



Contract N°: IEE/11/845/SI2.616378

***Bringing Europe and Third countries closer together
through renewable Energies***

BETTER

*Minutes of the BETTER Project Meeting in Madrid,
21 February 2013, Madrid, Spain*



Project Coordinator: CIEMAT

February 2013

Contract N°: IEE/11/845/SI2.616378

Project Acronym: BETTER

**Bringing Europe and Third countries closer
together through renewable Energies**

***Minutes of the BETTER Project Meeting in Madrid,
21 February 2013, Madrid, Spain***

February 2013

Project Coordinator: CIEMAT

Coordination of the meeting: Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)

Minutes taken by: Irene Rodríguez, Marta Santamaría, Cristina de la Rúa

Disclaimer: The sole responsibility for the content of this report lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CIEMAT: Welcome, introduction to CIEMAT team; presentation of the agenda; relevant events for the project since the kick-off meeting in Brussels; WP1 (coordination) and introduction to WP2 work progress

Yolanda Lechón, head of CIEMAT team, presented CIEMAT and particularly the Energy Department and the Energy Systems Analysis Unit.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT presented the agenda of the next two days and the latest developments since the Kick-off meeting in Brussels.

On the policy level, she mentioned that the current crisis is shaping EU policies and priorities, and could potentially modify the general interest for BETTER. For example, the achievement of the 2020 RES targets might not be on the top of the priorities for many countries while at the same time, given the RES market stagnation in many EU countries, internationalization of their activities becomes a more attractive option. Finally it is important to highlight that many of our targeted countries (in North Africa) are currently facing increase geopolitical unrest.

With regards to the WP1 work progress, she indicates that:

- The Advisory Board Composition is defined and the first AB meeting will probably take place side by side with the next project meeting.
- CIEMAT is currently working on the progress report and that they will need some support from partners (by a first/updated indicative state of advancement of hours spent since the starting date, per partner and per Work Package).
- CIEMAT will update the work plan for the next 6 months based on the information from partners presented during this meeting.
- Steering Committee´s telcos will continue to take place every two months (or earlier if needed).
- Currently, there is a Consortium Agreement being drafted and partners are asked that, once there is a final draft of it, they prioritize their revision and signature.

She highlights the importance of fostering and improving communication among partners.

She also mentions that EACI is very interested in this project and has high expectations on it. They continue to support it and our results will be looked at closely.

Marta Santamaría from CIEMAT presents the work progress on WP2 and explains the relevance of this WP for WP3-WP7 and the importance of the stakeholders' involvement.

ECN: Presentation of Deliverable 2.1

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN presents Deliverable 2.1. This report has analyzed the existing cooperation framework as well as the main initiatives and projects conducted on the sphere of the Better project. He concludes his presentation saying that there are a lot of projects related with MENA region. However, there is a lack of projects and information about Balkans and Turkey regions. BETTER can supply this lack of information in these regions. Moreover, another added value of the project can be to assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the implementation of cooperation mechanisms in the studied regions. He also comments the importance of stakeholders' feedback.

Johan Lilliestam from PIK comments that there are a lot of initiatives related to MENA region but he is not sure if these projects are only theoretical projects or they really work in practice. He also says that we have been focused on the importance of these projects for the European countries and it is needed that we develop the relevance and advantages for third countries.

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN answers that some of these projects/initiatives have resulted in concrete actions (like the Energy Community Treaty). Moreover, these kinds of projects increase the confidence of investors and result in better financial conditions.

Marta Santamaría from CIEMAT suggests indicating what are the main outputs of these projects and initiatives which are relevant for the different WPs of the BETTER project.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that BETTER should contribute to the existing body of knowledge by trying to look for win-win circumstances both for exporter and importing countries (as well as for transit countries, if applicable).

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN says that the next steps are crucial to find these win-win circumstances. It is very relevant to clearly communicate these benefits especially at the EU context.

Francesco Dalla Longa mentions that benefits in the short term will be on the sphere of cost savings but in the long term, benefits will be more related with better relationship between countries.

Johan Lilliestam from PIK states that one of the main benefits for Member States will probably be to reach 2020 targets in a cheaper way. Besides that, he highlights the importance of showing what are the benefits for the exporter countries which do not coincide with those from EU countries due to their different priorities and circumstances (political situation, economic development ...).

TUWIEN: Presentation of Deliverable 2.2

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN presents Deliverable 2.2. This report has revised Member States forecasts of using Cooperation Mechanisms (as described by their NREAPS), as well as results from previous IEE projects regarding Cooperation Mechanisms: Res4Less and Re-shaping. He explains that the work done in Res4Less project could be very useful for BETTER project. Nevertheless, there are some significant differences in the results from Res4Less and RE-shaping. Possible reasons include: Res4Less is focussed only on electricity; Res4Less is policy neutral; or hypothesis divergences between Green-X and ResolvE model as well as input data (for example, off-shore potential in Germany and France). As a conclusion, he says that cooperation mechanisms would allow reaching 2020 target in a less expensive way. These projects have a limited scope by considering the timeframe of 2020.

After the presentation, there is a discussion regarding the policy relevance of these and other projects such as Better.

Francesco Dalla Longa says that the aspects of the RES4LESS modelling work that Gustav has compared with the RE-Shaping results are based on a hypothetical policy framework that is substantially different from the one considered in the Green-X model. RE-Shaping considered policy scenarios that build on current policy measures at member state level, which are mostly aimed at achieving national targets domestically. On the contrary in RES4LESS a special "Full cooperation" scenario was constructed where MSs stop with current domestic policies and chose instead to use cooperation mechanisms to achieve an optimal allocation of RES resources across the EU. This scenario shows the potential impact cooperation mechanisms could have on achieving savings in support costs, but it does not provide a realistic picture of what is going to happen in 2020. The RE-Shaping scenarios are, in this sense, closer to reality. It is not surprising that there are differences

between the two approaches. The differences highlight that current policies in the EU are not focused on promoting cost savings through the use of cooperation mechanisms, but rather on achieving the national targets using domestic resources.

Gerhard Totschnig from TUWIEN wonders how comes that UK is an importer country in RESS4LESS project.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN answers that that this could be due to cost efficiency reasons and social acceptance reasons.

Franceco Dalla Longa highlights that the cooperative scenario is a little optimistic (last slide D2.2 presentation). Comparisons with other scenarios developed in RES4LESS project (apart from the “Full cooperation” scenario) may bring added value.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that these projects allow identifying where the potentials are. But also highlights that besides costs, potentials and national targets, there are some policy issues that play a crucial role and some barriers that should be also included in the analysis. For example, in some countries it is challenging to implement the cooperation mechanisms because, among others, of the industrial lobby, the government, society...may have other priorities/confronting interests.

Johan Lilliespam from PIK wonders if the BETTER results will be policy relevant or if they will only be for the result from modelling exercises (very theoretical). He also highlights the importance that the results are policy relevant for both EU and third countries.

Robert Pasicko from UNDP comments the relevance of not working only on quantitative estimates but also considering qualitative aspects to better understand the mechanisms and their potential implementation.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN mentions that these kinds of projects are useful to show the benefits to policy makers. He mentions that about 3% of total renewable energy demand in Europe can be supplied through cooperation mechanisms.

Francesco Dalla Longa says that one of the purposes of the modelling exercise is that they provide quantitative estimations about the potential benefits associated to the cooperation. However, we must look beyond the numbers to get policy messages.

JR: Presentation of Deliverable 2.3

Andreas Tuerk from JR presented Deliverable 2.3 which includes a comprehensive set of questions related to the actual implementation of cooperation mechanisms. He also compares the cooperation mechanisms with the Kyoto mechanisms and mentions the possibility to combine both types of mechanisms.

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN asks if there are other possible model agreements (for example bilateral agreements) to compare within cooperation mechanisms.

Andreas Tuerk from JR says that it has been included in Deliverable 2.3.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that the questions are very good but she asks about who will answer these questions.

Andreas Tuerk from JR says that these questions could partially be answered during the stakeholders meeting on 22nd February. He says that the models have to be discussed during the case studies with the stakeholders and decide which of them could be applied.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT asks Jürgen if stakeholders from North Africa region are aware of the potential conflicts that could arise due to the simultaneous use of CDM and Article 9.

Jürgen Kern from DLR mentions that these questions will be discussed with stakeholders in Morocco.

Andreas Tuerk from JR mentions that he plans to discuss some of these questions with the CDM community but will coordinate with the case study leaders.

Johan Lilliestam from PIK says that he is very sceptical about carbon trading/financing because it will not really make a useful contribution to cooperation projects since they are probably not eligible to certificates at all, and even if they are, the price is much too low to make a difference

PIK: Presentation of Deliverable 2.4

Johan Lilliestam from PIK explains that there are three levels to consider: macroeconomic, microeconomic and social acceptance. He also explains the importance of the several risks that could change countries' priorities and decrease confidence of investors.

Regarding job creation opportunities, Gerhard Tosching from TUWIEN mentions that importers countries will lose job opportunities.

Johan Lilliestam says that this matter is included in the social acceptability of the project. There is the possibility of producing a part of the energy in exporter countries and the other domestically.

Robert Pasicko from TUWIEN says that these countries have the opportunity of selling technology.

Natalia Caldes from CIEMAT says that there are some exporter countries that require manufacturing components at a local level (local content policies).

Francesco Dalla Longa highlights the importance of considering the time scale: there are issues that will be relevant in the short term and others, in the medium or long term. We have to be able to integrate this aspect in the analysis.

Cristina de la Rúa from CIEMAT agrees with Franceso because there are some issues (acceptance) that can change along time.

CIEMAT: Presentation of Deliverable 2.5

Cristina de la Rúa from CIEMAT presents the preliminary list of indicators and methodologies for quantifying relevant issues identified in D.2.4. Workpackage 3, 4 and 5 leaders have to review these indicators/methodologies in order to say which are more relevant and also feasible to quantify. A draft of this task has to be done by beginning April and the final output has to be done by the end of April.

There is a discussion about the main challenges associated to the implementation of such indicators (i.e: availability and quality of the data)

Robert Pasicko from UNDP mentions that it is a very difficult task.

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN mentions that the main barrier will be the data availability.

Robert Pasicko from UNDP agrees on this idea and highlights the importance of taking into account the lack of databases in the context the countries in which we are working.

Cristina de la Rúa from CIEMAT says that the minimum level has to be reached.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that it is necessary to find the balance in this task. This means that it is necessary to quantify as much as possible but on the other side; we may face limitations (such as data availability/quality as well as time and resources constraints). So we need to agree on a minimum number of indicators and methodologies to be considered as baseline. In case there was absolutely no data available, we could also rely on literature review.

Johan Lilliestam from PIK says that it is important to have in mind what we need these indicators for. The indicators are really useful when they can make quantitative measures. He thinks it is best to only have a few indicators.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT comments that these indicators are going to be fed into the SWOT analysis in the three case studies. She also says that, in order to refine D.2.5., recommendations and a consensus among WP 3-5 leaders are needed. CIEMAT needs to agree with WP's leaders, how many of the indicators presented today are feasible.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN agrees with Natalia Caldés, it is needed a reduction of indicators and put limits.

Johan Lilliestone from PIK indicates that besides quantitative indicators, it is important to use qualitative indicators which are more useful in the longer term.

Robert Pasicko from UNDP agrees with Gustav in reducing the number of indicators. The chosen indicators have to be the important ones. He also says that they have to be quantifiable but it is also valid the qualitative analysis.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN says that many of the environmental impacts can not be measured easily and are site specific.

Johan Lilliestone from PIK says that the challenge is not to find the database but creating it.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT puts, as an example, the job creation. One of the best methodologies is the input-output model. If there is not an input-output database available, maybe we can extrapolate some values taken by the literature.

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN says that such proposed inventory of indicators and methodologies could have a value in itself (which could be later used for other projects).

Emmanuela Menichetti from OME says that she expected that D.2.5 would be a synthesis of previous task of WP2. She suggests extracting important messages from D.2.3 and D2.4 and harmonizing the previous work done on WP2. She also asks if they are going to present all the indicators in the 22nd February meeting.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that they are not going to be presented it in stakeholders meeting; CIEMAT only wants to show the consortium the work progress on this task.

Andreas Tuerk from JR says that in task 2.5 it is not necessary to summarise all the task of WP2.

DLR: Progress and further steps in WP3

Juerguen Kern from DLR says that there is reduced availability of data in some countries (Algeria, Libya ...). Inputs for RES projects are necessary from present to 2020. Inputs regarding policy inventories are expected to be provided by PIK and OME. The data collection related to plants (both conventional and renewables) in Morocco has been very hard and difficult work. Apart from the case of Morocco and Germany, now they are going to continue with other countries, starting by Tunisia. It is decided to continue the discussion about tasks and inputs of WP3 in a meeting to be held on Friday 22nd, after the Stakeholders Meeting.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that the approach must be homogenized with the other regional WP.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN says that it is necessary to harmonize cost assumptions.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT asks DLR how they are planning to incorporate stakeholders' view in WP3 work.

Johan Lilliestam from PIK wonders about what it is going to be the discussion with stakeholders. He says that we need to know what stakeholders want and what the principals' barriers are for them.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that Franz Trieb insisted on the importance of trying to involve the stakeholders from the beginning of the process.

Juerguen Kern from DLR says that they are preparing the data for the models now but TUWIEN has to provide some instructions.

JR: Progress and further steps in WP4

Andreas Tuerk from JR says that some countries like Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia are currently facing an energy deficit but their RES potential (hydropower mainly) is very high. Data collection that they carry out together with UNDP for Albania and Croatia is advanced, and they have started with other countries. For Albania it is a difficult task due to the lack of information.

Andreas Tuerk from JR says that they have planed the regional Workshop in Zadar in October or November 2013.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT suggest that, regarding data availability; it is necessary to have a contingency plan in case of not having access to required data.

Johan Lilliestam from PIK suggests that ENSTO-E project might have data for the other countries.

Robert Pasicko from UNDP comments that they do not have all the data but Andreas answers that they will get all the data. They do not foresee any major problem in that respect.

Robert Pasicko from UNDP reminds of the importance on focusing on the messages apart of numbers. Demands for countries and other types of data bases may be wrong.

Andreas Tuerk from JR mentions that a member of UNDP has been collecting data and that in spring another road trip to gather data and information will be organized.

TUWIEN: Progress and further steps in WP5

Gerhard Totschnig from TUWIEN says that there is good data availability in Turkey.

There would be an international renewable energy conference on 27-29 June in Istanbul (Turkey). They will also run scenarios in September, and then CIEMAT will check the results for socio-economic impacts. A draft will be ready by January 2014.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT says that in the GA it is stated that for deliverable 5.2, a model run will be executed in order to see what the feasible pathway is.

Gerhard Totschnig from TUWIEN answers that TUWIEN will run the model as well for WP4. There will be a regional workshop sometime in between October and January 2014. He also says that they do not know whether they will model the transmission grid. Moreover, ECN will go to the Workshop and meet key stakeholders (i.e.: governments and NGOs).

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN says that they will collaborate in the analysis of the Turkey region. Ayla Uslu from ECN will attend this workshop. It is necessary to define how this contribution is going to be articulated (to know its added value and possible overlaps). There will be held a teleconference to discuss about it.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN says that it is needed a formal agreement for the role of ECN in both WP5 and WP6 (i.e: modelling to provide policy recommendations). Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN asks Natalia to send the text that Ayla prepared for that some time ago as background for the next telco.

TUWIEN: Progress and further steps in WP6

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN says that modelling work has started and database extension too (in month 6).

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT asks where and when the bottom-up approach is going to be conducted.

Gerhard Totschnig from TUWIEN answers that he is not sure about WP3 but WP4 and WP5 will run the techno-economic feasible scenarios in October.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN answers that it will be done in WP6 by September/October 2013.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT asks if they have agreed the data gathering process in the regions and their link with WP6.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN says that for Green-X more important policy information is expected for the region and then they will need data on the potentials.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT suggests reaching a consensus on deadlines to share data.

Johan Lilliestam from PIK says that for 3.2 the data is done in May but policy in September, it could be a potential bottlenecks.

Andreas Tuerk from JR says that they have to wait for the pathways for seven countries so they will need time before. He also says that the Balkans region will be challenging as it includes seven countries.

Gerhard Totschnig insists on the importance of harmonizing scenarios in the three case studies.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN suggests setting feasible ranges, country by country. WP6 will harmonize general assumptions, prices, prospects,... defined within the case study regions.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT asked Jurgen if they are planning to follow a similar approach for WP3 and he confirms it.

Emanuela Menichetti from OME says that physical inputs can be a challenge beyond 2030 because these countries will need RES for their own demand and this could be a bottle neck.

Jürgen Kern from DLR asks to set a workshop

Gerhard Totschnig from TUWIEN propose the summer (early September) as due date to harmonize the assumptions.

Gustav Resch from TUWIEN says that this next meeting will be good moment to harmonize data assumptions.

Jürgen Kern from DLR agrees with Gustav but he suggests having a conference.

Gerhard Totschnig from TUWIEN says that modelling will be ready in September or October so the workshop should be held in June or July in Athens

ECN: Progress and further steps in WP7

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN presents the progress and further steps in WP7 and concludes that they will work in Plans for concretes actions in order to make policy recommendations.

Andreas Tuerk from JR asks what is going to be asked to project developers.

Francesco Dalla Longa from ECN answers that March will be a good date to prepare a template for project developers with questions asking about their opinion on relevant issues.

Natalia Caldés from CIEMAT mentions that the Road Map will be very useful to bring us to reality in order to provide practical and oriented results.

Francesco says that it also works the other way around. He will work on the modelling work (WP 5 and 6).

OME: Progress and further steps in WP8

Emanuela Menichetti from OME says that this WP should not be considered as a separate one because WP8 is very important to involve stakeholders, who can answer the specific questions and also provide input to improve data or information. She also says that there will be a workshop in Istanbul on RE prospects in Turkey organized by OME back to back with its next Committee, on 16-17 April 2013. Given the focus of WP5, she invited TUWIEN to make a presentation as an occasion to exchange views with other experts. ECN also manifested an interest as well.

Juergen Kern from DLR asked about how to proceed to add new information on the BETTER Stakeholders database.

Emanuela Menichetti from OME answers that it should be possible to do it trough the internal access area in the Webpage but it does not work yet.

Chara Karakosta from NTUA says that it will take a couple of months to solve this problem. Meanwhile, partners should send new contact details directly to Emanuela Menichetti.

Robert Pasicko from UNDP asked which is the best way to involve stakeholders (big/small events; new event or next to other one, etc).

Enmanuela Menichetti from OME answers that we are in the first steps so is better to conduct a bilateral contact. In a second stage, different engagement modes will be suggested but, in general terms, it is up to each partner depending on what information and who wanted to be contacted.

Francesco Dalla Longa says that, based on his experience, organizing events next to other events does not succeed. Sometimes is better to try to gather more targeted audience than organizing large events.

NTUA: Progress and further steps in WP9

Chara Karakosta from NTUA says that the communication and dissemination of BETTER project is in progress and there will be a video of BETTER project by February 2014. She says that 1st Policy brief, expected for March 2013, have to be rescheduled. Summer meeting also: June or September.

Andreas Tuerk from JR asks to Chara Karakosta when the translations of brochures will be ready and she answers that it will depend on the specific needs.

Chara Karakosta adds that WP9 should monitor all the power point presentations and the activities that have been performed and that there will be a database for including stakeholders and all the activities in one or two months.

CIEMAT: Preparing 22 February stakeholders meeting

Andreas Tuerk from JR proposes to make four or five questions to ask stakeholders.

Johan Lilliestone from PIK supports this idea because the stakeholders may have the solutions to the possible conflicts/problems/barriers.

Juerguen Kern from DLR also agrees because it is necessary a qualify feedback of BETTER proposals, mainly of grid operators and representatives of governments.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A - AGENDA



BETTER PROJECT MEETING

“Bringing Europe and Third Countries Closer together through Renewable Energies”

21 February 2013, CIEMAT (Av. Complutense 40, 28040 Madrid, Spain)

AGENDA

10:00	Welcome Coffee	
10:30	Welcome; introduction to CIEMAT team; presentation of the agenda and some useful information for your stay in Madrid	Yolanda Lechón (Head of ESAU) Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)
10:45	Update on the relevant events for the project since the kick-off meeting in Brussels	Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)
11:00	WP1 : Coordination (progress report, etc)	Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)
11:15	Introduction to WP2 work progress	Marta Santamaría (CIEMAT)
11:20	D 2.1 – EU-RES cooperation initiatives with third countries	Francesco Dalla Longa (ECN)
11:40	D 2.2 – Pre-assessment of potentials and benefits of intensified RES cooperation	Gustav Resch (TU-WIEN)
12:00	D 2.3 – Design of the cooperation mechanisms as well as other finance mechanisms that can contribute to the deployment of RES in third countries	Andreas Tuerk (JOANNEUM)
12:20	D 2.4 – Parameters that are crucial to fully exploit the potential of the third countries cooperation mechanisms	Saskia / Johan (PIK)
12:40	D 2.5 – Measurements for key parameters	Cristina de la Rúa (CIEMAT)
(13:00 – 14:30) Lunch		
14:30	WP 3 – North Africa case study progress work, next steps, planning	Franz Trieb (DLR)
15:00	WP 4 – W.Balkans case study progress work, next steps, planning	Andreas Tuerk (JR)
15:30	WP 5 – Turkey case study progress work, next steps, planning	Gerhard Totchning (TU-WIEN)
16:00	WP6 – Integrated assessment work progress and planning	Gustav Resch (TU-WIEN)
16:30	WP7 – Roadmap	Francesco Dalla Longa (ECN)
Coffee Break		
17:00	WP8 – Stakeholder involvement	Emanuela Menichetti (OME)
17:30	WP9 – Communication strategy	Chara Karakosta (NTUA)
18:00	Preparation for tomorrow’s stakeholder meeting	CIEMAT
18:15	Wrap up and next steps	CIEMAT
Project dinner in Madrid		

ANNEX B - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS



BETTER PROJECT MEETING

“Bringing Europe and Third Countries Closer together through Renewable Energies”

21 February 2013, CIEMAT (Av. Complutense 40, 28040 Madrid, Spain)

No	Full Name	Organisation
1	Natalia Caldés	CIEMAT
2	Helena Cabal	
3	Yolanda Lechón	
4	Irene Rodríguez	
5	Cristina de la Rúa	
6	Marta Santamaría	
7	Jürgen Kern	DLR
8	Francesco Dalla Longa	ECN
9	Andreas Tuerk	JR
10	Chara Karakosta	NTUA
11	Emanuella Menichetti	OME
12	Saskia Ellenbeck	PIK
13	Johan Lilliestam	
14	André Ortner	TU-WIEN
15	Gustav Resch	
16	Gerhard Totschnig	
17	Robert Pasicko	UNDP