



Y 1.3

ON OF REVISED ENERGY PLANNING PROCESS AT ZUGLÓ, BUDAPEST 14.
DISTRICT - FINAL

DELIVERABLE 1.3.1.
Final evaluation

Version 1
09 2021



Introduction

ENES-CE project is designed to involve citizens at the very beginning of the planning process. This was done through a series of workshops and tools, through which the existing energy plans were revised and some of actions were implemented as pilot projects.

The WP1's main objective was to involve citizens in revising local energy plans and define new objectives, strategies and energy and climate actions through a bottom-up approach and quadruple helix, involving also the research centers, energy agencies, energy private providers, BROs in the final approval of the revised action plans. Local stakeholder engagement took place through a series of 3 workshops targeting A) citizens and B) businesses C) local NGOs D) municipality's institutions. The workshops were used to stimulate the debate about the current energy plans and to use the tools developed in TWP2. The workshops aim were:

- to present the new Climate strategy to the local communities
- to involve local citizens and civil organisations in the preparation of SECAP light monitoring (2 years)
- to kick off the civil involvement period, to highlight the energy cooperative and pilots.

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.

In the first workshop topic was the new energy plans, citizens and industry representatives were introduced with ENES CE project and with existing Sustainable Energy and Action Plan (SECAP) and climate strategy. The first workshop participants and the stakeholders answering our online questionnaire found the following three fields of action the most important and willing to engage in:

Facilitating condominium community solar investments with information and financial support

Community operated lockable bicycle storages in housing estates

Promoting cycling and pedestrian traffic: congested streets, better traffic safety

During the second workshop, we discussed and gathered current knowledges, experiences and local activities that can contribute to a successful pilot project and the possible involvement of residents and other stakeholders from Zugló in the selected tree pilot projects. Local stakeholder groups gave their input on identified measures and pointed out the most relevant ones to be implemented in Zugló.

10 possible pilot project actions were discussed:

Energy advisers network supporting households in need, Smart meters

Before renovation: Training for housing associations

Zugló climate coordinators, local climate groups

Creating community bike storage facilities in residential areas

Improving traffic calming and safety

Support for community solar panels in apartment buildings



The action will support the municipality's information and awareness-raising services.

Increasing green spaces

Community Green Guide Map

During the third workshop, we tried to stimulate citizen engagement in creating local energy strategies.

Final SECAP and the new Climate Strategy was presented at the third workshop. Local stakeholders gave their comments on the document and shown willingness to participate in the implementation of the identified measures. We kicked off the civil involvement period, highlighted the energy cooperative and pilots that they can support.

General evaluation of the revision process

In this part the whole revision process is evaluated 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.

	- Very badly				- very well	K/NA
Energy plan revision process objectives			5			

2. Please, rate on a 10-point scale where do you stand in the current energy plan revision process, where '1' means we have just started and '10' means we have fully completed, you can

	- Very badly				- Very well	K/NA
Energy plan revision process status		8				



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)**

Zugló is Budapest XIV. District with ~120.000 inhabitants. The social status of our inhabitants are heterogeneous and also out building stock. Although Zuglo is one of the most “green” district the number of active citizens, NGOs and citizens groups are rather low. TWe started the engagement process from the available “green” groups and tried to activate them and their citizen umbrella. We also involved the Zuglo’s institutions and officers from the first point. The three workshops have been organized and implemented online due to the Covid19 crisis so the attendance was a bit poor. At the third workshop, the involved NGOs were active but citizens and SMEs were not presented in large numbers. At each workshop, stakeholders as well as town administration were included in discussion. Finally, at the third workshop it was decided to establish Energy Action Group in Zugló. By identifying concrete pilot schemes with efficient reduction measures, together with time frames and assigned responsibilities, Zugló translates the long-term strategy into effective actions.

In first workshop started topic about new energy plans, citizens and industry representatives were introduced with ENES CE project and with existing Sustainable Energy and Action Plan (SECAP) and climate strategy. The first workshop participants and the stakeholders answering our online questionnaire found the following three fields of action the most important and willing to engage in:

Facilitating condominium community solar investments with information and financial? support

Community operated lockable bicycle storages in housing estates

Promoting cycling and pedestrian traffic: congested streets, better traffic safety

During the second workshop, we discussed and gathered current knowledges, experiences and local activities that can contribute to a successful pilot project and t. The possible involvement of residents and other stakeholders from Zugló in the selected tree pilot projects. Local stakeholder groups gave their input on identified measures and pointed out the most relevant ones to be implemented in Zugló.

10 possible pilot project actions were discussed:

Energy advisers network supporting comes to the homes of households in need, Smart meters

Before renovation: Training for housing associations

Zugló climate coordinators, local climate groups

Creating community bike storage facilities in residential areas

Improving traffic calming and safety

Support for community solar panels in apartment buildings

The action will support the municipality's information and awareness-raising services.

Increasing green spaces



Community Green Guide Map

During the third workshop, we tried to stimulate citizen engagement in creating local energy strategies.

Final SECAP and the new Climate Strategy was presented at the third workshop. Local stakeholders gave their comments on the document and showed willingness to participate in the implementation of the identified measures. We kicked off the civil involvement period, highlighted the energy cooperative and pilots that they can support.

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

Main obstacle was pandemic of Covid-19 which slowed down whole revision process. A lot of stakeholders which needed to be involved were working from home. Some of citizens couldn't come to the workshops because of the pandemic. Finally, some of citizens often think that it is a waste of time to join discussion since their opinion will not be taken into account so they avoid participating. Also SME's involvement was hard as they are more like to see projects and actions where they can see their added value much clearer.

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?

It has been proven, that the best option is to contact with the citizens throughout local NGOs already active and make online questionnaire. Dates of workshops and the place of workshop were adapted to epidemic conditions. It is important to stress out to citizens the purpose of the project, and seek their opinions and ideas so they feel involved.



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.**

	- Not realistic at all				- realistic	K/NA
Realisticity of objectives	1					

7. **Please elaborate your answer!**

Process has been prolonged because of Covid 19 crisis, and it is expected that implementation of measures will also be delayed. However, the national decisions of luring away local financial resources as well as lack of information on future funding schemes make goals uncertain. In addition, on local level, the 5-year council elections and yearly budgeting decisions may delay realization.

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

	- Not clarity at all				- Totally clear	K/NA
Clarity of goals				5		

9. **Please elaborate your answer!**

Since the Covenant of Mayors has developed guidelines and methodology how to turn SEAP into SECAP, in this regard there were no unknown variables with regard to the process itself. Energy planning revision process goals are clear.



1.3 Problems and improvements of the SECAP implementation

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

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

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.



Lack of available financing and co-financing options on regional and national level.

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

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



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.

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



1. Stakeholders, participants and new involvement techniques

In this part please the stakeholder and participant involvement process is evaluated.

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.

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

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	no barrier
Regional public authority	No interest in participating at local planning processes



Sectoral agency	There are no public energy agencies in the region
Infrastructure and (public) service provider	Limited participation due to the Covid-19 pandemic
Interest groups including NGOs	no barrier
Higher education and research	Higher education sector doesn't see its interest in energy planning process
Business support organisation	Business sector doesn't see its interest in energy planning process
General public	General public mainly isn't introduced to energy planning process

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

We mainly involved large Businesses which already have a very green focused CSR policy. We tried to involve SMEs and industry sector since they are the main leading power of economic growth in Zugló which also has a great influence on energy consumption and whole energy sector (ps Hungarian Post). They should have a great interest to improve energy efficiency in their buildings and transportation and production processes. Also, they are keen to start using renewable energy sources in their companies and some have already started the investments in this direction (PV plants).

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.

It is important to acknowledge experience of citizens in preparing and implementing their own energy refurbishment and green lifestyle.

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		<p>Most of the citizens currently spend over 20% of their monthly income on energy bills. Although most of residential heating is based on gas, and the price of gas in Hungary is rather low compared to other EU countries, citizens still work on improving their living standards through decrease of their bills</p>	
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	Air pollution is a very important topic for citizens		
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	Citizens primary want to decrease their energy bills, so they intend to		



	invest in energy efficiency. Because of lack of financial resources it is necessary to have co-funding from regional, national or EU level.		
11. More livable settlement, increasing welfare			
12. Other, namely: greening their lifestyle		Zugl ó citizens would like to do for the environment by change their present lifestyle and also happily volunteering in greening their neighborhood.	

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

Citizens are aware of the climate crisis. Most of citizens want changes in energy usage, but new heating/cooling system requires substantial financial resources and they are waiting for national support to start investment. Therefore they are interested more in behavioural change and community related methods.

2.2 New techniques

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

The COVID-19 pandemic was still ongoing so different online tools were used to disseminate and an abstract has been made to ease the understanding of the actions.

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

We used different methods of online communication like publications on web pages of Zugló and Mizuglonk sites. Also publication in local and regional online and printed media, online social media (Facebook pages), etc. we also used NGO's network and their social media channels.



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.

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

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

Tool #1 has been most useful in generating new ideas how to approach wider range of important stakeholders and involve citizens. The methods described in the Tool have already been and will be used in future meeting organization. Tool #2 has been developed as a tool which can be used by persons with more knowledge and expertise in energy planning so it will not be appropriate for us in Hungary. Tool #3 gave an insight in communication methods for presenting goals and results of energy planning to general public. It can be useful for stakeholders which implement different kind of projects but it not contained any very new methods, for example online tools which could be extremely useful in pandemic situation.