



ACTIVITY 1.3

EVALUATION OF REVISED ENERGY PLANNING PROCESS AT MUNICIPALITY

OF FORLÌ

DELIVERABLE 1.3.1.
Final evaluation

Version 1
09 2020



Introduction

ENES-CE project is designed to involve citizens at the very beginning of the planning process. This will be done through a series of workshops and tools, through which the existing energy plans will be revised and future ones co-developed.

The WP1's main objective is to involve citizens in revising local energy plans and define new objectives, strategies and energy and climate actions through a bottom up approach and quadruple helix, involving also the research centers, energy agencies, energy private providers, BROs in the final approval of the revised action plans. Local stakeholder engagement will take place through a series of 3 workshops that will target A) citizens and B) industry representatives. The workshops will be used to stimulate the debate about the current energy plans and to use the tools developed in TWP2.

- In STEP 1 the usage of Co-design tools will stimulate a debate between all stakeholders (including institutional ones) and will enable the redefinition of energy plans according to their input.
- Using the Community investment tools in STEP 2, a refined version of the energy plan will be presented back to them in the second workshop. In each municipality the best 3 projects will be selected and discussed in more technical detail. Through this an agreement on moving forward with the pilot actions in TWP3 will be obtained.
- Finally in STEP 3 the new energy strategy will be presented to the local communities by using the Communication tools from TWP2. Through this process the partners will guide the redevelopment of existing SEAPs in SECAPs and also a refinement of local data collection.

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation of the energy plan revision process is to rate the current state of the citizen engagement, the impact what the process have been made and provide recommendations to improve public involvement in general at community and regional energy planning.

The evaluation combines quantitative and qualitative methods as well.



1. General evaluation of the revision process

In this part please evaluate the whole revision process with the help of closed-ended and open-ended questions.

1.1 Summary

1. Please, rate on a five-point scale how you have managed to achieve the objectives set out in energy plan revision process so far.

	1 - Very badly	2	3	4	5 - Very well	DK/NA
Energy plan revision process objectives	1	2	3	4	5	9

2. Please, rate on a 5-point scale where do you stand in the current energy plan revision process, where '1' means we have just started and '5' means we have fully completed.

	1 - We have just started	2	3	4	5 - We have fully completed	DK/NA
Energy plan revision process status	1	2	3	4	5	9

3. Please summarize the energy plan revision process' current status with recommendations to other municipalities. (Some major topics of the revision process: number and type of workshops, estimation of reached citizens and other stakeholders, positive and negative experiences, major obstacles, biggest results and best practices)

The first activities intended to involve the local stakeholders, like a first contact and the request of answering to the Status Quo Analysis Questionnaire, led to a very little outcome. The turning point was the organization of the Workshops with the spread of a formal invite from the Environment & Energy Assessor and the development of a participative path together with a professional debate moderator: the gathering of even far different stakeholders allowed every actor to know each other and express his/her point of view. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to carry out any follow-up activity after the meeting due to the lack of time the organizations can devote to the path. A Local Focus Group with the pupils of primary schools turned out to be a very nice and pleasant experience; its output was a useful video, which has been used as a strong communicative tool, consenting to engage



the stakeholders during the workshops and raise the interest of citizens online. The match of environmental laboratories and production of communicative video has been replicated and it was possible both to reach the citizens with an enjoyable way to communicate and the families directly and then engage them for the other aspects of the project (i.e. Pilot Actions).

More than 25 territorial stakeholders, associations and local public authorities have been involved and participated to the workshops of revision of the SEAP.

The arise of the COVID-19 pandemic slowed down every activity, made impossible to hold the meetings in presence, reduced the possibility to cooperate between authorities and decreased the attention of the stakeholders on the SECAP issues. The Covenant of Mayors agreed to postpone the approval of the new SECAP for the Municipality of Forlì.

4. Please describe what was/were the biggest challenge/s during the revision process so far?

Facing the COVID-19 pandemic, of course, changed radically the perspective of fulfilling the WP-tasks and the scheduling of the activities. Anyway, the most difficult challenge so far, was creating a collaborative environment among the stakeholders, included between the Stakeholders and the Municipality.

**5. Please describe what have you done in order to tackle the previously mentioned problems?
What kind of support do you need to tackle these?**

The COVID-19 pandemic forced us to switch all the activities into an online mode, so Workshops and Local Focus Groups took place through videoconferences platforms, and also the videomaking educational project in the classrooms had been redefined sharing videos, photos and sounds via e-mails.

To increase the engagement of the stakeholder in participating to the meetings was sent an invite signed directly by the Assessor of the Environment and Energy Department of the Municipality of Forlì; the work of a professional debate moderator was meant to enhance the effectiveness of the meetings; a questionnaire proposed for the registration to the workshops had the role to focus on which expectation every participant had in the process.



1.2 Goals

6. Were the energy planning revision process' objectives realistic, given the time and budget allocated to the project? Please, rate on a five-point scale.

	1 - Not realistic at all	2	3	4	5 - Realistic	DK/NA
Realisticity of objectives	1	2	3	4	5	9

7. Please elaborate your answer!

Actually, the pandemic didn't give any chance to think about any realistic objective, since it seemed like normality has been suspended. Without a pandemic, the time foreseen to accomplish the goals would probably have led to a bigger rush. In particular, quite little attention was paid to the fundamental phase of the "data elaboration", i.e. the collection of energy consumption and climate data of the territory and their comparison to the SECAP's BEI and indicators.

8. Were energy planning revision process' goals clear? Please, rate on a five-point scale.

	1 - Not clarity at all	2	3	4	5 - Totally clear	DK/NA
Clarity of goals	1	2	3	4	5	9

9. Please elaborate your answer!

The revision process' goals are clear, actually the SECAP includes a totally new part about adaptation to the climate changes, which has never been handled in the previous SEAP. That could have been highlighted and taken into consideration with an allocation of time and budget as it's not a revision activity, but a new one.



1.3 Problems and improvements of the SECAP implementation

10. Which of the following problems do you consider is relevant during the energy plan implementation? Please rate on a five-point scale.

	1 - Not problem at all	2	3	4	5 - It's a very big problem	DK/NA
1. Lack of municipal financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Lack of residential financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
3. Lack of entrepreneurial financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
4. Lack of human resources at the municipality (the office staff is overloaded with work)	1	2	3	4	5	9
5. Lack of technical expertises at the municipality (there is none specialized in these topics)	1	2	3	4	5	9
6. Lack of political will (e.g. factious city council)	1	2	3	4	5	9
7. Public disinterest	1	2	3	4	5	9
8. Entrepreneurial disinterest	1	2	3	4	5	9
9. Weakness of civil cooperation (few NGOs)	1	2	3	4	5	9
10. Inadequate communication between the responsible persons in charge	1	2	3	4	5	9
11. Lack of data, or unreliability of data	1	2	3	4	5	9
12. No resources for continuous monitoring	1	2	3	4	5	9
13. Insufficient details for concrete actions	1	2	3	4	5	9

11. What other problems did you encounter during the energy plan implementation until the current state of the energy plan revision process? Please describe, if you had any.

The coordination of the activities between the different sectors and stakeholder (i.e. among offices, different enterprises and associations) was the most difficult challenging part of the revision process. Since an energy plan is a global activity which involves horizontally different sectors and several stakeholder, the most difficult challenge is trying to capture the attention of the key-persons and make them participate, add their point of view to the debate and engage them and their organizations.



12. Which of the following problems have been tackled so far by the energy plan revision process so far? Please rate on a five-point scale if relevant.

	1 - Not tackled at all	2	3	4	5 - Tackled	DK/NA
1. Lack of municipal financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Lack of residential financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
3. Lack of entrepreneurial financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
4. Lack of human resources (the office staff is overloaded with work)	1	2	3	4	5	9
5. Lack of experts (there is none specialized in these topics)	1	2	3	4	5	9
6. Lack of political will (e.g. factious city council)	1	2	3	4	5	9
7. Public disinterest	1	2	3	4	5	9
8. Entrepreneurial disinterest	1	2	3	4	5	9
9. Weakness of civil cooperation (few NGOs)	1	2	3	4	5	9
10. Inadequate communication between the responsible persons in charge	1	2	3	4	5	9
11. Lack of data, or unreliability of data	1	2	3	4	5	9
12. No resources for continuous monitoring	1	2	3	4	5	9
13. Insufficient details for concrete actions	1	2	3	4	5	9



13. Which of the following problems are intended to be tackled in the rest of the energy plan revision process? Please rate on a five-point scale if relevant.

	1 - Not have tackled at all	2	3	4	5 - Tackled	DK/NA
1. Lack of municipal financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
2. Lack of residential financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
3. Lack of entrepreneurial financial resources	1	2	3	4	5	9
4. Lack of human resources (the office staff is overloaded with work)	1	2	3	4	5	9
5. Lack of experts (there is none specialized in these topics)	1	2	3	4	5	9
6. Lack of political will (e.g. factious city council)	1	2	3	4	5	9
7. Public disinterest	1	2	3	4	5	9
8. Entrepreneurial disinterest	1	2	3	4	5	9
9. Weakness of civil cooperation (few NGOs)	1	2	3	4	5	9
10. Inadequate communication between the responsible persons in charge	1	2	3	4	5	9
11. Lack of data, or unreliability of data	1	2	3	4	5	9
12. No resources for continuous monitoring	1	2	3	4	5	9
13. Insufficient details for concrete actions	1	2	3	4	5	9



2. Stakeholders, participants and new involvement techniques

In this part please evaluate the stakeholder and participant involvement process.

2.1 Involvement

14. Please rate (on a five-point scale) how deep could you involve the following stakeholder groups in the energy plan revision process? Please rate on a five-point scale.

	1 - Couldn't involve at all	2	3	4	5 - Involved very intensely	DK/NA
Local public authority	1	2	3	4	5	9
Regional public authority	1	2	3	4	5	9
Sectoral agency	1	2	3	4	5	9
Infrastructure and (public) service provider	1	2	3	4	5	9
Interest groups including NGOs	1	2	3	4	5	9
Higher education and research	1	2	3	4	5	9
Business support organisation	1	2	3	4	5	9
General public	1	2	3	4	5	9

15. What was the main barrier of the deeper involvement of the following stakeholders? (regarding the stakeholder groups rated 1/2/3/4 in the previous question)

	Main barrier
Local public authority	
Regional public authority	Already has a Plan; provides top-down tools
Sectoral agency	
Infrastructure and (public) service provider	Often extra-territorial agencies; too big to focus on a single Municipality
Interest groups including NGOs	
Higher education and research	Difficulties in finding a communicative channel and/or a person who grants a gatekeeper role
Business support organization	Similar to financing agencies: not interested in the issue
General public	Difficulties in raising interest and reaching a wide audience for the communicative actions



16. What additional stakeholders could you involve in the revision process and ENES-CE project? Please describe.

Universities could help in finding technical innovative solution and starting parallel research programs to support the Municipality. Credit Institutes could offer some dedicate financial product to the private citizens or to the enterprises to develop and carry out some building requalification.

17. Which have been the main issues so far where local people could provide extra knowledge and experience to the municipality to improve local energy and climate plans? Please describe.

Urban Mobility and Building Refurbishment are the issues are the most popular issues, and many people among the stakeholder could share their experience and explain their suggestions and requests,

18. In your opinion which were the three most motivating factors to engage citizens during the revision process and why? Please describe the reasons in the 3 relevant cells.

	Why the selected one was the most motivating?	Why the selected one was the second most motivating?	Why the selected one was the third most motivating?
1. To increase employment / decrease unemployment		A place where the sectoral actors can discuss and find joint solutions	
2. To save energy in order to use less of the non-renewable energy sources			
3. Smaller energy bills, decreasing the regular monthly expenses			
4. To decrease greenhouse gas emissions for the mitigation of direct effects of climate change (e.g. heatwaves, extremities, extreme weather etc.)			
5. To decrease the indirect negative effects of climate change (e.g. damages in buildings, food/energy price increase etc.)			
6. To decrease air pollution			



7. Decentralisation of energy consumption, independence from the central grid(s)			
8. Pressure/needs of the public/local citizens	Sensitize citizens on Energy & Environment issues		
9. Political expectations/ following higher level decision-makers			Communicative channel between stakeholders and the Municipality
10. Expected financial benefits e.g. conditioned EU-funds			
11. More livable settlement, increasing welfare			
12. Other, namely:			

19. What other motivating factors came up during the revision process for the success of the SECAP? Please describe, if you encountered any.

Give to the Municipality a role of guidance on the SECAP's issues.

2.2 New techniques

20. What new collaborative interfaces have been created or used so far during the workshops and focus groups? Please describe.

The organization of workshops with a moderator with skills of team building aided in making more effective the meeting.

Due to COVID-19 pandemic, the use of online media channels and platforms, videoconferences and online questionnaires granted the possibility to keep in touch with the stakeholders and to continue the proposed path for the revision of the SECAP.

The support given by the existing municipal Energy Help Desk to the newborn Consumer Energy Group seems to be a very important part to build and grow stronger the group towards some joined activities.

21. What kind of communication channels and methods has been used so far to reach and activate the different stakeholders? Please describe.

The main communication channels and methods used so far to engage the stakeholder are:



- The workshops in presence (when possible) or in videoconference with a letter of invite from the Environment & Energy Assessor;
- Posts on social networks, both of the ENES-CE Project and of the Municipality;
- Educational activities with pupils of public municipal schools and production of an animated short-film to be shared among families and through media channels;
- A technical videoconference to illustrate the SECAP Issues to designers and professional experts;
- Public event with the involvement of citizens and families.



2.3 New tools

22. How useful were the new tools produced in the ENES-CE project during the energy plan revision process? Please rate on a five-point scale if relevant.

	1 - Wasn't useful at all	2	3	4	5 -Very useful	DK/NA
Tool #1 - Co-design workshop methods for engaging participants into local energy planning	1	2	3	4	5	9
Tool #2 - Community energy investment guidelines - technical, business and legal aspects	1	2	3	4	5	9
Tool #3 - Communication methods for local energy plans and creating an atmosphere of acceptance	1	2	3	4	5	9

23. Please elaborate your answer! What were the pros and cons of the tools produced in ENES-CE?

Tool #1: The Manual gave useful inputs, furthermore in Forlì was produced an animated short-video (replicated in the last year) exploring the point of view of pupils attending the Municipal schools. It was possible to use it to engage the stakeholder during the Workshops and to reach a wider public among other citizens.

Tool #2: Since in Forlì is planned the establishment of an Energy-Consumers' Purchasing Group, the community investment guidelines seem to focus on far more expensive activities.

Tool #3: The communication methods and the following communication strategy gave a useful prompt for the efficiency of the project and its diffusion among the citizens.



3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 Points tackled

The revision of the Local Energy Plan is a global activity which concerns horizontally different sectors and several stakeholders, also very far one from another. As a consequence, the most challenging task is engaging every involved organizations, coordinating the debate stimulating an atmosphere of acceptance. The most important steps of the participative path which had a positive impact in tackling the difficulties occurred were: a formal invite from the Environment and Energy Assessor of the Municipality of Forlì and the appointment of a professional debate moderator to support the discussion during the workshops. Moreover, Local Focus Groups in schools turned out to be very effective because the idea of producing a stop-motion videoclip collecting the suggestions of the pupils led to a very useful communicative tool both for the engagement of the stakeholders and the citizens in general.

The COVID-19 pandemic deeply affected the scheduled tasks of the project and the revision process. Thanks to a responsive switch to an online version of the activities, it was possible to limit the delays and preserve a certain representativity of the several stakeholders participating to the path.

3.2 ANNEXES

As many activities, meetings and tasks, due to COVID-19, have been postponed and The Covenant of Mayors agreed to postpone the approval of the new SECAP for the Municipality of Forlì, the Council of the Municipality of Forlì did not approve formally a final version of the SECAP yet. Although the file attached is still a draft, the participative process accomplished thanks to the ENES-CE project led to several important milestones and integration already constituting the main body of the Plan. The updated and definitive version will be published onto the Municipal website, FMI's one and the website of the ENES-CE Project.