



Reflection Group

Minutes of 10th Meeting

30 November 2005, 10.00 - 18.00

Rue de Mot 24, Brussels, room 73 on the ground floor

Agenda:

1. Welcome by the chairman, minutes of last meeting, agenda
2. Opening remarks and news from the Commission
3. MERG strategic orientation and mid-term plan, housekeeping issues
4. Action on new member states and candidate countries
5. Co-operation between EnR and ManagEnergy
6. Opinion Paper on the Energy Efficiency Green Paper
7. Energy Intelligent Europe
 - a) Presentation of the EIE Executive Agency (William Gillett, Priit Enok)
 - b) Analysis (statistics) on participation of local agencies in the last two EIE calls (Priit Enok)
 - c) Status of structure and work programme for EIE II (Pedro Ballesteros Torres)
 - d) Problems and improvements for local agencies and actors to participate in EIE, MERG input to EIE II work programme?
8. Public roles of Local Energy Agencies
9. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair for 2006
10. Any other business

Annexes: Attendance list, presentations

The start was delayed until 10.30 am due to transport problems on the Brussels metro.

1. Welcome by the Chairman, minutes of last meeting, agenda

Boris Papousek (BP) welcomed the attendees to the meeting. He noted that at the previous meeting held in Gamlitz (Austria), day 1 had looked at a general discussion of the issues surrounding Energy Agencies and day 2 had focused on concrete activities – and he thanked those who had agreed to undertake specific tasks.

The **minutes** of the previous meeting were agreed. IWB agreed to take the minutes again.

The importance of the Energy Efficiency Green Paper item on the agenda was noted; then the **agenda** was agreed.

2. Opening remarks and news from the Commission

Mr Gonzalez-Finat thanked the group members for their attendance and contributions, as it was solely on a voluntary basis, and noted that this was now the start of the 5th year of ManagEnergy. The next Reflection Group (MERG) meeting would be held on 6th February 2006, to be followed by the **ManagEnergy Conference** on 7/8th February. The programme for this event will be published soon on the ManagEnergy website and he hoped that MERG members would be able to attend. He noted also that the recently concluded Sustainable Energy Europe conference had concentrated on the importance of energy efficiency, which will be a key component of the ManagEnergy event.

The **Energy Services Directive** is now in the final run-up to being adopted; one important outcome should be the creation of national energy plans. If adopted, the directive will also be debated at the February conference.

Energy Agencies are seen as being politically neutral bodies acting as an interface between consumers and suppliers – perhaps they could, for example, act as brokers sourcing funds for energy efficiency projects. If Europe is to meet the challenge of a 20% cut in CO₂ emissions by 2020 then local actors will be a key link in the chain. Mr Gonzalez-Finat concluded by again thanking Boris Papousek for hosting the Gamlitz meeting.

Mr André Brisaer noted that by 1/1/06 there should be a new Director General as Mr. Lamoureux is leaving DG-TREN. There will also be a new Deputy- Director General coordinating energy matters. The new Deputy DG will be asked to be involved in the February ManagEnergy conference. *[The new DG has since been named as Mr Matthias Ruete from Germany.]*

This will create new opportunities and challenges for ManagEnergy; Unit D must promote itself to the new leadership, demonstrating the value of its work. Energy efficiency and renewable energy do to some extent sell themselves, but it is very important to show the value of local players and to increase their visibility.

3. MERG strategic orientation and mid-term plan, housekeeping issues

BP tabled his draft strategy paper, which is based on the discussions and results in Gamlitz, and presented the key issues.

The original objectives of the group are still valid – to advise, suggest and disseminate (page 1). The Commission will benefit from a better knowledge of issues affecting local energy actors, and the local actors will benefit from better-formulated policies and decisions.

As MERG's resources are limited, it needs to focus on specific areas – mainly those within Unit D including ManagEnergy and EIE. He summarised seven elements of strategic orientation (pages 2-3) for the group:

1. To reflect on ManagEnergy and other dissemination activities/campaigns
2. To reflect on the development of the EIE II Programme
3. To offer informed advice on strategies, such as the Green Paper on energy efficiency
4. To support the formation of new Energy Agencies and to strengthen the capabilities of existing ones
5. To support national associations of local and regional Energy Agencies
6. The reflect on how clean transport issues can be taken up by Energy Agencies
7. To facilitate communication between the Commission and Energy Agencies and other local actors

It was noted that ManagEnergy is running well, so that there is a lesser need for number 1 at the moment. Numbers 2 to 4 are as agreed at Gamlitz; number 5 is a new opportunity and important task, and number 6, although less urgent, should be kept on the agenda, as should co-operation with EⁿR.

Specific tasks were formulated, for which task co-ordinators have been appointed (see draft paper).

In the discussion KMK said that she believes Concerto is also very important, for example through Agencies' involvement with creating a network of associated communities, and the use of the ManagEnergy website to find potential Concerto partners. It will also generate useful results that can be disseminated to and by local Energy Agencies, especially as a way of encouraging replicated solutions to complex problems.

AB is uncertain how likely it is that Concerto will be continued in the next Framework programme – although there will continue to be a need to coordinate with those involved in dissemination of FP7. IWB observed that few Agencies have been able to participate directly in Concerto (eg. in the UK where there are 21 agencies, there have only been three communities with Concerto projects) – so maybe we should also reflect on the size of projects supported by the Commission.

BP then summarised the four organisational issues for the group: membership, coverage from new member states, the expectations of the Commission and funding. AB noted that although he accepted that the group could benefit from more resources, these count as administration costs and not project costs and therefore have strict limits.

BP asked for comments on Sections 1 to 3 within the next two weeks, so that the paper could be finalised before the 6th February meeting.

Concerning organisational issues, BP then read through the 8 items about membership in the paper (§4.1). He explained that the rules were written down to overcome one or two past issues about how members were selected.

AB responded that the Commission had created the group – and normal procedure would be to publish a call in OJEU for interested parties to make themselves known. However, this approach is not mandatory for an informal advisory group such as MERG, so there is no objection by the Commission to the group having its own written procedures. He clarified that the Commission and IEEA (Intelligent Energy Executive Agency) are not formal members of the Reflection Group, but can participate when appropriate. Paragraph 2 should be reformulated.

It is recognised that members have to liaise with Energy Agencies at a national level, and that it would therefore be useful if a national association could send along another person if the regular contact was unable to attend. The group should be kept as flexible and democratic as possible without affecting its ability to operate.

It was noted in (4) that the Commission cannot formally nominate someone to the group, but could invite an expert on the recommendation of the group. It was also observed in (8) that these rules will be implemented from the February 2006 meeting on.

With these changes, the membership rules were agreed.

Chair, Vice-Chair & Task Co-ordinators: The descriptions of the roles of the Chair and Vice-Chair were mainly taken over from Gerry Wardell's previous paper. BP has added a description of the roles of task co-ordinators, too.

The meeting discussed whether to allow postal votes for the two main officers from those unable to attend a particular meeting. The group agreed not to do this, unless there were at least two formal notifications received in advance; often the Vice-Chair is nominated at the meeting.

Text agreed, subject to final amendments to be circulated by BP.

4. Action on new member states and candidate countries

RD gave a PowerPoint presentation (summary annexed). He summarised the actions so far, based initially on RG's paper, but taking into account the ECUBA Report and the Green Paper.

The critical questions are:

- how can more Energy Agencies be established?
- how can they become sustainable after the 3 year co-funding period? and
- how can awareness be raised with local authorities and national energy actors?

RD offered concrete suggestions for actions, possibly through ManagEnergy, including a brochure, training for local authorities, training on capacity building, transfer of know-how from the EU-15, training on finance, closer links to the financial sector and industry, and possibly a competition between or award for Energy Agencies. Training – which is a key requirement – could be offered on a cross-regional basis.

Regarding the EIE II programme, there were several suggestions about funding – for example, fewer projects requiring a lower co-funding proportion would be helpful.

DG-TREN could also help in non-financial ways, such as requiring regional or local energy plans, or improving dissemination of best practice.

Finally, Energy Agencies in the NMS must develop links with other networks (or links to members of those networks), as well as to other MERG members and national EIE committee members.

It was agreed that the summary of the position produced by RD should be used as the basis for an action plan.

In the ensuing discussion, it was noted by AB that the Commission normally deals with national authorities, so it is important to show the added value of dealing with local players and this should not be seen as short-circuiting national governments. Under the Energy Services Directive, there will need to be national action plans, but there will be no requirement to create them at a local or regional level. Action plans should perhaps focus on how new agencies in the NMS can support national governments. Agencies should not forget that industrial groupings, such as the white goods manufacturers, are also willing to talk to local actors, for example in the context of Sustainable Energy Europe by promoting energy labels.

KMK observed that structural funds and the national development plans for their use have an important role, even though energy efficiency has been given a low priority in the current round. In the proposed 2006-13 round, local authorities had hoped for specific funding for energy markets but this was removed by Poland and now cannot be funded. She added that it is important for Energy Agencies to work at a local level with SMEs. Then she suggested that there might be a benefit in creating thematic networks of specialist agencies across national borders.

KD presented shortly the BISE initiative, which held its second meeting in Sofia in October. As crucial areas buildings and financing were identified. She suggested a better integration of this initiative and that it could be helpful for RD, as there was also an action plan developed within BISE. RD should make a direct contact.

RD asked for more comments, especially from agencies in NMS, before he produces a final paper.

BP summarised that we are still at a brainstorming stage. He suggested focusing on the main priority action points and then expanding what could be done by whom and why. The main points could also be extracted from that paper and sent through formally to DG-TREN by letter. RvL thought that a similar letter could be sent to EnR as it represents the national agencies.

Agreed to take item 7(c) next, as Mr Pedro Ballasteros Torres had joined the meeting.

7c. Energy Intelligent Europe: Status of structure and work programme

Mr Pedro Ballasteros Torres presented that the proposals for 2006 have yet to be formally approved by the Commission, but it is hoped that this will be done before the ManagEnergy

conference in February and the call will be announced in June 2006. Commission officials have recommended opening all key actions (including KVA10, which is the only one closed in the current round) but highlighting those that have been less well used in earlier rounds.

The Commission will set priorities based on recent policy developments, such as the management of energy demand, improving communication and creating biomass action plans. The structure of the Work Programme should be left unchanged and there is still the possibility of financing excellent proposals in non-priority areas – but proposers should consult with the Commission before submitting anything formally.

COOPENER will not be funded in the 2006 call as its budget has been exhausted.

DG-TREN is aware that there are problems in participation for smaller agencies and would welcome feedback on the barriers, not just for EIE II, but also for the new CIP programme (which encompasses EIE).

Regarding the coming EIE II programme the group was told that D1 is coordinating the efforts in DG-TREN. AB explained that CIP is still at an early stage, so it is too soon to identify priorities. At the moment discussions are mainly about financing and attempting to keep sustainable energy on the agenda, rather than losing it into a larger general competitiveness programme. The IEEA may be extended to cover all projects within CIP, not just sustainable energy programmes.

The February 2006 meeting would be the best time to make inputs about administrative procedures or rules, for example by highlighting problems in participation that might exclude local actors.

5. Co-operation between EnR and ManagEnergy

RvL had circulated information about MERG to EnR members following the last meeting and reported back to the troika (past, present and future presidencies: ADEME, Senter-Novem and Energy Saving Trust) but they felt it was too early for a formal agreement. BP met Rob Kool, the current EnR president and they identified possible support by national agencies for new local Energy Agencies in the NMS as a first priority area for cooperation.

Then RvL informed about the Central/Eastern Europe Group of EnR. The chair (STEM) put this on the Agenda and exchanged ideas with Christopher Walden (STEM/ManagEnergy) but there was no time to discuss it at the meeting. However, they will present the logical framework to the next full meeting of EnR in Dublin on 7-8 February, to which MERG may send a representative, although it is recognised that this clashes with the ManagEnergy conference in Brussels. AV reported briefly on his contacts and observations, as he was participating in that meeting in Poland.

RD noted that each country needed to work out its own approach and that some national agencies fail to understand the role of local agencies. BP felt that the most positive outcome would be if EnR could help support the creation of new agencies where there are none.

AB and GW asked to see the EnR document on the typology of Energy Agencies, which he (AB) would then e-mail to the MERG and could, if appropriate, put onto the ManagEnergy website, subject to the permission of SEI which had carried out the work.

RvL suggested that MERG could explore links with the RUSE project (Redirecting Urban areas development towards Sustainable Energy – www.ruse-europe.org).

As conclusions the group agreed:

- As a first priority the cooperation should concentrate on raising the awareness for and supporting the creation of new agencies in NMS and CC.
- MERG will be invited to the next EnR Central/Eastern Europe working group meeting in April. RD will take up the contact to the chairperson.
- MERG could also send someone to next full meeting of EnR in Dublin on 7-8 February 2006 (the meeting is, however, at the same time as the annual ManagEnergy conference in Brussels).
- A letter should be written to EnR with the MERG position and asking for (a more formal) response. This should include asking EnR members if they could help in providing co-financing for EIE projects.

6. Opinion Paper on the Energy Efficiency Green Paper

This paper aims at a group submission that can be signed off at the next meeting in February, as agreed at the Gamlitz meeting. GW had circulated a questionnaire, although it was felt that it concentrated rather much on local provision in the area surrounding the respondent. Other networks have or will be making submissions to the Commission, such as AIEA or Energie-Cités. MERG should not duplicate or critique these other studies but focus on: why there are local agencies and the benefit of such actors, increase their visibility, tell what they need and how agencies add value to the CIP / EIE programme.

KK summarised his paper on information, incentives and financing to consumers and companies. As most campaigns only reach a small number of adults, education should target schools to get everyone at some point in their life. BP asked how MERG could turn this paper into a formal submission. GW suggested focusing on the areas where Energy Agencies have specific expertise, e.g. in dealing with local authorities, and felt that there is a need to narrow down KK's list.

AB suggested that the group could highlight the competencies of local agencies, showing what they can do better than anyone else. He was also interested in barriers that might be identified by the questionnaire, although GW thought they might also show up in the ECUBA paper. AB also suggested that there could be coordination between MERG, EnR, Energie-Cités, etc. to put national, regional and local efforts into context.

IK said he was confused by why he should be responding both as a local actor and as part of MERG, and failed to see the value of the general opinions asked for in the questionnaire as part of a response to a detailed document. IWB recommended that MERG should answer the specific questions posed in the Green Paper, and not just submit a general paper extolling the

virtue of Energy Agencies. He drew attention to questions 7, 10, 12 and 22, all of which are asking about the appropriate level of actions, and which give an ideal opportunity for MERG to explain the benefits of local action.

AB said that if MERG draws out its own responses by early February there is still time to coordinate with EnR and others, especially with respect to the following Action Plan. He suggested that MERG could both focus on answering the specific questions and provide a general response in support of local Energy Agencies. BP answered that a 2-stage process might be appropriate: first find a position from the local point of view and then consult and coordinate with others. PC warned that it might be difficult to find common ground, even among agencies, due to different national regimes in taxation and the size of member states (and hence agency structure).

As conclusions the group agreed:

- All MERG members should fill out GW's questionnaire on behalf of their members, rather than as individuals, and send it to GW.
- GW and KK will prepare a draft response by end of January for circulation prior to the next meeting.

7. Energy Intelligent Europe

(a) Presentation of the IEE Executive Agency

William Gillett and Priit Enok presented the Intelligent Energy Europe programme and the work of the new Executive Agency - ieea (see presentation).

The current Call was launched on 7-10-2005. Administratively it is split between SAVE, STEER, ALTENER and COOPENER.

Type I actions will form the main projects, typically 50% funded, with a €500,000 budget – there is total funding of €40 million, so there may be around 100 projects. Type II actions (Energy Agencies) have €5 million, so there may be around 25 projects with €200,000 each and 2 to 4 agencies in each contract. Type III actions (support of events) also have €5million.

Countries participating are the EU-25, plus NO, IS, LI, BG and RO (the final two subject to final confirmation). 15 key actions are open, including 4 horizontal key actions – ie. all except KVA10 (training EAs on transport). National information days will be held in most countries. There is a web newsletter “Intelligent Energy News”.

EIE is looking for a high level of European added value, especially with people in different countries working together to solve common problems. However, EIE should not be used for research – that is part of FP6.

The Intelligent Energy Europe Executive Agency (IEEA) now has around 100 current projects described on its website and around 40 staff in post.

(b) Analysis (statistics) on participation of local agencies in the last two EIE calls

William Gillett and Priit Enok presented also some figures on the participation of local agencies in the last two EIE calls, which were prepared by Waltraud Schmid from ieea (see presentation).

In the 2004 call there were 206 type 1 proposals submitted with 90 selected for negotiations. Grant agreements are under preparation and should be signed before Christmas. Seven grant agreements are for a total of 20 new Energy Agencies. Some provisional data gives the following picture (see presentation):

Provisional information:	2003	2004
No. of Proposals	256	219
No. of Applicants	~1800	~1700
Approved applicants	753	892
-- agencies in above approvals	105	146
Agencies as application coordinators	31	33
-- approved in above coordinators	9	18
Approved Projects with Agencies	51	63
-- number of agencies in above	33	56

In 2004 the greatest agency participation was from Bulgaria (24 projects). Some agencies had agreed to take part in more projects than their co-financing would allow, and so had to withdraw at the negotiation stage. This is a black mark – MERG members were asked to tell their members not to do this. 18 Energy Agencies were involved in 5 or more proposals, but some countries were still missing out completely. Conversely, 14 different Italian agencies were involved.

There were 50 or 60 proposals for events, but only 9 will be financed as many lacked a genuine European perspective and were essentially just local events with the odd European speaker. Equally the Commission will not finance “mini-Type I” projects, where the event is tacked on at the end to try and gain funding for a small single-country project. The Commission also dislikes events that cost €80,000.01, as they are clearly designed specifically to capture the maximum possible event funding.

Members asked for more information about the Horizontal Key Actions. HKA1 & HKA2 are for integrated actions designed to address RES and RUE in several sectors.

HKA1 is focused on local communities in which politicians, planners, project developers and citizens can cooperate to demonstrate a high degree of sustainable energy use. 8 projects were selected in the 2004 round, most commonly around rural communities (e.g. seeking to become carbon neutral), but also involving cities and national parks. HKA2 is “Think Globally, Act Locally”. Its description is deliberately not clearly defined, so projects need to be set out carefully. There were few proposals in the last round, but included one sharing on-line energy advice systems.

Priit Enok agreed to make his presentation available to MERG members.

(d) Problems and improvements for local agencies and actors to participate in EIE

BP gave a presentation on problems and possible improvements for agencies. He noted that although around 25% of Agencies had participated in 2003/4 taken together, but this still meant that 75% had not done so, despite having been established with European support.

When EIE is meant to be an instrument also for local energy agencies and actors, we should analyse the barriers and see how to improve the situation. He ran through a list of problems:

- Lack of capacity and resources to write proposals (as local energy agencies have fewer staff compared e.g. to national agencies) – high cost and high risk as it can take several hundred hours to pull together a proposal as a coordinator;
- Lack of know-how to manage European projects (& risks);
- Local agencies are by definition working locally; they may not know many contacts or potential partners in other member states and it is sometimes difficult to give your work a “European dimension” as required (when working locally)
- Co-financing can be a real problem, especially for agencies that are not part of a local authority or are without core funding;
- There is direct competition with national agencies in some countries (and it is usually not beneficial to have partners from one’s own country)
- Cash flow problems – terms of payment, with negative cash flow after the first third has been completed and delays in payment of amounts due (he cited Graz Energy Agency as having to temporary finance almost €200,000 of EU work across several projects);
- Non-eligibility of costs, e.g.:
 - writing, submitting and negotiation of proposals
 - marketing and project development costs
 - missing revenues cannot be covered by other projects (as Energy Agencies do not make profits on their activities);
- Problems with Bank Guarantees (wording, some require cash collateral or personal guarantees from unpaid Board Members, cost of guarantee ineligible if payments are delayed).

Then BP presented some ideas and strategies to improve participation:

- Strengthen capabilities and capacities of agencies
- Member states should provide better co-financing
- Improve financial conditions:
 - Terms & delays of payment, eligibility of costs, preparation costs bank guarantees, percentage of funding;
- Improved (and easier) schemes for actions on local level, including the replication of good practice in other member states
 - single proposals, clustered later for the European dimension
 - operational grants
 - two stage applications to lower costs and risks in writing proposals
- Special schemes for information and awareness activities at local level (grants)
- Support for national coordination or thematic networks

William Gillett responded on behalf of the IEEA:

1. He is not convinced that projects are too big, even for small agencies. Brussels cannot effectively manage large numbers of small contracts – the necessary procedures are the same for €50,000 as for €50million. Instead agencies should look at grouping together.
2. Agencies should not seek to obtain too great a share of their activities from the Commission not for profit programmes (EIE, FP6). These should be seen as “spice in the curry” and not as core activities and should represent no more than (say) 10% of an agency’s work. (It is of course different for new agencies with Type II funding.)
3. It is very unlikely that financing from Europe will exceed 50%.
4. IEEA is committed to simplifying procedures, cutting the time from proposals to signature, easing requirements round bank guarantees, etc. It also recognises that some of the measures introduced to combat fraud have made life difficult for genuine applicants. IEEA is looking again at the cost of audit certificates, bank guarantees and performance guarantees.
5. The move from DG-TREN to the executive agency did lead to some non-recurring delays in making payments. This logjam has now been broken and payments are again flowing.
6. Preparation costs will never be eligible.
7. In 2000-2001 ALTENER tried to cluster projects, but it did not work – people stayed with their original partners and did not mix.
8. Operational grants may work – there is a legal basis – but IEEA has no experience of them.
9. Two stage proposals are unlikely in EIE as the Commission will already review 1 to 2 page outline proposals and will spend up to one hour talking to a prospective consortium.
10. The evaluation of ALTENER looked at what it has achieved in the marketplace. It has to work at three levels: (1) raising awareness (2) changing attitudes (3) leading to investment or changes in laws/regulations. Ten years ago, raising awareness would have been enough, but this is no longer the case.

Taking up point 8, RG noted that under the new proposal for EIE II, tripling both the EU contribution and the co-financing is planned. This means that some €780 million will need to be found, largely from the private sector as national governments are unlikely to increase their contributions to the same level. But the private sector is not interested especially if a project is both uncertain and 12 months away. For this reason a two stage procedure would be helpful as it would allow proposers to go to private sector co-financers once the first stage has been passed and there is a good chance that the project will actually happen. This should reduce the number of projects lost at the negotiation stage.

ML suggested that to overcome the issues surrounding small agencies, national agencies or the Associations could contract on their behalf. But under current rules they are not allowed to then sub-contract the work. Mr Gillett observed that there are special clauses that allow the

performance of a project by members of an Association rather than directly by the Association itself, that might be usable in this context.

OS noted an additional “non-rational” reason for not preparing proposals, that some agencies feel unsupported, and could perhaps benefit from MERG helping with partner searches. Mr Gillett advised the agencies to make full use of national and local contact points paid for by member state governments.

MG commented that it was inequitable that project participants have to submit their reports on time or else risk losing payments, but IEEA seem to be able to make late payments with no sanctions against them.

AB advised to group to concentrate on what it saw as being the main barriers and where they felt that there might be some openings for change from DG-TREN.

BP summarized that this is an important discussion for the local and regional energy agencies and that it is a strategic question for DG TREN (and not for the IEEA), if the EIE programme should be designed also for local agencies and actors. Of course there are always several reasons why a change or improvement is not possible but in his opinion the MERG is there to put forward ideas and initiate discussions.

Further input for the EIE II programme should be made at the next meeting. BP asked for active contribution from the members.

8. Public roles of Local Energy Agencies

This item was deferred until the next meeting as time had run out and GMV had been unable to attend.

9. Election of Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson for 2006

As there is no current Vice-Chairperson, who should normally be elected as the next Chairperson, the Chairperson as well as the Vice-Chairperson should be elected. BP as current Chairperson proposed to appoint for the year 2006:

Chairperson: Roman Doubrava, Slovakia

Vice-Chairperson: Ralf Goldmann, Germany

The MERG members unanimously approved both proposals.

RD took the opportunity to shortly outline his priorities for the group’s work, which are:

1. Increase the visibility of local and regional agencies and actors in Europe’s policies and programmes
2. Contribute to shaping the new EIE II programme
3. Support the creation of agencies in the NMS and CC and continue networking with other associations and initiatives like EnR etc.

10. Any other business

The following issues were shortly touched:

AB and RB informed shortly about the Sustainable Energy Europe conference, which took place the two previous days (28-29 Nov). It was a good event for networking, forming partnerships and get things moving.

PC observed that on one hand registration for the conference was closed and on the other hand there were a lot of free seats. He suggested that participation should be confirmed somehow or a small fee should be collected.

RB informed the group about several ManagEnergy news:

The next annual ManagEnergy conference will take place on 7-8 February 2006 where the Green Paper on Energy Efficiency will be central for the discussions.

The new kids corner on the ManagEnergy web site, which was developed by Daniela Mormile, is online.

ManagEnergy will provide video cards. This is a nice tool that can be used in emails. If there is a presentation of someone online then a link can be sent through the email to make it easily accessible.

A brochure on education is published and any feedback is welcomed.

The next meeting is planned for 6 February 2006 in Brussels, just before the conference. Boris Papousek concluded, wished all participants a good journey back and closed the meeting.

Chairman 2005: Boris Papousek (AUT)

Minutes: Ian Byrne (UK)

Annex 1: Attendance List (alphabetical order):

(for contact details see ManagEnergy Reflection Group homepage)

		<u>Organisation and country, if representing national association</u>	
RB	Ronald (Rex) Bailey	DG-TREN: unit D3	EC
AB	André Brisaer	DG-TREN: head of unit D3	EC
IWB	Ian Byrne	Assn of UK Energy Agencies/MKEA/NEF	UK
PC	Panos Coroyannakis	Islenet	-
GC	Geraldine A. Cusack	AIEA	Ireland
KD	Krisztina Dely	Energie-Cités	-
RD	Roman Doubrava	Energy Centre Bratislava	Slovakia
MG	Michael Geißler	FEDARENE	-
RG	Ralf Goldmann	EAD	Germany
IK	Ivan Kalchev	ABEA	Bulgaria
KMK	Katarzyna Michalowska-Knap	EC BREC	Poland
KK	Kostas Konstantinou	Anatoliki SA, REACM	Greece
ML	Maud Leloutre	Flame network	France
RvL	Rebecca van Leeuwen-Jones	EnR (SenterNovem)	-
JML	José Ramón López	EVE	Spain
BP	Boris Papousek	ManagEnergy Reflection Group (Chair)	Austria
OS	Otmar Schlager	EA Waldviertel / ANEA	Austria
AV	Aare Vabamägi	Regional Energy Centres Estonia	Estonia
GW	Gerry Wardell	CODEMA / AIEA	Ireland
ZW	Zeno Winkels	Dutch Association of Energy Agencies	Netherlands

Commission officials attending only part of the meeting to make specific presentations are not included on the above list and are given their full name when they spoke in the meeting.

Further annexes:

- Annex 2: Presentation on “Action on New Member States and Candidate Countries” by Roman Doubrava.
- Annex 3: Presentation on the “Intelligent Energy Europe Programme and the Intelligent Energy Europe Executive Agency (ieea)” by William Gillett and Priit Enok.
- Annex 4: Presentation on the “Involvement of Local and Regional Energy Agencies in the Calls for proposals 2003 and 2004” by Waltraud Schmid.
- Annex 5: Presentation on “Participation of Local and Regional Energy Agencies in EIE – Problems and Possible Improvements” by Boris Papousek.