

# DOCUMENTATION ON DECISIONS OF 3<sup>RD</sup> “DEPLOYMENT DESK MEETING”

---

D.T1.1.4

final version

09 2021

---





---

Title Documentation on decisions of 3<sup>rd</sup> “deployment desk meeting”

Deliverable D.T1.1.4

Authors Robert Pratter, Reiterer & Scherling

Contributors Katja Karba, Štefan Žohar, Stefano Dotta, Mauro Cornaglia, Matija Hrupački, Mario Vašak, Andrea Dornhofer, Wolfgang Hofstetter

Status final

Reviewed by Michael Heidenreich (PP5), Katja Karba (LP)

Submission



## Content

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Date and place .....	3
3. Number and types of participants/target groups .....	4
4. Topics tackled.....	6
4.1. Transnational summary .....	6
4.2. Regional summary .....	7
4.2.1. Slovenia .....	7
4.2.2. Croatia.....	8
4.2.3. Austria.....	8
4.2.4. Italy .....	9
4.2.5. Germany .....	10
5. Links to deliverables and outputs .....	11
6. Synthesis .....	12
7. Conclusion .....	13
8. Appendix.....	14



## 1. Introduction

The document provides a summary of the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meetings, which took place in Slovenia, Croatia, Austria, Italy and Germany between November 2020 and September 2021. Detailed minutes of every deployment desk meeting can be found in the appendix.

The deliverable is structured in the following chapters:

Date and place, which shows the date and place the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meetings took place,

Number and type of participants, which provides some information about the participants of the deployment desk meeting and

Topics tackled, which provides a content-related summary of the outcomes of the meetings. This chapter is divided in a transnational summary, which compares the countries/pilots with each other and a regional summary, which is the summary of the respective deployment desk meeting per participating country. Therefore, there is a subchapter for each country.

In the chapter Implemented actions and links to deliverables, outputs the procedure of the meetings is described in detail and the connection to the other deliverables is explained. Moreover, the implemented actions and the used promotion materials are listed.

The chapter Results, effects and the response describes the achievements during the deployment desk meeting. The main emphasize is on the expected effects, the impact that is obtained by having different (or single) action(s) and on the response of the targets, if possible, together with some measurable data (via feedback forms, etc.).

The last chapter provides a Conclusion, followed by the detailed protocols of the deployment desk meetings in the appendix.

## 2. Date and place

- In Slovenia there were four meetings in the frame of the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk. The first one on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of February 2021 at the municipal premises in Lendava and on the pilot site, the second one on 4<sup>th</sup> of March 2021 on the pilot site and the third one on 22<sup>nd</sup> of April 2021 in the City Hall of Municipality of Lendava and in the city library where the pilot is implemented. The fourth one was the tool workshop, which was carried out on 14<sup>th</sup> of June 2021 as an online meeting.
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting in Croatia was held on 30<sup>th</sup> of September 2021 at the pilot site of the Bračak Manor (Energy Centre Bračak), Bračak 4, 49210 Zabok, Croatia.
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting in Austria took place on the 9<sup>th</sup> of June 2021 at Gasthof Ederer in Weiz together with the tool training of the local stakeholders (D.T3.3.3)
- The 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting in Italy took place on April 27, 2021, from 9.00 to 12.00 as an online meeting on the Zoom platform.
- In Germany the parts related to the Store4HUC tools were carried out together with D.T3.3.3 at the “Zukunftsforum Energie und Klima” conference on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November 2020. Moreover, the gained knowledge from the other deployment desk meetings will be disseminated in Germany via the Climate Alliance channels.



### 3. Number and types of participants/target groups

- Slovenia: The three meetings were attended by different types of the organisations:
  - 1<sup>st</sup> meeting: in total 6 people from the Municipality of Lendava, from the Institute for Tourism and Development Lendava, from the Development agency Sinergija attended the meeting. The meeting was attended by less participants as on the previous meeting due to the pandemic situation at that time. Only the main stakeholders met each other that are directly connected to the pilot investment.
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting: 8 people attended the meeting coming from Režonja d.o.o., GIA-S, Petrol, Termoing Lendava, public library Lendava, Local energy agency Ptuj, Development agency Sinergija.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting: 10 people attended the meeting coming from the Institute for Tourism and Development Lendava, Režonja d.o.o., Termoing Lendava, Municipality of Lendava, public library Lendava, Local energy agency Pomurje, Development agency Sinergija.
  - 4<sup>th</sup> meeting see D.T3.3.3

- Croatia:



- Austria:





- 
- 
- 
- 



- Italy: Fifty-five people subscribed to the event and forty-five effectively participated to the cross-fertilization and deployment desk event, belonging to different target groups and being directly involved with all three projects interested by the meeting:
  - 16 representatives of Public Administrations and Local Authorities (Piedmont Region, different Municipalities);
  - 6 representatives of universities and research institutes (Polytechnic of Turin, ENEA and Euro-Mediterranean Economists Association);
  - 2 representatives of bank foundations (Fondazione CRC, Compagnia di San Paolo);
  - 1 representative of an energy agency (EDISON);
  - 9 representatives of private training companies, public services providers and non-profit organizations (AFP Dronero, IRIS s.r.l., STP s.r.l., ALOT s.r.l., GRD s.r.l., Kyoto Club).
  
- Germany: A maximum of 67 audience members were participating in the Zoom meeting. A broad mixture of municipal stakeholders, project managers, university staff, climate change managers and many others from different working fields were attending. The event was addressed to municipalities, energy consultants and individuals interested in setting up a project or buying energy storage.
  - Municipal representatives (amongst others):
    - City of Cottbus
    - City of Mönchengladbach
    - City of Fulda
    - City of Bayreuth
    - City of Nürnberg
    - City of Lübeck
    - City of Fürth
    - City of Bottrop
  - Furthermore, there were participants from other Stakeholders like:
    - Solarenergie-Förderverein Deutschland e.V.
    - Fraunhofer IBP
    - TÜV SÜD Industrie Service GmbH - DIFNI
    - DB Energie
    - Philipps-Universität Marburg
    - Institut für Betriebliche Bildungsforschung



## 4. Topics tackled

### 4.1. Transnational summary

In every country (except Germany) at least two different thematic question blocks have been discussed with the participants of the deployment desk meetings. The first one consists of questions about the possible upscaling of the project results and the second ones are about the tools, which have been developed within the Store4HUC project. Some questions were the same for all countries and some rely on regional particularities. Moreover, it was free for every region to adjust the suggested questions according to their needs and to add further queries. This makes sure that every deployment desk deals with the most important topics for their stakeholders and gives the flexibility to adjust thematic fields, if requested by stakeholders in order to bring in also new aspects.

In general, the members of the national deployment desk meetings see a high upscaling potential for all four pilots. There are not many comparable pilot plants available in the particular region at the moment, so that the pilots serve as innovative good-practice examples. In Slovenia for example there is already one other city (Ptuj), which is interested in the Lendava pilot in detail because they plan to do a similar installation in one of their own public buildings. In Italy a survey was carried out to ask the stakeholders' point of view on the replicability of the project on a local level: 70 % of respondents declared to believe that the pilot project in Cuneo is interesting and replicable. In Croatia, the Krapina-Zagorje County is rich in cultural heritage that needs to be restored and put into operation. The local pilot at Bračak Manor can pave the way for the restoration of such historical urban sites. And the members of the Austrian deployment desk meeting also see a high upscaling potential for the general idea as there are many district heating grids in Austria and in the neighbouring countries with a similar initial situation.

In the second thematic block, the tools which have been developed within the Store4HUC project (Optimal Sizing Calculator, Autarky Rate Tool and in some countries also the Optimal Heat Source Scheduler) have been discussed. In Austria and Croatia, the third deployment desk meeting was carried out together with the stakeholder training (of D.T3.3.3). In Slovenia the third deployment desk was carried out as combination of four separate meetings, the stakeholder training being one of it and in Italy the stakeholder training and the deployment desk meeting have not been connected at all. In general, very positive feedback on the tools could be collected. In the opinion of the Slovenian deployment desk members for example, the Optimal sizing calculator is well prepared, very easy to use, but still quite complex. The training was definitely welcome and instructive. Without the training the participants would not have mastered the tool, so they received a quality treatment of the tool, where they also went through all possible variations and related changeable profiles. The feedback for the Autarky Rate tool was also very good. The tool will be used in the future as it is very concrete and useful. The training was fine, although the tool is pretty much self-intuitive and they could start using it even without the training. Training participant have already agreed to sign the Letter of Intent (of D.T3.3.4) for both tools. Similar feedback was collected at the Austrian deployment desk. The stakeholders have been very interested in the presentation of all three tools (a first version of the Optimal Heat Source Scheduler was presented too) and some of them declared their interest in signing the Letter of Intent. In Italy the tools have been briefly presented and a survey was carried out. The questions were meant to understand the interest of the respondents in using the tools in the future and in attending the specific event planned for training of their use (the tool training have been scheduled at a later time). Both questions got very good responses, being the 80 % of respondents interested in both. In Croatia the collection of a detailed feedback on the tools will be done in the frame of D.T3.3.4 promotion activities.

A detailed description of the second thematic block is also available in the Deliverable D.T3.3.3: *Workshop with partners and members of the deployment desks*



In Italy, another topic related to Energy Communities was discussed at the third deployment desk meeting. The discussion consists of four worktables, in which the establishment processes of some Renewable Energy Communities in Piemonte Region have been presented by the representatives of those municipalities that started the projects within the SMART and GREEN ECONOMY call, thanks to the support of Fondazione CRC and Environment Park.

As there is no pilot site in Germany and the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting was mainly related to the pilot upscaling, a different procedure similar to the 2<sup>nd</sup> deployment desk meeting was worked out for Germany. The gained knowledge from the other deployment desk meetings have been or will be disseminated in Germany via the Climate Alliance channels. Mentioned Store4HUC tools have been introduced together with D.T3.3.3 activities at the “Zukunftsforum Energie und Klima” conference on the 17<sup>th</sup> of November, 2020.

## 4.2. Regional summary

This chapter provides a short summary of the outcomes of the discussed topics, separated by country/pilot. Detailed minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meetings are available in the appendix.

### 4.2.1. Slovenia

#### Summarised replies on discussed questions about upscaling the project results

Asked for a retrospective review of the chosen storage solution, the Slovenian members of the deployment desk agreed, that the current solution (paraffin based latent heat storage) is optimal, as they had to consider the low temperatures of the geothermal system, the space constraints in the library basement and the constraints of the monument protection institution. Nevertheless, improvements are always desirable and are noticeable only after the work has been done or are part of a later evaluation. They would definitely involve a larger range of geothermal energy experts from the given outset the next time, supporting the design of useful interfaces between the pilot and district heating grid.

There is already one energy expert from Ptuj (the size of the city is similar to the city of Lendava) who is interested in the details of the Slovenian pilot because they want to do the similar installation in one of their public buildings. Although the Slovenian pilot is specific, for which you need geothermal system (which is quite rare in Slovenia), the transfer can be also done partly (only paraffin latent storage). However, the storage can be also connected to biomass districts which is even better as the temperatures are higher.

To increase the upscaling potential, the members of the Slovenian deployment desk see a need for governmental support. In their point of view it is absolutely necessary to support such solutions at the state level and, of course, with financial support. Any financial scheme that would co-finance heat or energy storage solutions is a good starting point to extending such solutions.

#### Summarised replies on the tool presentation

The members of the Slovenian deployment desk are very interested in the presented tools, the Optimal sizing calculator and the Autarky Rate Tool.

In their opinion, the Optimal sizing calculator is well prepared, very easy to use (User manual is great), but still quite complex. The tool is very general designed and is not developed for specific products or services of singular companies, which is an advantage. The training was definitely welcome by the audiences. Without the training the participants would not have mastered the tool, so they received a quality treatment of the tool. They could use tools at work and most stakeholders voted to sign the Letter of Intent. Asked for recommendations for improvement they noted that the size of the tool is very big, so



it takes up a lot of space on the computer and that the calculation time is quite long. The tool could be online, so there might be less problems with downloading.

The feedback for the Autarky Rate tool was also very good, the tool is excellent, very easy to use but still give a lot of data and information. It has been declared to use the tool for future planning. Signing a Letter of Intent is considered by everyone. The training was fine, although the tool is pretty much self-intuitive and they could start using it even without the training. There were no recommendations for improvements.

#### 4.2.2. Croatia

##### Summarised replies on discussed questions about upscaling the project results

As there are not many examples of such energy-efficient cultural heritage buildings in Croatia, the members of the Deployment Desk agreed that Bračak Manor will serve as an innovative lighthouse example over the next years. The long-term goal is to show innovative materials and technologies in reconstruction as a demonstrative example to other similar historical urban sites and to show that despite of the strict conservation requirements the project of this type can be realised. As Krapina-Zagorje County is rich on listed buildings that need to be renewed and put into operation, this pilot project can pave the way for the restoration of such historical urban sites. If the goals of the European Union for the decarbonisation of buildings are to be achieved, some legal frameworks will certainly have to be adjusted to facilitate the realization of such projects. Also, the realization of such projects on cultural heritage buildings is more expensive than in normal conditions so for extended realizations, it is necessary to encourage such investments with corresponding financial initiatives.

##### Summarised replies on the tool presentation

All three tools were presented - the Optimal sizing calculator (Module 1), the Autarky Rate Tool and the Optimal Heat Source Scheduler (Module 2). Mr. Filip Rukavina, the main developer of Module 1 and Module 2 held this workshop. He has shown how each of the tools can be accessed and the usage of the tools through the Excel tables for modules 1 and 2 and through the web interface for the Autarky Rate Tool. The presenter has used the example of the pilot site Bračak to explain the operation of Module 1 and of the Autarky Rate Tool which gave the participants a very good insight how the tool can help them in the assessment of different investment possibilities for a particular site - in terms of sizes, costs, return on investment and the expected performance and effects. For Module 2 the case of scheduling a heat source with storage similar for the case existing in the Store4HUC pilot in Weiz was shown. The possibility to assess the gains in scheduling with respect to classical automatic control based on top level storage temperature was clearly emphasized. The simplicity of the tools usage from the IT perspective was shown - from the tool download/access to set-up of the calculation parameters and outputs preview.

At the end of the workshop the letter of interest was presented to the stakeholders by Prof. Mario Vašak. The representatives of the deployment desk were very keen to disseminate the Store4HUC tools among their networks. The procedure how to do that was discussed and agreed, starting with a simple e-mail giving access links to the tools and explaining them shortly.

#### 4.2.3. Austria

##### Summarised replies on discussed questions about upscaling the project results

Asked for a retrospective review of the chosen storage solution, the Austrian members of the deployment desk agreed, that the current solution is optimal, because the necessary operation time of the heating grid in the summer months could be significantly reduced. From the current perspective there is nothing



significant, which should have been done differently, but the monitoring is still ongoing and the final results will be evaluated at a later stage.

The members of the deployment desk meeting see a high upscaling potential for the general idea as there are many district heating grids in Austria with a similar initial situation. There is also a high potential for biomass grids all over central Europe. The pilot has proved, that the implementation of a thermal storage is a good solution to improve the operation of district heating plants.

#### **Summarised replies on the tool presentation**

The members of the Austrian deployment desk are very interested in the presented tools, the Optimal sizing calculator, the Autarky Rate Tool and a first version of the Optimal heat source scheduler.

For the most participants the Optimal sizing calculator was very interesting. They will try out the tool and some of them already agreed to sign the letter of interest. The training was very helpful for them to understand all functions of the tool especially how to use own profiles or to discuss the different optimization possibilities. There have not been any recommendations for improvements yet.

The participants agree that the Autarky Rate Tool can be very useful for showing the potential of electrical storages and to get more information about storages in general. Most of them are interested to use the tool and declared to sign the letter of interest. The training itself was interesting to get an introduction to the tool even if most of them agreed that they could also easily use the tool without the training. There have not been any recommendations for improvements yet.

#### **4.2.4. Italy**

##### **Summarised replies on discussed questions about upscaling the project results**

In Italy an investigation of the participants' interest and opinion on the topics discussed in the first part of the event was made through the submission of online surveys launched via Zoom. The first survey that followed the presentation of the pilot action in Cuneo of the Store4HUC project, asking the stakeholders' point of view on the replicability of the project on a local level: 70% of respondents declared to believe that the pilot project in Cuneo is interesting and replicable. Above all, by replying to the second question, the majority of respondents thought that the public transport systems, such as the sloping elevator in Cuneo, could be integrated in the development process of a Renewable Energy Community. That showed how such a peculiar case as the one in Cuneo could offer stimulations of ideas and opportunities for innovation in additional interventions.

Pilot projects like Store4HUC, being beneficiaries of economic and technologic support from the partnership and from the project, are able to put in play many different tools that allow for a certain degree of experimentation. It is very important that pilot projects share the knowledge acquired because that allows for an optimization of resources and gradually can make the local authorities more independent in transition towards extended renewable energy project implementations.

Moreover, thanks to the communication actions that characterize the EU projects, the widening of stakeholders' groups allows for a better knowledge of the topic and represents an opportunity to share experiences, beside the fact that it increases the public interest for related topics.

##### **Summarised replies on discussions related to energy communities**

In course of the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting in Italy experiences on Renewable Energy Communities and other energy efficiency projects have been discussed at four worktables. All worktables were attended by some representatives of the municipalities that undertook the implementation process of an Energy Community in their territories. By telling their stories to the other participants, what emerged was the diversity of situations that characterizes each process. However, as it occurs in smaller renewable energy



interventions such as the sloping elevator in Cuneo it is declared that synergies among similar subjects are used to share positive and negative experiences and learn from each other. All participants agreed in affirming that any experience, even though specific and peculiar, are replicable and may serve as good practice example for others.

Asked for difficulties the Public Administrations had to face while implementing energy efficiency projects, most of the civil servants and local authorities mentioned the complexity of bureaucratic procedures to carry on initiatives in regards to energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. That complexity increases progressively with the size of the intervention and may lead as worst case to insuperable regulatory limits and lack of human resources needed for the implementation of such projects. According to some participants, the lack of economic resources might be sometimes possible to overcome with specific funds, such as the European ones and those coming from Bank Foundations. Moreover, the internal specific formation and the support of external experts are two important elements to consider when undertaking an ecologic conversion project.

Training measures on renewable energies and their applications at local level were acknowledged as a very important instrument to support the Public Administration in initiating and promoting ecologic transition processes. Many stakeholders suggested to create professional schools that could provide the necessary skill to young experts designing Renewable Energy Communities.

Last, citizens' involvement and communication represent for many participants valid supporting elements, both in the implementation of small and bigger projects. Attendees acknowledged the importance of stressing the social purpose of the ecological transition: citizens should be informed and aware that short-term high costs for the development of renewable energy projects, often mean a long-term benefit for the whole community, from the economic, social and environmental point of views.

#### **Summarised replies on the tool presentation**

During the 3<sup>rd</sup> Deployment Desk meeting the tools have been briefly presented and a survey was carried out. The questions were meant to understand the interest of the respondents in using the tools in the future and in attending the specific event planned for training of their use. Both questions got very good responses, being the 80 % of respondents interested in both. The Workshop on using the tools was independently organized on the 1<sup>st</sup> of July as an online meeting. Details on the workshop will be provided in the specific report (of D.T3.3.3).

#### **4.2.5. Germany**

In Germany there has not been a discussion on upscaling the results, as there is no pilot in Germany. Instead the outcome of the other four deployment desk meetings have been and will be shared with the German stakeholders via the Climate Alliance network.

The Autarky Rate Tool was presented in Germany as part of the “Zukunftsforum Energie & Klima, F7: Energiespeicherung in historischen urbanen Gebäuden”. After the presentations, the constraints of the inputs have been discussed between the audience and the presenter and some valuable inputs for further improvements were given. A detailed discussion of the feedback is available in D.T3.2.4.



## 5. Links to deliverables and outputs

The 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meetings were carried out in Slovenia, Croatia, Austria and Italy and Germany. In Austria, Slovenia and Croatia it was possible to conduct the deployment desk meetings face-to face. The Italian deployment desk meeting was carried out online because of the high number of participants. Compared to the previous Italian deployment desks and by the effect of the merging of presenting a couple of European projects, the participants were slightly different from those previously involved, which represents an opportunity to expand the Store4HUC project knowledge towards other interested stakeholders.

In Croatia, Austria and Slovenia the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting was combined with the tool training of local stakeholders (D.T3.3.3). In Italy the two events have been carried out separately.

In Austria, the official pilot opening was discussed during the deployment desk meeting and all members have been invited. The pilot opening has been carried out together with D.C.6.2 (thematic regional seminar) activities. Those members of the deployment desk, which have not been able to attend the tool training, or those who like to get some additional information have been invited to join the second Webinar (D.C.6.6), which is combined with D.C.6.1 (Documentation on training on tools for additional stakeholders) and will be focused on the Store4HUC tools.

In Germany the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting was combined with the D.T3.3.3 activities at the “Zukunftsforum Energie und Klima” conference. Moreover, the gained knowledge from the other deployment desk meetings will be shared with the German stakeholders via the Climate Alliance communication channels.

In the context of communication activities, on the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meetings promotion material like the solar power banks (of D.C.3.3), the cotton bags (of D.C.3.1) and the leaflets (of D.C.2.1) have been distributed to the participants in most of the countries. The project roll-up (D.C.3.2) was used, too.

The outcome of the second topic is also important for D.T3.2.4 activities, where the feedback of the stakeholders for the Autarky Rate Tool is collected, and future improvements are discussed. Furthermore, the deployment desk meetings are related to the deliverable D.T1.1.1, which outlines the concept of the deployment desks as well as to the deliverable D.C.1.1, the communication strategy.



## 6. Synthesis

The most important achievement of the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meetings was to bring together all relevant institutions and organizations at local level in a regular way, to provide them an update about the current status of the project/pilot and to discuss the final steps of the pilot implementation/monitoring. By establishing the stakeholder deployment desks, we ensure, that the main local actors are integrated and properly involved in the whole project. With this instrument, we will reach the relevant players to share the knowledge and transfer it to other external audiences that are not part of the inner circle. Especially in these difficult times with COVID-19 the deployment desk meetings were important to stay connected with the stakeholders and keep the project running. Of course, the option to have an online meeting instead of a physical meeting was offered to everyone.

In Slovenia, three meetings were needed to move the pilot implementation from point zero to mission completed. In any case, these meetings accelerated the construction works, but also explained what will be done and what still needs to be done. The first data monitoring settings were established in close collaboration with key stakeholders of the pilot. In short, the pilot activity took place quite quickly, which gave the opportunity to monitor the performance already in the first heating season. So, the Slovenian team was able to hand over the documentation in the last meeting.

In Austria, results of the ongoing monitoring were discussed. The already existing measurement data was analysed and the timetable and the responsible person for the final steps were fixed. Moreover, the developed software tools were presented to the stakeholders, and the use of the Optimal Heat Source Scheduler for a further optimization of the pilot operation was discussed.

In addition to that, the upscaling of the pilot results has been a central topic and the official pilot opening event was utilised talking about replication possibilities. The event served also as dissemination action extending the integration of stakeholders from other municipalities or regions with comparable initial situations.

In Croatia, the relevant players have been invited to share the knowledge and transfer experiences to other additional audiences attending the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting. All stakeholders have been informed about the activities connected to upscaling project results. Also, the results of the Store4HUC tools were presented, with a special focus on the Bračak pilot project. Besides that, REGEA (PP8) provided the stakeholders with detailed description of newly installed photovoltaic system, battery system and central energy management system. It was explained what type of the battery system is installed, its advantages against others and relevant technical details such as capacity and mode of operation. Moreover, the first monitoring results have been explained in comparison with the expected productivity of the photovoltaic system. In general, all stakeholders were quite satisfied with the meeting, which is confirmed by the feedback forms that the stakeholders filled in anonymously after the meeting.

In Italy, the 3<sup>rd</sup> deployment desk meeting followed two main goals:

- to inform the Public Administrations and the other stakeholders of the opportunities on the topic of energy solutions given by many ongoing European project at the regional level;
- to collect the participants' opinions on their personal experience with ecologic transition processes in order to understand how local regulations, but also regional and national ones, should be adapted to facilitate and to make such initiatives more diffusible.

What emerged from the discussion was a prevalence of photovoltaic solutions, widely promoted by the national regulation framework, while many participants highlighted the importance of using and exploring other renewable energy sources, such as the micro-hydro-electricity and the biomasses, where possible. In all four working groups, there was agreement on the need to network in order to face difficulties together.



In all, everybody acknowledged the fact that those ecologic transition interventions create new job places and stimulate the development of new professional roles. Therefore, the consequences for the employment are declared as reliable.

In Germany, the similar procedure as for the 2<sup>nd</sup> deployment desk was used, since this worked well the last time. The pilot related results of the other four deployment desks are shared with the German stakeholders. The combination of the tool related part of the deployment desk with the D.T3.3.3 at the “Zukunftsforum Energie und Klima” conference was quite successful. More than 67 participants attended at the tool presentation followed by a fruitful discussion.

## 7. Conclusion

Once again, stakeholder meetings have been shown to be important, to speed up the agreements with stakeholders which are crucial and things move forward. The members of the deployment desk like the concept of the periodical deployment desk meetings as this gives them the possibility to get the latest news from the project, discuss the upcoming work and exchange experiences and knowledge gained from the pilot implementation. Moreover, good feedback on the tool training and on the developed tools in general could be collected. The tools have proven to be more than welcome, as they will be useful in the day-to-day work of many organizations.

Even if it is still difficult to organize such deployment desk meetings because of the COVID-19 situation, it was confirmed by almost all participants that such events are very important for the stakeholders to remain informed about the project progress and to have the possibility to be actively involved in the project as also for the project team to be able to get feedback and valuable inputs from the stakeholders.



## 8. Appendix

- Minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> “deployment desk meeting” in Slovenia
- Minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> “deployment desk meeting” in Croatia
- Minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> “deployment desk meeting” in Austria
- Minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> “deployment desk meeting” in Italy
- Combined minutes of 3<sup>rd</sup> “deployment desk meeting” in Germany and the documentation on the workshop/training session for stakeholders in Kassel (D.T3.3.3)