but there is still much work to be done to achieve the CO<sub>2</sub> reduction target of 20% in Portugal.

The seminars were a good opportunity to disseminate information about the come2CoM project and to promote the interaction between municipalities as well as between municipalities and companies invited to the seminars showing what services they could offer.

## 9 Slovenia

### 9.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

At the beginning of the come2CoM project, only two municipalities had signed up to the CoM so far in Slovenia (Velenje, Ljubljana). Therefore, the Slovenian partner ZRMK decided to inform as many municipalities as possible about this initiative. First of all, ZRMK sent brochures and information material about the CoM to all Slovenian municipalities by email. For those municipalities which showed interest, ZRMK organized presentations on the come2CoM project and the CoM in general. Mayors and other local municipality representatives were invited to those presentations.

After the presentations, ZRMK visited a few municipalities and some of them finally decided to sign up to the CoM. During another visit, ZRMK explained to them how to develop a SEAP. The first step was to ask all municipalities to establish a municipal steering committee. The municipal steering committee consists of the mayor as well as councillors, civil servants and representatives from other areas in the municipality who play an important role in reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (energy-, construction-, transport-, education department). The steering committee is responsible for fulfilling the CoM requirements. Together with the committee, ZRMK has examined the local energy concept of the municipality and defined the tasks to be fulfilled. At the same time, ZRMK started to discuss with them about how to develop the BEI and a standard SEAP.

According to the IEE grant agreement, ZRMK had to support two cities individually with SEAP development. In the end, ZRMK provided individual support to three municipalities who evaluated ZRMK's support as follows:

All municipalities were satisfied with the support provided to set up the project and with suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs demonstrated. They also agreed that the chosen methodology was applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans. One municipality was not quite satisfied with the priorities and key actions which were recommended to achieve the objectives. The municipalities were rather dissatisfied with the information they received on financial mechanisms for the realization of actions mentioned in the SEAP.

Table 19: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Slovenia

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/not quite satisfied	insuffi- cient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	66,6%	33,3%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	66,6%	33,3%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the	33,3%	33,3%	33,3%	0%	3 (=100%)

objectives.					
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	33,3%	66,6%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	66,6%	33,3%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	0%	66,6%	33,3%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realization of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	0%	33,3%	66,6%	0%	3 (=100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	0%	66,6%	33,3%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	66,6%	0%	33,3%	0%	3 (=100%)

## 9.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The Slovenian project partner ZRMK organized two SEAP seminars. The first seminar took place on 10<sup>th</sup> of March 2011 and second one on 12<sup>th</sup> of July 2011. On 3<sup>rd</sup> of December 2010 ZRMK organized a presentation of the come2CoM project and presented an overview of the CoM (participant list enclosed in this report).

The event on the general presentation of the project come2CoM and the CoM in December 2010 was attended by 36 mayors and other local representatives of municipalities respectively.

In the first SEAP seminar dedicated to **Support municipalities for accession to the Covenant of Mayors and reduce of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; Sharing experience of municipal strategies for sustainable energy**, ZMRK tried to encourage the mayors of Slovenian municipalities to sign up to the CoM. ZMRK invited the mayors of all Slovenian municipalities (210), representatives of local energy agencies (8), other representatives of local communities and interested professional public. It was attended by 28 participants, of which 4 Local Energy Agencies (LEA) which represented 47 municipalities. In total, the come2CoM project and the CoM initiative were brought to the attention of 67 municipalities.

The second seminar dedicated to **The Covenant of Mayors and the procedures for drawing up SEAP; Exchange of experiences between municipalities** took place in Ljubljana on 12<sup>th</sup> of July 2011. It was attended by 56 participants (lecturers included, some of which represent individual municipalities through Local Energy Agencies). 26 participants represented 20 municipalities. 4 Local Energy Agencies (LEA) represented 54 municipalities. In total, the come2CoM project and the CoM were brought to the attention of 74 municipalities. Other participants included representatives from business and non-governmental organizations (NGO).

At the seminar, participants learned about:

- what are the obligations of signatories when joining the CoM,
- what are the benefits of the approach,
- how to elaborate a SEAP, how to upgrade the local energy concept,

- how did the first Slovenian signatories to the CoM start to fulfil their obligations,
- possibilities of co-financing of investments in environmentally friendly technologies,
- investors, contractors, owners and users of buildings – what motivates them to energy-efficient construction / renovation,
- energy efficient and green building as a development challenge and an opportunity for the local community.

According to the evaluation results (see table below) almost 80% of the participants were very satisfied and 20% satisfied with the general organisation of the SEAP seminars. The seminar corresponded very well (40%) or well (60%) to the expectations of the participants, whereas 10% of the participants were not quite satisfied with the seminar. Almost 70% of the participants were very satisfied or satisfied with the different methodologies and CO<sub>2</sub> emission tools presented. 6% of the participants were not satisfied with the methodologies presented. Some participants wanted detailed methods for the determination of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and practical advices and first-hand experience. Due to the fact that only a few Slovenian municipalities have joined the CoM so far, the number of methodologies and CO<sub>2</sub> emission tools presented was limited. More than 60% of the participants were very satisfied with the key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP clearly presented at the seminars. Further on, the participants were also satisfied with the practical advice they received during the seminars and they were convinced that seminars helped them to select a suitable methodology for their city or municipality. The participants also wanted to see the practical development of a SEAP– the actual proceeding. The participants were also satisfied with the practical advice they received during the seminars and they liked the information on financial mechanisms available to local authorities. They also demanded a more determined proceeding of state authorities to effectively achieve the objectives.

Table 20: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Slovenia

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respondents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	78,2%	18,8%	0,0%	3,0%	34 (=100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	40,6%	50,0%	9,4%	0,0%	33 (=100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	28,8%	41,2%	24,1%	5,9%	34 (=100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	62,3%	30,0%	8,7%	0,0%	34 (=100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	29,4%	44,1%	26,5%	0,0%	32 (=100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	42,5%	34,1%	23,4%	0,0%	33 (=100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	37,6%	32,4%	30,0%	0,0%	34 (=100%)

### **9.3 Country specific conclusions**

At the beginning of come2CoM project, only two municipalities had signed up to the CoM so far in Slovenia (Velenje, Ljubljana). Once ZRMK sent information material about the CoM to municipalities, interest in the CoM increased. This is also evident from the relatively high participation in presentations and seminars.

The majority of Slovenian municipalities counts less than 12.000 inhabitants and technical staff for fulfilling the CoM requirements is rather scarce. The elaboration of the BEI was seen as the biggest obstacle for the technical staff of the municipality when joining the CoM. Some municipalities expected that all work on the BEI and SEAP would be done by ZRMK.

To conclude, it can be said that in many municipalities, the decision to sign up to the CoM and to develop a SEAP is associated with financial difficulties.

## 10 Sweden

### 10.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

When offering individual support to the municipalities, it is essential to listen to their individual needs which often differ a lot. The differences concern most of all the numbers of employees in the municipal organization for issues related to local energy planning. For this reason, it is not fruitful to develop a common plan on how to support municipalities in their endeavours for local energy planning. Therefore, ESS started the process by offering most municipalities to come to see them in their city. ESS presented the CoM for those who did not know about it yet or did not have sufficient knowledge about it. ESS presented the possibilities it had to support them in the affiliation process. This was more or less a dissemination activity, but it was a necessary step in order to start the process in the municipalities. After this first step, some of the municipalities decided to sign up to the CoM, some municipalities wanted to think about it and for some it was clear that they did not want to sign up. For the municipalities which wanted to sign after this first meeting, ESS proposed a way of support offered to them (described later by demonstrating the example of Älmhult). In some cases, ESS has applied this approach.

Municipalities which had signed up to the CoM before the come2CoM project started, were also offered the help of ESS. Some of them needed help to fill out the BEI and/or wanted to attend the seminars on SEAP development.

In general, the support provided was seen as helpful. The comments received were mostly positive. The questions on financial issues were rated less satisfactory, since ESS was not focusing on these issues during the meetings. Also the question on internal and external communication was not answered to the full satisfaction of the municipality representatives, although ESS talked about it during the meetings with some municipalities. There were several suggestions that ESS should organize regional meetings for e.g. exchanging experiences with other municipalities. ESS takes this suggestion seriously and will focus on that more in the future.

Table 21: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – Sweden

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respon- dents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	0%	100%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	14%	86%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	14%	86%	0%	0%	7 (= 100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	29%	57%	14%	0%	7 (= 100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	14%	57%	29%	0%	7 (= 100%)

Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	29%	29%	42%	0%	7 (= 100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative structures of our city/municipality.	29%	57%	14%	0%	7 (= 100%)
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	14%	57%	29%	0	7 (= 100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	14%	43%	43%	0	7 (= 100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	29%	29%	42%	0	7 (= 100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress.	14%	72%	14%	0	7 (= 100%)

## 10.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

The regional energy agency for southeast Sweden organized four seminars on the development of SEAPs. The first three were basically the same, but were held several times because of new cities keeping to sign up to the CoM. New cities were also having some discussions in their civic organizations concerning the affiliation to the CoM. The seminars took place on 13<sup>th</sup> of May 2011, 23<sup>rd</sup> of November 2011, 18<sup>th</sup> of January 2012 and 13<sup>th</sup> of March 2012.

The first three seminars mainly had three purposes:

- to give instructions on how to affiliate to the CoM,
- to discuss methodologies on how to elaborate a BEI and
- to discuss methodologies for SEAP development.

The different municipalities attending the seminars were starting from different situations - some of them had already signed up to the CoM and some had elaborated a BEI as well. The different ways of work with the different approaches led to fruitful discussions. The agendas for the first three workshops were more or less the same, with presentations from municipality representatives on the different situations of their municipalities and analysis of the translated slideshow from JRC. Further on, representatives from the regional energy agency analysed the different methods for elaborating a BEI and SEAP. The workshops ended with some discussions on how the energy agency can support different municipalities in the process.

The fourth and last workshop was focusing on the elaboration of the SEAP. Only a small part of the meeting was about the initial affiliation process, since most of the participants had passed that stadium. The regional energy agency for southeast Sweden started with a presentation on the situation of the CoM in Sweden in general and an invitation to a national meeting in Växjö for all municipalities which had signed up to it. The different representatives were presenting their own situation in the process. The main part of the seminar was about presentations from three different municipalities on methodologies applied for elaborating the SEAP. Daniel Uppsäll from the regional energy agency for southeast Sweden, who supported the municipality of Älmhult in its process from the very beginning, organized meetings with different representatives for the most relevant departments in the civic organization. The proposed measures were suggested by representatives

from different municipal sectors and discussed with a technical committee in the organization. Then the committee proposed which measures the politicians will take a decision for. One important lesson learned was that officials and politicians take the process more seriously when someone from outside of their organization is coordinating the work. The second presentation was from the municipality of Karlskrona, by Lisa Wälitalo. She presented the methodology they had used when elaborating the SEAP. Tommy Lindström from the municipality of Borgholm was as well invited to give a presentation of its participation in an EU-funded project, named IslePact. The members of this consortium are representing different islands. They have developed a tool for forecasting different scenarios, estimating the impact of measures chosen on a more scientific basis.

In general, the seminar attendees were satisfied with the seminars on the CoM. However, the participants rated the issue “different methodologies and CO<sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented” as rather not satisfactory. The reason why the satisfaction rate was so low on that issue is that it was not discussed in the seminars, but during the individual meetings. The complete evaluation results from the seminars are presented in the table below.

Table 22: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – Sweden

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respondents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	31%	69%	0%	0%	14 (=100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	31%	69%	0%	0%	14 (=100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	8%	50%	34%	8%	13 (=100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	8%	84%	8%	0%	13 (=100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	8%	42%	50%	0%	13 (=100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	15%	77%	8%	0%	14 (=100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	0%	50%	33%	17%	13 (=100%)

### 10.3 Country specific conclusions

In the past two years, Swedish municipalities have been supported in their endeavours to boost energy efficiency in their own civic organisation. They are supported with approximately 35,000 Euro per year, if they present an action plan and can prove that they are implementing the different measures of the action plan.

Some Swedish municipalities had joined the CoM before the national funding system for the elaboration of an action plan came into force in 2009. Once the national funding took effect, the

municipalities primarily focused on the national initiative and the elaboration of the action plan, since it was financially supported. However, at the end of 2011/beginning of 2012, Swedish municipalities started signing up to the CoM once again. ESS therefore supported the Swedish CoM municipalities in the framework of the come2CoM project in developing their SEAPs.

Since the starting points vary a lot from municipality to municipality, it was essential for ESS to take the municipalities' individual needs into consideration. For many municipalities, it has been a long way to go from getting information on the CoM until finally joining. The two years' time (come2CoM project duration) for informing the municipalities about the CoM, supporting them in the adhesion process and thoroughly assisting them in developing the SEAP often seemed too short for accomplishing the CoM process (especially BEI and SEAP development). Therefore, ESS only supported municipalities that had already knowledge about the CoM when the come2CoM project started.

The seminars have in some cases been the starting point for a natural and on-going exchange of experiences between different municipalities with similar needs and conditions. ESS also experienced that politicians and municipal officials take the work on local energy planning more seriously when someone from outside is guiding them. The SEAPs are more effectively developed when organisations from outside and not the municipalities themselves, take the role as coordinator.

## 11 UNITED KINGDOM

### 11.1 Evaluation of the individual support provided to municipalities in developing their SEAP

A total of 7 local authorities have been given detailed support in the development of a Covenant of Mayors Sustainable Energy Action Plan. The type and size of the authorities varied greatly ranging from large urban areas such as Cardiff and Bournemouth to small rural areas such as Bisley and Llandovery.

The support provided was based on a methodology developed by Severn Wye, which was designed to be flexible to the size, needs and data available in each of the areas.

The offer of support was advertised via a campaign that includes a mail out to all 102 authorities in the South West, West Midland and Wales areas, a series of announcements and presentations at regional and local events plus personal consultations and existing connections with local authorities.

A total of 8 authorities came forward to be the recipients of support under the come2CoM scheme including Cardiff City Council, Bath and North East Somerset, Gloucestershire County Council, Bisley Parish, Llandovery Town Council, Bournemouth and Poole Borough Council, Gloucester City Council.

Gloucester City Council subsequently pulled out due to budget cuts and Bournemouth and Poole Councils agreed to work together as they cover adjoining geographical areas on the South coast.

Each of the participating local authorities or councils was provided with information on the background and rationale behind the Covenant of Mayors and details of how and where to sign up.

The authorities were also given support in creating a baseline emissions inventory, setting a realistic yet challenging target and in the development of a SEAP – a more detailed description of the methodology and support provided is in the WP3 Report on Applied Methodologies.

In reality the level of experience, resources available and support required differed greatly between the authorities, the reasons behind the council's decision also differed in each case and are useful to analyse what were the key drivers behind the decision. The situation in each of the participating UK authorities is summarised below:

Cardiff – a large urban authority with a dedicated sustainable development unit that offered some staff resource to work on the CoM. The Council had already prepared a Cardiff CarbonLite Strategy and wanted to use the CoM SEAP to support this strategy and add a more quantitative element to the document. As the capital city in Wales the Council felt that it would set a good example to others to sign up. National CO<sub>2</sub> emissions data was used as a basis for the BEI and reduction target.

BANES – a rural district with a single large historic town and a history of action on climate change. BANES signed the CoM as part of an ongoing programme of work led by the Environmental Strategic Partnership (ESP). The partnership includes not only the Council but representatives of the NHS, Constabulary, local businesses, University, NGO's and other third sector organisations. The CoM SEAP was intended to pull together all of the disparate strands of carbon reduction work in the district and has formed the basis for the partnerships longer term work programme.

Gloucestershire County Council – a large county council covering a wide area and two large central urban areas. The council decided to join the come2CoM project to develop the action planning work that had been started under a UK government initiative. Extending the local 3 year plan into a 10 year plan (to 2020) was a key driver. The council have close connections to Severn Wye and were keen to exploit the support offered through the IEE project.

Llandovery – a small rural town in a remote, agricultural district. The town council were keen to sign the CoM as a public statement of intent to act on climate change and help motivate action throughout the town and surrounding areas. They see the development of ‘green’ initiatives as important in attracting tourists to the area and building on the agricultural heritage of the area. The town council however has very limited resources and relies on volunteer help to progress projects.

Bisley – a small, rural but relatively wealthy parish located in the Cotswold Hills. The parish is well known for being at the forefront of community action on climate change and felt that the CoM would provide an extra incentive to residents to take action. The parish council has several knowledgeable and committed campaigners and is particularly keen to establish a clear carbon footprint (BEI) for the whole community and set a clear emissions reduction target and plan of action for how this can be achieved.

Bournemouth and Poole – these two adjacent authorities decided to sign up together and support each other through the process. Each authority covers a large mainly urban area on the south coast with a very heavy tourist influx during the summer months. Bournemouth had begun developing an application to Civitas and was keen to join the CoM in support of that application.

The following evaluation is based on responses from 3 authorities that have completed their SEAP at the end of the project.

Table 23: Results of the evaluation of the individual support provided – United Kingdom

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
Suitable approaches for the preparation of SEAPs were demonstrated.	67%	33%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was guided in choosing an appropriate methodology for our city/municipality.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I think that the chosen methodology is applicable to and suitable for the existing local energy plans and programmes.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was assisted in defining energy efficiency and CO <sub>2</sub> targets.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Priorities and key actions were recommended to achieve the objectives.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to get support from relevant stakeholders.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Advice was given on how to integrate the SEAP into the administrative	67%	33%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)

structures of our city/municipality.					
I was assisted in time and financial planning.	33%	67%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions mentioned in the SEAP.	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
Recommendations on the internal and external SEAP communication were given.	67%	33%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)
I was informed on how to monitor the work progress	100%	0%	0%	0%	3 (=100%)

## 11.2 Evaluation of the seminars on the development of SEAPs

Two seminars were held in the UK to promote and support the CoM and to help local authorities to choose the correct methodology and approach to SEAP development.

The seminars were held towards the end of the work programme as they were designed to be a launch of a UK version of the CoM club bringing together new and existing signatories in a network that provides mutual support and inspiration.

The first seminar was run in conjunction with a well-known and well attended national conference event run by the UK Carbon Action Network in York.

The sessions covered a presentation on the CoM and the multiple benefits gained from signing up plus a talk by a representative from Bath and North East Somerset Council on the positive experience with the CoM and support under come2CoM.

An interactive workshop session then involved participants in an exercise to look at current activity on emissions reduction in their areas and how these could form the basis of a SEAP.

There were 7 attendees at the seminar including representatives from local authorities in the north east region and a social housing provider plus 2 staff from Severn Wye.

The second workshop was held in Cardiff (capital of Wales and CoM signatory) and was designed as a stand-alone event to build on the interest shown in the CoM by Welsh Authorities.

The event was published widely across the national networks including One Voice Wales, Community Energy Wales, the Welsh Sustainable Development Officers Group, Wales Council for Voluntary Action (WCVA), the all Wales Pathfinder project and the Welsh Government.

An overview of the importance of maintaining links to European initiatives entitled 'Making European connections – why it's important and how it can help' was presented by well-known policy analyst Dr. Liz Mills. Dr. Mills has worked on a great many EU initiatives including as an evaluator for IEE, and as a UK contact point for INTERREG IIIC and consultant to several URBACT cooperation projects. She is also an academic expert in local government policy and regional planning.

This was followed by a review of current activity across local authorities in Wales delivered by Mike Batt from Carbon Trust Wales. Mike provided an overview of the actions that authorities are taking

to reduce the 'corporate emissions' from their own activities and how this is setting a good example for residents, businesses and community groups to follow. Several inspiring case studies were included and a summary of the CO<sub>2</sub> and financial savings authorities across the country have achieved.

This was followed by a detailed description of the Covenant of Mayors, including a screening of the come2CoM video, and how the scheme can be of benefit to local authorities, parishes, towns and communities alike.

A thorough description of methodology that has been developed under come2CoM was presented including both the calculation of a BEI and the development of a SEAP.

A summary and graphical presentation of the results of the Severn Wye work with Cardiff City Council (recently informed that their SEAP has been approved by the JRC and accepted by the COMO), Bath, Llandoverly, Gloucestershire and other come2CoM authorities.

This led into a lively question/answer session and discussion which was then followed by an interactive workshop session, facilitated by Severn Wye staff, that covered the requirements of a SEAP and how to go about setting emissions reduction targets and communicating actions to wider stakeholders and citizens.

The seminar was attended by 19 delegates from a variety of organisations including local authorities, Welsh Government, the Energy Saving Trust, WCVA, community housing and Sustain Wales.

Evaluation responses were received from 15 delegates from the two seminars and the results are summarised below.

Table 24: Results of the evaluation of the seminars on SEAP development – United Kingdom

	excellent/ very satisfied	good/ satisfied	weak/ not quite satisfied	insufficient/ not satisfied	Total number of respond- ents
How do you evaluate the general organisation of the seminar?	37.5%	62.5%	0%	0%	8 (=100%)
How well did the workshop correspond to your expectations?	37.5%	50.0%	0%	12.5%	8 (=100%)
Different methodologies and CO <sub>2</sub> emission tools were clearly presented.	14.3%	71.4%	14.3%	0%	14 (=100%)
Key steps for elaborating and implementing a successful SEAP were clearly presented.	33.3%	60.0%	6.7%	0%	15 (=100%)
The seminar helped me to select a suitable methodology for our city/municipality.	16.7%	66.7%	8.3%	8.3%	12 (=100%)
Priority was given to practical advice and first-hand experience.	16.7%	33.3%	50.0%	0%	6 (=100%)
I was well informed on financial mechanisms available for local authorities for the realisation of actions planned in SEAPs.	18.8	68.8%	12.5%	0%	16 (=100%)

The results show that on the whole the seminars were found to be useful and informative with between 50% and 100% of respondents being very satisfied or satisfied in answer to every question.

It is difficult to please all of the people all of the time and perhaps the marketing of the events could have been targeted better to avoid delegates arriving with a false sense of what they were going to learn and comments indicated that attendees wanted more time and more detail on technical issues.

Most respondents wanted more time to network with other attendees and to learn more about the CoM and the technical aspects of developing a SEAP.

### **11.3 Country specific conclusions**

There is no doubt that it has been a challenge to present the Covenant of Mayors in an attractive and appealing manner to UK local authorities. The name itself is awkward in English as a 'Covenant' is a rarely used term and a 'Mayor' in the UK is usually a ceremonial role that holds no real power or influence in political decision making.

The authorities, particularly under difficult financial conditions, resort to concentrating on core and statutory duties. The calculation of a baseline for community wide emissions and the setting of a emissions reduction target is NOT currently mandatory in the UK although many larger UK authorities are obliged to monitor, report and reduce the emissions from their own operations under the Carbon Reduction Commitment.

As a result uptake of the CoM has remained very slow after the initial phase (prior to the start of come2CoM) where the majority of larger cities and some regions (the North East) signed up. The sign up rate, outside of come2CoM, after that period has been zero, indicating the lack of enthusiasm for the initiative under current conditions.

However, various marketing ploys were used by Severn Wye Energy Agency to encourage and motivate authorities to join the scheme – by making the links to possibility of using the CoM as a link to EU initiatives and the lure of EU funding, plus the offer of free, or heavily subsidised support under come2CoM were crucial.

The feedback from the support and seminars shows that authorities find the commitment to producing a BEI and SEAP quite daunting and really need significant technical support especially on the task of quantifying the impact of activity in tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>.

In summary the CoM still presents an excellent opportunity for UK authorities to develop detailed, quantified BEI and SEAP and create a long-term framework for action, and those who have signed up to the CoM have found the experience very useful. However the initial resistance to the scheme remains high, not helped by the slightly obscure name in English and the current very tight financial situation in most authorities.

## 12 Overall Summary

The support provided to municipalities in SEAP development in the framework of the come2CoM project was very much appreciated by the municipalities. The support provided was rated as helpful or very helpful by most of the respondents. Only very few respondents said that the support given was neither helpful nor unhelpful.

Most of the respondents also commented that they were very thankful for the support received through the come2CoM project, not only because it was free, but also because it was professional and very comprehensive and related to defining a CO<sub>2</sub> reduction target, setting up administrative structures, data collection, defining measures etc. At the same time, the come2CoM project partners observed that getting support through the come2CoM was often decisive for municipalities to sign up to the CoM or get started with their work on the BEI and SEAP. They also realized that without giving the municipalities any professional help in drawing up a BEI and a SEAP, they often would not have managed to finish their SEAP on time and/or in good quality.

Negative comments with regard to the helpfulness of the given support relate less to the help provided by the come2CoM project partners, but mostly to the framework conditions. Difficulties related to data collection, the lack of financing for the implementation of actions and too few examples of good-practice examples of SEAP development/ from municipalities were stated among others.

Concerning the individual support provided, the respondents were asked about their suggestions with regard to future assistance offered on SEAP development. Obviously, the answers varied from country to country and from person to person according to the individual needs. However, it was mentioned several times that professional help is needed for drawing up the SEAP as well as for its implementation and that know-how has to be built up in the local authorities in order to professionally deal with the CoM requirements in the future. In addition, the respondents were very much interested in receiving more information on good-practice examples, concrete projects implemented and success stories. More information on financial support for municipalities is needed as well. This goes hand in hand with what the respondents were missing when dealing with the CoM and SEAP development: more examples of good practice cases, better exchange/networking with other municipalities and more complete information on subsidies and financial support. The complete comments on the individual support can be found in the evaluation templates in the annex.

Concerning the support through seminars provided, the participants were asked about what they found the most/least interesting, what they missed and about their suggestions for future seminars on the CoM. Among the aspects found the most interesting, the exchange of information and experience between stakeholders, the introduction to the CoM and SEAP methodology and advice on how to fill in the BEI and SEAP were mentioned. Presentations of real projects, possible actions to undertake to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and discussions on methodologies and selection of data sources were found very interesting as well. On the other hand, in some cases, seminar participants missed input on concrete guidelines on how to develop a SEAP, exchange of experience, good practice examples and more information on financial subsidies for municipalities. Feedback from other municipalities having signed up to the CoM as well as more networking opportunities would have also be welcome in some seminars. Suggestions for future seminars included more detailed instructions on SEAP development, presentations of SEAPs developed in other regions and/or countries and better exchange of experience between municipalities, just to name a few. The complete comments on the support through seminars can be found in the evaluation templates in the annex.

**Annex**