



ACTIVITY 1.3

EVALUATION OF THE ENERGY PLAN REVISION PROCESS IN THE NIEMCE
COMMUNE, IN THE LUBELSKIE VOIVODESHIP.

DELIVERABLE 1.3.1
Final evaluation

Version 1
01.2022



Introduction

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

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

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

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

The evaluation combines quantitative and qualitative methods as well.



1. General evaluation of the revision process

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

1.1 Summary

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

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

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

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

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

The Low Carbon Economy Plan (LCEP) revision process is in an advanced phase. As part of the project implementation, three workshops in 2020 and 3 workshops in 2021 have been successfully conducted. The discussion enabled indicating the major barriers and limitations that may appear at the stage of implementation of investment projects. They concerned technical constraints related to the existing infrastructure for the transmission of energy carriers.

The revision of the LCEP and the involvement in this energy planning process residents, companies, NGOs and other stakeholders from the commune results already with the creation of the citizens energy group in the commune: "Niemce Energy Cluster" on 22.10.2021.



The current status of the Low Carbon Economy Plan (LCEP) upgrade is as follows:

In the Niemce Commune in the Lubelskie Voivodeship during the ENES- CE project the document of Low Carbon Economy Plan (LCEP) from year 2016 was revised. This document was presented and consulted on the 1st project workshop in 2020 and adopted on 4 February 2020 by Resolution No. XIV/138/2020 of the Council of Niemce. This LCEP is for years 2020-2025.

The next revision of the LCEP was made 2021 by External Expert engaged in the ENES-CE project and the draft document of the LCEP and investment activities were discussed during the project workshops in 2021 and also during the education action, which was chosen as priority action to carried out by the new created citizens energy group in the realization of the ENES-CE project: “Niemce Energy Cluster”.

The draft document “LCEP for the Niemce Commune for 2021-2030, with a vision of activities until 2050 (update)” which contains elements of the SECAP may be adopted by the Council of the Niemce Commune in the future.

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

The biggest challenge has been to start a bottom-up citizens involvement approach in the revision process and convince the project stakeholders that they would be able to make key decisions within the created citizen energy group. The Polish legal system favors top-down planning, therefore it is important to carry out activities showing the advantages of bottom-up planning. During the revision process, difficulties were also encountered beyond the capacity of the citizen energy group being formed regarding energy infrastructure.

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

In order to convince the stakeholders, at the beginning of the revision process an interviews in form of survey and series of three workshops in 2020 and next 3 workshops in 2021 were conducted, each with a broad discussion with a panel of questions and answers. Indicating the experiences of Western European countries, the advantages and achievements, RES investments obtained thanks to bottom-up initiatives (citizens energy groups) were presented. Due to the inability to solve problems related to the energy infrastructure, alternative actions have been proposed. (e.g. investments and use RES to generate energy by the Niemce Energy Cluster, commencement of talks with PGE after the creation of the energy cluster about the possibility of establishing a Main Supply Point in the Niemce Commune.

1.2 Goals

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



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

7. Please elaborate your answer!

The energy planning/plan revision process' objectives were realistic. An external Expert has been engaged to provide knowledge and experience in energy planning and support the process of planning investments in RES and the implementation of project tasks in terms of content. Awarded a 4 on a five-scale is due to limitations associated with the occurrence of the coronavirus pandemic.

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

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

9. Please elaborate your answer!

Goals for the planning revision process were understandable. The tools provided by ENES-CE partners helped to implement the revision process in the project.



3 Problems and improvements of the SECAP implementation

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

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

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

Polish legal system which is favoring top-down planning.



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

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



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

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



2. Stakeholders, participants and new involvement techniques

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

2.1 Involvement

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

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

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

	Main barrier
Local public authority	-
Regional public authority	-
Sectoral agency	PGE is not very interested in development of the distributed energy which will be a competition for its activities
Infrastructure and (public) service provider	-
Interest groups including NGOs	-
Higher education and research	little interest in participating in the LCEP update and energy planning process
Business support organisation	A small number of business support organisation in the Niemce Commune.
General public	-



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

New stakeholders worth involving in the ENES-CE project are entities responsible for the supply of individual energy carriers (e.g. PGE Dystrybucja S.A.), local entrepreneurs and new group of residents.

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

The workshop was attended by an entrepreneur, whose experience could be used in updating PGN and in creating KEN and conducting a pilot action.

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

	Why the selected one was the most motivating?	Why the selected one was the second most motivating?	Why the selected one was the third most motivating?
1. To increase employment / decrease unemployment			
2. To save energy in order to use less of the non-renewable energy sources			
3. Smaller energy bills, decreasing the regular monthly expenses			Reduction of the amount of energy bills has a positive effect on potential project members, as it guarantees certain benefits in the longer time horizon.
4. To decrease greenhouse gas emissions for the mitigation of direct effects of climate change (e.g. heatwaves, extremities, extreme weather etc.)			
5. To decrease the indirect negative effects of climate change (e.g. damages in buildings, food/energy price increase etc.)			
6. To decrease air pollution	In Poland, including the Niemce Commune,		



	bad air quality is very noticeable. Citizens want to change and improve air quality.		
7. Decentralisation of energy consumption, independence from the central grid(s)			
8. Pressure/needs of the public/local citizens			
9. Political expectations/ following higher level decision-makers			
10. Expected financial benefits e.g. conditioned EU-funds		Co-financing from UE funds allows the implementation of beneficial projects without a large own contribution.	
11. More livable settlement, increasing welfare			
12. Other, namely:			

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

Changing legal regulations favoring the prosumer system.

2.2 New techniques

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

Several methods of communication were used during the project implementation. Workshop meetings were the leading one. Each workshop consisted of a presentation and discussion panel. This solution enabled exchange of information and presenting needs by all stakeholders. The third workshop in 2020 due to sanitary restrictions and a large number of participants, was conducted online.

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

Communication channels like: the website, facebook direct mailing and placing the invitation on the doors of public buildings, leaflets or promotional materials.

Workshops are the best way for continuous and easy flow of information from top to bottom and vice versa. Method of communication used simple language and presentations to clarify aims, common goal and propose steps, then hearing proposals from habitants and discussion with the Expert. Those methods contribute to effective communication and help to create atmosphere of mutual understanding and prepare people to accept change or new proposals in the energy planning.



2.3 New tools

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

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

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

In the case of tool 1, it proved highly useful because it allowed reaching various groups of stakeholders. Establishing cooperation between residents, entrepreneurs, the commune office and other entities allowed for a substantive discussion on the further implementation of the project.

In the case of tool 2, the character of the activities undertaken by the Niemce Commune under the ENES-CE project, will be related to the increased use of renewable energy sources, reduction of final energy consumption and reduction of costs incurred for the purchase of electricity. This are not commercial activities, therefore the indicated tool has not been fully used.

Tool 3, focuses on communication channels. The target group is analyzed, before any action is taken. Methods and tools recommendations are then made.

In Lubelskie Voivodeship communication channels are the website of the Niemce Commune, direct mailing and placing the invitation for the Workshops on the doors public buildings in the Niemce Commune. The information after the Workshops is placed on the websites of the Niemce Commune, Lubelskie Voivodeship, ENES-CE project website and facebook. Leaflets about the project are also one of the ways of communication.

Workshops are the form of baseline for continuous and easy flow of information from top to bottom and vice versa. Method of communication is use of simple language for clarify of the aims, common goal and propose steps, than hearing proposals and discussion with the Expert what is contributing to effective communication and creation of the atmosphere of acceptance and preparing people to accept change or new proposals in the energy planning.