



## ACTIVITY 1.3

### EVALUATION OF REVISED ENERGY PLANNING PROCESS AT MUNICIPALITY OF KOPER

**DELIVERABLE 1.3.1.**  
**Final evaluation**

**Version 1**  
**12 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)

In 2008 Municipality of Koper elaborated the first Local energy concept (LEK). LEK was updated in year 2013. On the basis of LEK a Baseline Emission Inventory for Sustainable energy action plan (SEAP) has been elaborated, which includes upgraded LEK measures. In the present period the Municipality is preparing a Sustainable Energy and Climate Action Plan (SECAP) with the aim to improve the local energy strategy and to increase regional competitiveness.

Revision process of SEAP has shown that the majority of measures which could significantly contribute on CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are not sufficiently being implemented yet and that the efforts of city administrations are representative and could become an example of best practice to citizens. It is important to strengthen the public awareness and training activities toward stakeholders within the residential and tertiary sector. 3 workshops were carried out within the ENES-CE project



were citizens and other stakeholders came together and have discussed the current SEAP. First workshop was attended by various stakeholders. Participants submitted their proposals for measures within the frame of LEK and SECAP documents, shared its experience in the field of joint projects and gave proposals of potential pilot projects within ENES-CE project. The attendance on second and third workshop was lower, but the outcomes of the workshops were good. Stakeholders were involved also with the Status quo analysis Questionnaire.

---

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

The biggest challenge during the revision process so far was facing with the COVID-19 situation. The second challenge proved to be a low number of information/data and its quality within residential, tertiary and transport sector. Consequently, a smaller number of measures have been implemented.

---

**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?**

Despite the stricter measures during the COVID-19 period, we decided to carry out all the workshops face-to-face. Second and third workshop was organized in accordance with the decisions and decrees of the Government of the Republic of Slovenia and the hygiene recommendations of the National Institute of Public Health (NIJZ).

For the second challenge we have prepared recommendations for certain measures regarding the collection of missing data. The data quality that not referred to public sector could be improved through the analysis of successfully implemented projects, implemented feasibility studies and establishment of additional databases.



## 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!**

Estimated time and budget for energy planning revision process was sufficient. An external expert was engaged to develop the revision of SECAP and implementation of the workshops.

**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 goals for energy planning revision process were quite clear. Guidelines and document templates developed by the project partners helped us to implement all the activities. With the help of the guidelines, a revision of SEAP was prepared.



### 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 expertise 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.

At Municipality of Koper low number of measures have been implemented within residential, tertiary and transport sector as consequence of less availability of information or data. Quality of this data are often insufficient and evaluation of measure progress is not enabled. Additional reason of reduced number of activities is a lack of financing sources from national and EU funds as well as the lack of willingness to take over the financial risk of investors in the phase of project investment.



At residential, tertiary and transport sector the monitoring of measure efficiency is not sufficient and available data level is consequently low. The need of including additional experts and external stakeholders who has significant impact on measure implementation was also identified.

**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 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	
Sectoral agency	
Infrastructure and (public) service provider	
Interest groups including NGOs	Small number of NGOs.
Higher education and research	
Business support organisation	Will be involved in the creation of solar cooperative.
General public	Covid-19 situation, low response of citizens to workshops.



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

- Presidents of local communities
- Energy advisory office for citizens En Svet
- Managers of a multi-apartment buildings
- Promoters and operators of joint projects

**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.**

The residents have already been involved in various energy projects through workshops and meetings.

**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			
2. To save energy in order to use less of the non-renewable energy sources			
3. Smaller energy bills, decreasing the regular monthly expenses		Energy costs are increasing every year, mainly due to rising energy consumption and rising energy prices. Heating costs typically account for 60% and the cost of electricity for 40% of total energy costs. People are looking for ways to reduce energy bills.	
4. To decrease greenhouse gas emissions for the mitigation of direct effects of climate change (e.g. heatwaves, extremities, extreme weather etc.)	Citizens have become aware of environmental and climate issues and negative consequences of climate change (drought, hail, floods) and therefore want to be active in drawing up energy plans.		



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)			More and more people want to become energy self-sufficient and independent of market price fluctuations.
8. Pressure/needs of the public/local citizens			
9. Political expectations/ following higher level decision-makers			
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.**

## 2.2 New techniques

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

Workshops were conducted with the help of external energy experts. In the first part we have presented the results of the project, the discussion followed. Due to the small number of participants at the second and third workshop, a very constructive dialogue developed between the participants.

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

- E-mails
- Telephone conversations
- Workshops
- Homepage of Municipality Koper
- Posts on social networks of ENES-CE Project

Other communication channels will be used in the pilot phase:



- municipal's social media service (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram)
- municipal's newspaper
- monthly newspaper (Obala plus) for households in the municipalities of Ankaran, Koper, Izola and Piran
- a daily newspaper (Primorske novice) with an emphasis on the news from Primorska region



## 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 has useful ideas for approaching wider range of important stakeholders and involvement of citizens. It will be used also in the next workshops when cooperative will be establish.  
 Tool #2 is intended for the use by professionally trained personnel and not the general public.  
 Tool #3 a very transparent tool of communication methods.