

Reflection Group

ManagEnergy Reflection Group Minutes of the 12th Meeting

**12-13 June 2006, 10.00 - 17.30
Hotel Istota, Pezinok, Slovakia**

Agenda

Sunday, 11/6/2006 - Arrival of participants

Monday, 12/6/2006

1. Welcome by the chairman, minutes of last meeting, agenda (Roman Doubrava)
2. Opening remarks and news from the Commission (Rex Bailey)
3. Cooperation with EnR – report from the meeting with EnR WG CEEC, discussion (Roman Doubrava, Yelena Varasteh)
4. Results of the last call under the IEE Programme (Rex Bailey)
5. Future of the IEE Programme, discussion (Ralf Goldmann, Boris Papousek)
6. World Gas Conference & Energy Guidebook (Pim Koegler)
7. Action on NMS/CC - Discussion on working paper (Roman Doubrava, MERG members from NMS/CC)

End of day 1

Tuesday, 13/6/2006

7. Action on NMS/CC – discussion on working paper (continued)
8. AOB, closing remarks, next meeting
9. Site visit to District Heating Plant in Nova Dubnica

The meeting commenced at 1000.

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

Roman Doubrava welcomed participants to the Meeting noting that it was exactly five years since the group first met.

The minutes of the previous meeting were **approved**.

Roman Doubrava summarised the revised agenda. Ian Byrne agreed to take minutes again. Pim Koegler asked if he could talk briefly about the energy guide book. These were **agreed**.

Roman Doubrava noted that one of the main items of business at this meeting concerns sustainable energy in new member states. Unfortunately the only four countries were represented at the meeting (Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Estonia). The group is likely to be joined in the near future by Romania (ABMEE Brasov) and Slovenia (RA Sinergija), but they, although invited, were unable to attend. Roman Doubrava also noted that he has attended the working group meeting of EⁿR focused on the new member states.

2. Opening remarks and news from the Commission

Rex Bailey started by thanking Roman Doubrava for making the arrangements for the meeting.

Green Paper on a European strategy for sustainable, competitive and secure energy

Commissioner Piebalgs has pointed out that energy security does not just depend upon the supply side, but must be preceded by tackling the demand side and in particular energy efficiency. Roman Doubrava asked if we should create a formal response to the Green Paper. Boris Papousek thought not, and that the group should concentrate on the demand side, where it had considerable influence - this was generally agreed by members.

The Eco-Design directive has been passed into council, and 14 items of equipment have been selected to be covered by the directive. It is being strongly supported by European equipment manufacturer, but the list of goods selected has not yet been published.

The **end use efficiency and energy services directive** has now been adopted.

Green Paper on Energy Efficiency

Samuele Furfare has been working through around 5000 responses to the Green Paper, supported by an intern. MERG members were thanked for the submission that the reflection group put in to the commission on the Green Paper.

Following on from the Green Paper, it is intended that an **Action Plan** will be adopted by council on 30th October. This plan is still at a relatively early stage - Randall Bowie is responsible for co-ordinating its drafting. It is likely to contain policies for the next six years and measures that should lead to a long term aim of reducing energy consumption by up to a quarter. There will be considerable emphasis given to "soft" measures such as campaigns and networks.

The Action Plan is likely to include three thematic pillars:

Implementation of existing legislation. This will include supporting measures at the appropriate level, for example modifying energy labelling on appliances and a revised agreement over Energy Star, which needs to be modified for use in the new member states.

Behavioural change. This is centred around raising awareness, disseminating information, fostering education and training and encouraging Energy advice and audits.

Better financial instruments. Improvements could be made to tax structures, the removal of barriers to the implementation of Energy-efficiency, the use of cohesion funds to encourage sustainable energy, and lending through the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the European Investment Bank.

Supporting these pillars, there are likely to be three sectoral themes - transport, transformer and distribution losses (collectively known as "transformation losses") and the global dimension of energy efficiency.

Ian Byrne strongly supported the international dimension, referring to work that his organisation had carried out in SE Asia. However he was surprised to note that households and industry were not treated as separate sectors. Rex Bailey responded by noting that they are generally well covered by the first two thematic pillars.

Gerry Wardell asked about the national strategic reference frameworks required under the Lisbon process to be submitted by the end of the year for regional funds. He also asked about the links between DG-TREN and DG-Regions. Rex Bailey referred to recent meetings between member states and the Commission at which the states were asked to identify areas where they have problems and how these might affect the Lisbon priorities of competitiveness and innovation. Priorities should subsequently emerge that can be taken on by the European Council and find their way into guidelines for structural funds.

Pim Koegler noted that CEMR were concerned that the three pillars should reach down to a local or municipal level; he also asked about the future role of the Sustainable Energy Forum and the opportunity for the European Investment Bank to guarantee loans at a local level. Rex Bailey noted that IEE2 will have more funds and will be able to provide project funding that should reinforce existing networks and agencies as well as establishing new Energy Agencies at a local level. Directorate D will be doing its best to translate the overall framework into specific actions. The European Commission will also reject inadequate national energy efficiency plans. Rex Bailey commended the Dutch national transition plan to the meeting and Pim Koegler expressed the hope that it would soon be translated into English.

ManagEnergy Energy Week (Brussels January 2007)

Directorate D are proposing an Energy week to be held in Brussels from 29 January to 2nd February 2007. This first sustainable energy week is likely to have the following agenda:

Monday/Tuesday: EREC conference (Flagey Convention Centre)

Wednesday: ManagEnergy conference, devoted to the new programme (IEE2). There are now likely to be a seven annual programmes rather than a four-year programme with defined calls each year.

Thursday: Sustainable Energy Europe campaign conference.

Friday: this is provisionally reserved for a local event, for example based around the Brussels Energy Agency.

There are likely to be two award ceremonies (SEE campaign and the Energy Globe awards) in the evenings.

Ian Byrne asked if it would be possible to hold the reflection group meeting on Friday, which Roman Doubrava also thought useful. Roman Doubrava also suggested that there could be training workshop for new Energy Agency managers. Rex Bailey thought that either could be useful and it might be desirable for the group to be able to reflect upon the outcome of the week - members could receive comments from colleagues on the earlier events, if they were unable to attend all four days.

Boris Papousek commented that some conferences supported by IEE and ManagEnergy in the past have been of a rather general nature and not worth attending. He noted that there had

occasionally been some more specifically focused workshops on practical issues and would welcome more of these, for example on the implementation buildings directive, the energy services directive, or on clean transport. Roman Doubrava agreed adding that seminars on building the capacity of management in the new member states. Ralf Goldmann was concerned that this sort of conference could be difficult at an international level owing to variations in the types and sizes of agencies as well as the lack of a common language. Boris Papousek felt that it is not just about management skills but more about creating thematic events. After further discussion it was agreed that Roman Doubrava should write to Pedro Ballasteros about the content of conferences. MERG members were asked to send suggestions for suitable topics to Roman Doubrava by 19 June.

There was a broader discussion about the funding of thematic networks with particular concern raised about the fact that partners are sometimes expected to share or "give away" knowledge, and yet still have to pay 50% of the costs. Rex Bailey noted that there are some concerted action funds for dissemination around legislation.

Item 3 was deferred until Yelena Varasteh was able to join the meeting.

4. Results of final call under IEE

A summary of the most recent call's results is now online on the DG-TREN website: co-ordinators have been informed of their results around two weeks ago.

In all 231 proposals were received; five were ineligible so there were around 20% more eligible applications than in 2004 (and 7% more than in 2003). This greater response is possibly due to there being more info days.

40% of all proposals had new co-ordinators.

1867 organisations were represented from 29 countries in the bids.

Around 60% of participants are private (non-profit or commercial).

Assessment was carried out by 78 external experts, who felt that the overall quality had risen. A committee at the end concentrates on difficult cases. As DG-TREN has around Euro 1 million more than it originally expected there is practically no reserve list, and they are having to apply the quality rules very closely. Quality is determining factor and the negotiations are largely around the exact budget allocated.

91 proposals were recommended for financing (€ 53.3 million) with 862 participants between them - a 40% success rate. 82 were recommended for negotiations. The number of very weak proposals gaining a score of under 30 had gone down substantially.

Overall there have been 14 contracts for new Energy Agencies over the three IEE rounds 2003-5, including four in this 2005 round which should lead to the establishment of another 17 new agencies. Rex Bailey summarised the geographical locations of the expected new agencies, noting that for the first time, in Malta, a national agency is likely to be funded, although it is organised through the university not the government. The other agencies had a tendency to be in the southern half of Europe, with a couple of exceptions (such as at Riga in Latvia).

Rex Bailey agreed to provide figures to the group on participation in the programme by existing Energy Agencies.

The CIP programme has been allocated total funding of € 3.6 billion over seven years. Within that IEE2 will receive around € 730 million (€ 103 million a year) and includes an increased focus on clean transport.

5. Future of IEE2

Boris Papousek and Ralf Goldmann led the discussion following a presentation of the paper that had been circulated earlier in the year. They highlighted that although there will be some payments made under calls for tender, at least €80 million a year will be available on a matched funding basis which will require actors to find co-funding of a further €80 million. This is seen as being a particular issue as some participants have had to withdraw after initially being awarded contracts due to a lack of co-financing at a relatively late stage. They noted Bill Gillett's comments that IEE projects should not be seen as being at the core business of an organisation, but instead should provide no more than 10 - 15% of total turnover. In turn this could be seen as implying that the sector needs to have total turnover in excess of € 1600 million, yet typical Energy Agencies only have turnover in the range of € 0.2 to 5 million.

This raises five basic questions:

1. How can the co-financing be secured?
2. How can we secure participation by small or medium of players?
3. How many actors can take part in total?
4. Should there be limitations on funding against turnover?
5. How can we ensure a stable participation in the programme?

Most barriers to participation are financial, for example the costs of writing and negotiating proposals can come to typically 100 to 350 hours for the co-ordinator (and up to 100 hours for a partner). Contract negotiation alone can typically take 60-150 hours as well as providing ineligible costs of travelling to Brussels for the negotiation meeting.

Ian Byrne felt that many prospective partners will not spend as long in putting together submissions as the figures indicated, but this can sometimes lead to partners joining consortia that are inappropriate. Ralf Goldmann noted that a good partner will not just join a consortium with little consideration, but should also undertake extensive consultations on a regional basis to ensure that they have full local buy-in and stand a good chance of raising the co-financing.

Possible ways of improving the process could include raising the percentage of European funding available, which would make seeking co-financing easier, as the private sector are reluctant to join in typical projects. Risk could also be reduced by a two-stage application process, so that co-financing might only need to be sought after an initial approval, which would make it then easier to approach the private sector if there was known to be a high chance of success. If a two-stage process were to be adopted, negotiation costs in the second stage should be regarded as eligible.

IEEEA have objected to the concept of a two-stage process due to a lack of manpower to manage it, and to there being no shortage of applications under the current rules.

Ralf Goldmann added that timing is also an issue for co-finance. Budgets are often set in September or October before the start of the new calendar year (although Ian Byrne noted that the whole process is three months later in the UK). Pim Kogler suggested that local or regional government could perhaps support agencies in writing funding proposals.

Gerry Wardell reported that Energie-Cités have supported MERG in suggesting up to 75% EU funding. Pim Kogler have felt that this might increase budgets and so cut the number of projects. Roman Doubrava thought that private companies may be able to gear up 25% but not 50%. Kostas Konstantinou suggested that as sub-contracting costs and travelling costs have to be funded 100 percent they are very difficult to co-finance from within the organisation's own budgets.

Framework projects are seen as being another possible type of programme. Under these the Commission comes up with proposals for well-defined priority areas and this should enable a

larger number of actors to participate with lower costs. However most of the projects approved under FP6 (such as ENERGIE or Concerto) are for a substantially larger sum of money than under IEE.

There could also be a place for operational grants (for example information, advice or awareness campaigns) at the local level.

Among the other issues that had been included in the draft paper were matters to improve the financial conditions surrounding contracting, including automatic interest on late payments, co-financing for Project development, and 100 per cent funding for co-ordination dissemination costs. Members liked the idea of the Energy Efficiency Action Plan requiring national governments in the member states to provide co-financing for agreed projects.

Gerry Wardell referred to the problem that if EU funded projects should be no more than 15% of turnover for some of the smaller agencies this could be as little as € 30,000 which is seen as being too small by the commission. Ian Byrne suggested that a potential solution for small projects would be to allow national governments to pay amounts to local actors up to a defined maximum limit of say € 20,000. This approach was used by ALTENER 10 years ago but has since been discontinued.

Kostas Konstantinou suggested that co-ordinators might be more willing if they were able to receive a slightly higher percentage funding than other participants. Ian Byrne agreed and noted that the three Energy Agencies he is involved with have had a policy of not acting as co-ordinator due to the increased risks.

Grzegorz Wiśniewski said that although the statistics look good for 2005 they may not stay this way, particularly when we have a larger budget under IEE2. He suggested that there could be a requirement for additionality to obtain funding so that only those projects that would not go ahead without the European contribution would receive payments. This requirement is imposed by - for example - the Kyoto joint implementation programme.

Concluding, Ralf Goldmann and Boris Papousek agreed to put these points into a paper to submit to Alfonso Gonzalez stressing that if nothing is done the pool of participants is almost bound to shrink, as happened the number of years ago with OPETs, or the projects may be snapped up by utility companies using their marketing budget as co-financing. MERG members were asked to provide any extra comments to Ralf or Boris in the next three weeks.

6. World Gas Conference & Energy Guidebook

Pim Koegler started by introducing himself as wearing several hats including that for the energy network of CEMR. The energy guide book is a 32 page A4 document that has come out from CEMR, Energie-Cités and the Climate Alliance. At present it is only available in English and he can provide hard copies on request.

Pim Koegler then reported about the outcome of the World Gas Conference held in Holland last month. He explained how the northern Netherlands has been looking at potential effects of global warming and how it will affect spatial planning in a document called **Grounds For Change**. Using 2035 as the reference date, climate change adaptation may have to include some allowance for flooding of land that is currently used for agricultural purposes. There will also be a tendency for energy sources to move from those hidden underground to ones are visible above ground, such as wind, biomass or solar, all of which need to be incorporated into a spatial framework. It is important that stakeholders have a clear idea of the timescales that might be necessary to make the changes.

In the workshops at the conference he noted that planners liked to start drawing straightaway, but energy experts wanted to do lots of calculations first and that it is important that the cultural differences between different professions are recognised. Other key lessons included the need to get political involvement right at the start of the process and the fact that although energy experts may be used to working on several different scenarios in parallel, spatial planners can usually only provide a full set of drawings for a single scenario. Gasunie had been very helpful in the conference as gas is expected to be the main transition fuel between now and 2035.

Grzegorz Wiśniewski gave a short presentation about the second European Conference of Municipal Energy Managers that will be held in Warsaw in early October. This is a follow-on from the first conference held in Stuttgart in 2004. Although the main agenda of the conference is now set, he still open to suggestions for speakers, parallel sessions, and ways of involving MERG members. Please send comments as soon as possible to him like e-mail at grzegorz.wisniewski@ieo.pl (or eo@eo.org.pl). The target audience is likely to be around 60:40 supply/demand side and the working languages will be Polish and English.

3. Relationship with EⁿR

Roman Doubrava summarised some of the historical contacts between MERG and EⁿR, including a letter that he had received from them in reply to our letter of 6th February which had been discussed by their committee. Generally EⁿR seem to believe that the most fruitful area at the moment for cooperation between two groups is in the area of central and East European countries.

Yelena Varasteh explained how an EⁿR working group was established in 1993 to help new member states become involved with sustainable energy. It has since been refocused on to central and Eastern Europe, including the Western Balkans and the new neighbourhoods. The main emphasis now is on new financial instruments for renewable energy and energy efficiency.

Roman Doubrava agreed to circulate the presentation.

Yelena identified that new member states usually lacked strong national energy agencies. Sometimes personnel are shared between national and local or regional agencies so it is important therefore to include municipalities or counties in the process. Funding remains a significant issue as many of the smaller national agencies cannot even afford to attend the EⁿR meetings.

Roman Doubrava thought it would be productive if MERG and EⁿR were to join forces more on policy work and that it should improve both organisations' profile at the EC level. He then posed three questions:

- How collaboration with EⁿR could lead to greater value for local and regional Energy Management agencies in their links with ManagEnergy and the European Commission;
- Whether EⁿR are proposing that formal working should only relate to the new member states; and
- How EⁿR manages to cope with such a long list of priority topics.

Yelena Varasteh answered that the area of new member states is thought at the moment to be the most fruitful one for cooperation, and that they cope with the long list of the topics by discussing one in detail at each meeting. More information is available on the EⁿR website.

Grzegorz Wiśniewski felt that we could take advantage of the greater size and resources of national agencies, including the ability to carry out regional research projects. Gerry Wardell thought that it had worked well where National Energy Agencies developed national projects that could be delivered through local agents. Grzegorz Wiśniewski is concerned that there is

sometimes direct competition for funds between national and local agencies but recognises that there is no single model that can be applied across all countries.

Roman Doubrava concluded by proposing that MERG should continue to look for ways of working closer to EⁿR at the national level.

At 17:45 the meeting was adjourned until the following day.

3. Co-operation with EⁿR (continued)

Following yesterday's discussion on co-operation, Yelena Varasteh had prepared a short presentation in which she had identified specific areas for liaison including preparations for workshops, identifying what has been achieved in each member state. She requested ideas by the 16 June initially so that they could be considered in advance of the next full EⁿR Meeting (19-22 June) in Bucharest, Romania.

Pim Koezler described a project where low-income homes had been refurbished with an increase in comfort, and decreases in health problems (asthma) and in crime, and where the national agency had worked in partnership with the local municipality.

Ian Byrne said that he thought that co-operation should be best kept to a standing invite to attend each other's meetings and to exchanging information, but with working on specific projects - such as the workshops suggested by Yelena Varasteh - on a more *ad hoc* basis. He noted that the two groups have distinct roles to play in the relationship with the European Commission and that the issues affecting national and local Energy Agencies are often quite different.

Yelena Varasteh and Roman Doubrava thought that there could be a joint workshop sometime next year, possibly associated with a ManagEnergy event to increase the rate of participation and reduce travel time.

Grzegorz Wiśniewski asked how many countries are represented on the IEE committee by a National Energy Agency (who would also be EⁿR members) as opposed to by civil servants (government employees). Yelena Varasteh agreed to try and find out, though EⁿR is not itself up represented on the IEE committee. She repeated her request from MERG members to send ideas for co-operation as soon as possible to Roman Doubrava, so that he can summarise them and send them on to her before the next full EⁿR meeting.

7. New Member States

Roman Doubrava expressed his disappointment that only four new member states have been able to attend this MERG meeting.

He again presented the slides from November 2005 identifying some of the issues affecting NMS.

New member states still have a tendency to address energy on a centralised basis with a lack of awareness of the value of local actions. Even where there are local Energy Agencies, some do not appear to work too closely with the local authorities.

Some ideas that could be incorporated into the forthcoming Energy Efficiency Action Plan include encouraging chief executives from local government bodies to speak to local Energy actors, training for Energy Agencies, transfer of know how between old and new member states, various training actions that could be funded through IEE2, and co-operation with other networks.

Viktoria Csorba especially agreed with the point concerning training. In Hungary there is a centralised Energy Centre in Budapest and although there are a few other local Energy Agencies, communication between them is generally quite poor. She highly values the exchange of experience that can be gained through ManagEnergy conferences and the reflection group.

Grzegorz Wiśniewski noted that the situation in Poland is a little different as it is a much larger state so the regional dimension is more important. He thought that the regional info days had been most useful, both as a way of disseminating information but also to give a chance for local actors to attend and meet each other informally. Generally Poland would benefit if more local players could be involved in European projects. He also suggested that cross-border co-operation with near-neighbours is highly valuable (in much the same way as had been done before accession through the bilateral programme that has now ended) and therefore that more use should be made of INTERREG.

Gerry Wardell observed that the issue of financing problems is not unique to new member states. Agencies in the EU 15 also lack funding from local or regional governments although the most successful Agencies have managed to diversify their funding base. He felt that Energy Agencies achieve most when they are able to bring "*influence on the flow of events in the local context*". Networking is a very valuable tool and cited Energie-Cités, FEDARENE and the national Association of Irish Energy Agencies.

Pim Koegler said that CEMR would also support the point about training and how it is important that Energy Agencies work together as much as possible and not compete.

Aare Vabamägi cited an example where flat-owning associations had been able to do energy efficiency improvement work that was unable to be done by the National Energy Agency, because the former was able to borrow money from banks secured on the property. He noted that although there is some money available in local authorities in Estonia, for example for energy audits and planning, it remains very limited. MERG can help to providing more information about the experience of other and training would also be helpful.

The meeting then discussed in some detail issues surrounding problems with ventilation in apartments. Aare Vabamägi noted that the problems in these properties had arisen in part because the owners had concentrated on visible measures such as windows, rather than the most effective mechanisms (heating controls), and that the problem had been compounded by a lack of trust in energy experts. Also, there had been no experts available at the county level with only two or three trained people covering 15 counties. Aare Vabamägi agreed to write down some examples and include them in the revised working paper.

Viktoria Csorba confirmed that her experience in Hungary was similar where there are centralised budgets that are regularly being cut. Roman Doubrava noted that in Slovakia there is a positive development in that many municipalities can now collect their own local taxes and so are more motivated to undertake improvements that will appeal to voters.

All MERG members, especially including those from new member states not in attendance, were asked to send further comments to Roman Doubrava so that the final version of the paper can be agreed at the next meeting.

8. Any other business

The next meeting will probably be held in the second half of October in Brussels. Several members spoke in favour of holding it immediately before or after another event to enable more economical use of travel.

Award for Best Local Energy Actor (ManagEnergy)

Rex Bailey mentioned that there is to be an award for the Best Local Energy Actors of the year and in ManagEnergy's contract with the Commission, they identified that the case studies are expected to be judged by MERG. The award will be handed over by Commissioner Piebalgs, probably at the ManagEnergy event in January 2007. Gerry Wardell was concerned about this, as he thinks MERG should focus on strategy. Ian Byrne disagreed, noting that it would be excellent opportunity to promote local action but that the sticking point would be the costs. He requested Rex to ask STEM if they have a small budget that could be used to pay for this assessment. It was agreed that Anders Berglund (or Christopher Walden) should be invited to the next meeting to explain more about the award. (STEM have a standing invitation to attend the reflection group meetings and Christopher has often done so, although he is currently on paternity leave.)

After further discussion it was agreed that MERG is willing to help in principle, providing that some resources can be made available, and that they will form an informal sub-committee. Ian Byrne felt that judging could be carried out most effectively by two or three people meeting for a day in Brussels, because if the submissions were just send round by e-mail there are always other demands on members' time so proposals may not receive a full consideration. He was also concerned about the timescale, as if the awards are to be made at the end of January 2007, judging will probably have to take place in December 2006, the deadline for submissions could then be late November 2006, and the award would have to be formally launched perhaps in September 2006 and consequently MERG will need to agree with STEM the basis for co-operation and criteria for selection by the end of August this year.

In response to a concern about the potential number of applicants, Rex Bailey noted that as there were only 38 case studies on the ManagEnergy website he did not expect a large number of people seeking the award.

Summarising the meeting, Roman Doubrava noted:

Ralf Goldmann and Boris Papousek will submit a final paper with their views on the future of Intelligent Energy Europe;

Rex Bailey should circulate the (draft?) Action Plan on Energy Efficiency at the earliest opportunity (ie. as soon as it is public);

He (Roman Doubrava) will continue to work on the paper on participation of new member states;

The next MERG meeting is likely to be in late October 2006.

Roman Doubrava and Miroslava Pavelková were again thanked for their excellent organisation of the meeting.

The meeting was formally declared closed at 11:45; most participants then attended a study tour to a woodchip district heating plant at Nova Dubnica.

Annex: Attendance List (alphabetical order):

(for contact details see Managenergy Reflection Group homepage)

		<u>Organisation and country, if representing national association</u>	
AA	Anne Ahtiainen	Turku Energy Agency	Finland
RB	Ronald (Rex) Bailey	DG-TREN: unit D3	EC
IWB	Ian Byrne	Assn of UK Energy Agencies/MKEA/NEF	UK
VC	Viktoria Csorba	Budapest Energy Agency	Hungary
RD	Roman Doubrava	EA Bratislava, MERG Chair	Slovakia
RG	Ralf Goldmann	Berlin Energie Agentur	Germany
PK	Pim Koegler	Council of European Municipalities & Regions (CEMR)/Province of Groningen	(Netherlands)
KK	Kostas Konstantinou	Anatoliki SA	Greece
ML	Maud Leloutre	FLAME Network	France
BP	Boris Papousek	Energieagentur Graz	Austria
AV	Aare Vabamägi	SA Regionaalsed Energiakeskused	Estonia
YV	Yelena Varasteh	EnR/STEM	(Sweden)
GW	Gerry Wardell	CODEMA/AIEA	Ireland
GWi	Grzegorz Wiśniewski	Instytut Energetyki Odnawialnej	Poland

Miroslava Pavelková (ECB Bratislava) provided valuable help and support for the meeting.

Minutes written by Ian Byrne.