

Contract N°: IEE/11/845/SI2.616378

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

BETTER

***Minutes of the BETTER Internal Meeting in Athens,
19 September 2013, Athens, Greece***



Project Coordinator: CIEMAT

September 2013



Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union

Contract N°: IEE/11/845/SI2.616378

Project Acronym: BETTER

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

***Minutes of the BETTER Internal Meeting in Athens,
19 September 2013, Athens, Greece***

September 2013

*Project Coordinator: **CIEMAT***

*Coordination of the meeting: **Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)***

*Minutes taken by: **Marta Santamaría (CIEMAT)***

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.

Session I . Introduction

Alexandros Flamos welcomes all BETTER partners to Athens and the meeting.

Natalia Caldés thanks NTUA for hosting; presents the agenda and objectives of the next two days meetings; and introduces Boris Schinke, from GermanWatch.

Session II . WP1-WP2 Work carried out so far and next steps

Regarding WP1, Natalia Caldés mentions that:

- Overall consortium management is progressing well. Next report to EACI will be the Interim technical report and financial statement, due in December, 2013.
- Internal coordination is also progressing well, except internal quality control system and she proposes a change: [i] authors of reports should send reports to CIEMAT; [ii] CIEMAT will forward it to designated reviewers; [iii] reviewers will send their revision to authors and CIEMAT; [iv] finally, authors will send the final reviewed report to all partners.
- Next project meeting will be held in Paris.
- Coordination with relevant projects and initiatives could be improved.
- Advisory Board is conformed and the list of final members is presented.

Regarding WP2, Natalia Caldés mentions that:

- The conceptual framework of Deliverable 2.5 (Indicators) has been enlarged, specially by including indicators for *Current situation assessment* (in terms of social; micro and energy security level), as well as the impact on *Transit countries* (in terms of socio-economic and energy security level).
- The whole list of indicators is presented. All partners are invited to send their feedback. Environmental indicators by technology have been classified in different level of priority. Environmental indicators priorities by region will be discussed with stakeholders.
- Open issues to be defined in short-term: availability of data from models; availability of data on potential environmental impact in transit countries; scenario definition; regional specificities, etc.
- There is some need for internal coordination between partners especially with JR; TUWIEN; OME and DLR.

During the open discussion, the difficultness of measuring all indicators in quantitative terms is mentioned, as well as the necessity to narrow a list of “key indicators”. It is also mentioned that the assessment was originally due in December but given the delay in the Bottom up modelling results, the impact assessment results will also be delayed accordingly.

Session III. WP3-WP5 Work carried out so far and next steps

Regarding WP3, Franz Trieb mentions that:

- Regarding Task 3.1. (Inventory of RES-E in NA), the inventory of power plants and substations has been completed; policies and targets (by PIK) as well as barriers also identified. Next step is to receive feedback from stakeholders. TUWIEN will need data by October.
- Regarding Task 3.2. (Prospects for RES in NA), feasible pathways towards sustainable supply has been identified, concluding that there is enough flexible RES-E available in NA.
- Regarding 3.3. (Prospects for RES-E exports), the proposal of constructing a first draft of CSP-HVDC to link Morocco and Germany was presented, highlighting its high value due to the fact that is a flexible power generation. To assess the contribution of RES imports from NA, two scenarios (with/without imports) of 90% of RES in Germany are compared. Benefits of CSP imports will be: less power plants in Germany (150 GW); 5 times less grid capacity; 5 times less power storage; 90% RES-E can be achieved much faster and with much less effort, more stability in system and lower external costs.

During the open discussion it is suggested the convenience of analyzing different pairs of importer-exporter countries, not only Morocco- Germany. DLR justifies the election of the sustainable approach and the proposal arguing that it is the most challenging case among all the possible paths identified in the REACCESS project. Finally it was highlighted the need of explaining the reasons behind this choice when presenting the results.

Regarding WP4, Andreas Tuerk mentions that:

- The work is progressing well: data collection is completed; bilateral meetings in Serbia and Bosnia; stakeholder exchanges in the other WB countries; first elaboration on strategic considerations and business models.
- Main conclusions: RES potentials and forecast of RES consumption has been estimated for Albania; Bosnia; Croatia; Kosovo; Montenegro; Macedonia and Serbia. It is remarkable the cheap hydro potential in the region.
- Countries in the region will be eligible to make use of: statistical transfers; Joint support schemes and Joint projects (this one, requiring the physical transfer), however statistical transfer needs the approval of the Energy Community. The current statistical basis in the countries is weak.
- Main barriers identified for RES deployment in the region: institutional weaknesses; legal uncertainty and regulatory barriers (low purchase prices, etc); uncertainty regarding feed-in tariffs, budgetary caps for feed-ins; administrative complexity and difficulties to get financing. There are also plans to strongly expand fossils; cheap coal resources (eg Bosnia, Kosovo) and good acceptance of coal sector as a source of new jobs.
- Initial plans to use cooperation mechanisms (Joint Projects) exists in Albania (1500 MW of Wind), Serbia (solar and hydro) and Bosnia.
- Low feed-in tariffs are not a barrier for some technologies and locations, such as hydro.
- It will be very relevant the planned undersea cable between Italy and Montenegro.
- There is one experience in the framework of Coop. Mech.: a MoU between Italy and Serbia on Joint Projects but finally, the Italian Parliament didn't approved the FITs.

- Daniel Steiner also presents a conceptual frame to determine conditions for business models: rate of returns; amortisation period; exporting time; share of export; concession period. This conceptual frame may form a basis for the decision making process between host and investor country and help host countries to formulate policy conditions subject to the needs of investors. This conceptual framework can be combined with a presented decision support tool (developed by JR) that helps host countries to decide how much of their RES-potential they can assign to be used under cooperation mechanisms. Johann mentioned that a decision support tool needs to consider also the import country. To come to a support level for imports would be an iterative process. A game-theoretical model could be used.

During the open discussion, more details regarding the content, scope and relevance/usefulness of business models are discussed. Fixing RES targets in the region will ease things (G. Resch). Some clarifications about the electricity market configuration are provided.

Regarding WP5, Gerhard Totschnig mentions that:

- The electricity demand is expected to double until 2020.
- Hydropower generation is very high, so it offers a balancing potential for EU grid.
- Turkey is likely aiming to access the European Energy Treaty.
- Regarding D.5.1. (Inventory of RES), shows the existing and planned hydro power plants in HiREPS. Historic hourly demand data are also collected.
- Regarding 5.2.4. (Electricity demand scenario), it is very demanding data. This is a key task for later modeling work due in October.
- Gerhard asks: CIEMAT which kind of data input is needed for 5.2.6; JR which kind of data input is needed for 5.3.3; NTUA which kind of data input is needed for 5.4
- The regional workshop in Turkey will be organized in January 2014.

During the open discussion the probability of using Cooperation Mechanism in Turkey was discussed. Gustav Resch highlighted the lack of interest among stakeholders due to an increasing national energy demand, as well as other barriers (lack of energy planning; no interest on the political side, etc.).

During the last part of Session II, Natalia Caldes suggests to have an open discussion about the ongoing and future coordination between Case Studies, inviting to keep in mind the storyline (done by PIK/JR/CIEMAT). Franz Trieb summarizes the main conclusion from each region: in North Africa, there is interest in exporting but there is no off-taker; in West Balkans, there is some interest but institutional barriers to implement it; in Turkey, there is no interest at institutional level. After this, it is discussed:

- The reasons behind the promotion of Cooperation Mechanisms from the political level, both at the EU and MS level: enhancing RES outside UE (G. Resch); some countries need it (G. Resch); to get over the fragmented ongoing approach (G. Resch);
- The reason against spreading the use of Cooperation Mechanisms: Spain is against of importing energy from North Africa due to grid limitations (F. Trieb); politicians are not convinced about its use (F. Dalla Longa); for 2020 it is not needed (G. Resch).
- The reason of using cooperation with third countries instead of intra-EU cooperation: DNI in North Africa is higher than in South of Spain (F. Trieb).

Some other aspects are mentioned, as the fact that RES should be differentiated depending in its supplying capacity: some RES are flexible and some not, what can the sellers offer and the buyers want (R. Pasicko). BETTER is in the way of building next steps for implementing cooperation mechanisms. The results included in WP7 should contribute to this goal (J. Lilliestam; F. Dalla Longa and G. Resch), as well as providing model results complemented by other kind of more qualitative information through the SWOT analysis (N. Caldes).

Session IV. WP6-WP9 Work carried and so far

Regarding WP6, Gustav Resch focuses on:

- Making a brief revision of WP6 objectives; task and timeline; overview on the BETTER modelling system; expected results and deliverables and role of partners.
- Regarding Task 6.1. (Model and database extension), they received data from Balkans two weeks before (with some delay due to the validation process).
- Regarding Task 6.2. (RES policy assessment in 2020), the main challenge resides in determining RES targets in 2020 for third countries. It looks like RES cooperation will be practically limited to Balkans.
- Regarding Task 6.3. (Long term prospects for cooperation with 3rd countries beyond 2020), relevant issues to be addressed to define scenarios are discussed, specially what concerns to long term RES targets and how to treat and incorporate political instability in third countries.
- Regarding inputs from WP 3-5, TUWIEN proposes considering three policy scenarios: [i] business-as-usual; [ii] strong RES deployment and [iii] 2020 RES target fulfillment.
- Regarding Task 6.4 (Assessment of co-effects), Daniel Steiner presented a list of co-effects that may be considered , including three fields: air pollution (GEI and other pollutants); energy security aspects and macro-economic aspects. JR as task leader will coordinate discussions of partners participating in this task. Work will be divided in general into: macro-economic assessment (CIEMAT, with assistance of JR), air-pollution aspects (JR,potentially input of CIEMAT), energy security (JR in cooperation with PIK). For analysing these aspects, indicators of task 2.5 will be used.
- Regarding challenges and next steps, main issues concerns: building up database with inputs from WP 3-5, that is still in progress and should be ended soon; model preparation; model coupling; merging short and long terms needs and scenario definition.

Regarding WP7, Francesco Dalla Longa mentions that:

- The WP has had an early start and ECN is in close contact with Case Studies.
- Regarding the Roadmap, this will set the departure point, identify opportunities and prerequisites; barriers/risks and ways to overcome it. The target audience will be policy makers (in EU and third countries) and will include regional subsections.
- Regarding the Action Plan (AP), it will be drawn from barriers and SWOT analysis in case studies; there will be one Action Plan per region; with a max. length of 20 pages; targeted to policy makers (EU & 3rd countries) and considering a time horizon up to 2050.

- Regarding the Practical guidance for developers and finance providers, its goal will be to identify key questions that are relevant for project developers. These will be discussed within the consortium and stakeholders.
- Some questions to be discussed during the Workshop on 20th of September are presented. Regarding WP8, Enmanuela Menichetti mentions that:
 - Reminds which are main components of WP8 (stakeholder engagement; create synergies with other initiatives and stakeholder consultation) and links with other WP.
 - Reminds the outcomes of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan designed in December, 2012.
 - Stakeholder matrices has been set as an additional tool to facilitate stakeholder engagement in each WP. Maintaining the database is responsibility of WP Leaders. Matrices were circulated in June 2012 but OME only got it back for WP4 and CIEMAT.
 - “BETTER Associate Member (AM) Status” has been created to engage key stakeholders. For the moment, there are six AM, all from North African region. Andreas Tuerk and Robert Pasiscko mention that this is not necessary at the moment for the Balkans.
 - Regarding Task 8.2 (Creating synergies with other initiatives), there is an open collaboration and exchange with several institutions (PWMSP, MEDGRID, etc.). There is room for some improvements in the website: there are several tools and database with no clear connection among them; risk of missing relevant information for partners and risk of disappointing EACI.
 - Regarding Task 8.3 (Stakeholder Consultation Workshops), there is a need to start defining a strategy of regional workshops. Regarding bilateral consultations, OME needs to be updated about the status of bilateral consultations and future plans, and know how they give support.

During the open discussion, N. Caldés proposes updating Stakeholder matrices and send it to OME, at least before each Steering Committee (bimonthly). A. Flamos proposes to simplify the matrix as much as possible (two columns) to make it useful.

Regarding WP9, Chara Karakosta highlights some issues:

- Task 9.1 (Dissemination Strategy) and 9.2 (Web-site) have been completed and are in continuous update process. 3rd version of Dissemination Strategy, due in December 2013. Invitation letters to Associate Member has been sent.
- Task 9.3 (Policy debate) and 9.4 (Information promotion) are in progress:
 - o Policy brief: draft of 1st Policy Brief, with results from WP2, due in the end of September 2013.
 - o Logo
 - o Leaflets: 300 receipts;
 - o Newsletters: 2 newsletters until december 2013 -> 2350 receivers;
 - o Updating material in social media tools (youtube, twitter, etc.) and two videos.
 - o Intervention in 10 public events and other upcoming events;
 - o One working paper (JR);
 - o Three BETTER events and upcoming BETTER Workshops: EU workshops (Paris, Feb. 2014; Vienna, Aug. 2014) and regional Workshops (Oct. 2013 – Jan. 2014).
 - o Bilateral meetings in Morocco (Nov. 2012) and Serbia & Bosnia (Jul. 2013).

Session V. Invited quest presentation

Boris Schinke, as invited Member of the Advisory Board, makes a presentation on “Discussing sustainability safeguards for large-scale RE-projects in the MENA region”:

- Firstly, introduces GermanWatch and their background in MENA region.
- Potential synergies with BETTER reside in the frame of the D.2.4. and D.2.5, especially what concerns the “Acceptance level”.
- He presents an exhaustive inventory of RES and efficiency policies in MENA; RE targets; expected future RES deployment as well as current CSP projects (announced/planned/construction/ operation) in MENA region.
- There is a potential risk of “racing up the bottom” (committing negligence of regulation and lessen standard requirements) due to competition between MENA countries, in a process of scaling-up RES production. This risk makes advisable to foster a commonly accepted best-practice guidelines.
- There is a large list of challenges and opportunities of large-scale RES deployment in MENA: technology transfer; environment issues (impacts on water, land and electricity availability; potential contribution to re-green the Sahara); socio-economics and livelihoods (value creation, high-quality jobs; proceeding without affecting traditional livelihoods; potential contribution to education/skills; exporting energy in a context of no full access to electricity; identification of potential groups of beneficiaries; what about potential partnership with Sub-Saharan); civil society engagement (why has not being involved?).
- Creating a market-friendly industrial policy is just not enough. Sustainability requirements are needed to accompany such principles in MENA.
- The project “Social CSP” (March 2013-December 2014) arises with the goal of identifying empirical and participatory development of socio-economic sustainability requirements/safeguards for the implementation of CSP project in the MENA region. Partners of the project consortium are: GermanWatch; Wuppertal Institut; BICC; Association Energies Renouvelables, Développement Durable et Solidarité; Ain Sahms University and Desertec Foundation.
- The three dimensions defined within the “Sustainability framework for large-scale RE projects” defined in the project were presented: energy; human and operational dimension. The conceptual framework for the identification of PC&I of the project has a double approach: top-down and bottom-up.
- Potential synergies with BETTER resides in: [i] impact assessment on the North African Region; [ii] identification of barriers and opportunities trough SWOT analysis and recommendations and [iii] establishing a solid stakeholder network.

During the open discussion, Boris Schinke provide some more details on certain aspects raised: their approach to the identified challenges (J. Lilliestam); the relevance of visual impact (M. Santamaría); the design of compensatory measures (A. Flamos) and requirements of local content (J. Lilliestam).

ANNEXES

ANNEX A - AGENDA



BETTER EVENT IN ATHENS

Bringing Europe and Third Countries Closer
together through Renewable Energies

19-20 September 2013, Athens, Greece



Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union

AGENDA

1st Day, 19 September 2013

8:30-9:00	Welcome Coffee	
9:00-9:30	SESSION I. INTRODUCTION	
9:00-9:30	Welcome Speech Meeting Programme and Targets	Alexandros Flamos (NTUA) Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)
9:30-10:10	SESSION II. WP1-WP2 WORK CARRIED OUT SO FAR & NEXT STEPS	
9:30-9:50	WP1 - Management, Coordination Activities and Reporting	
9:50-10:10	WP2 - Outputs and Results	Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)
10:10-13:00	SESSION III. WP3-WP5 WORK CARRIED OUT SO FAR & NEXT STEPS	
10:10-10:50	WP3 - EU-North Africa Case Study	Franz Trieb (DLR)
10:50-11:10	Coffee Break	
11:10-11:50	WP4 - EU-West Balkans Case Study	Andreas Tuerk (JR) Steiner Daniel (JR)
11:50-12:30	WP5 - EU-Turkey Case Study	Gerhard Totchning (TU-WIEN)
12:30-13:00	Case Studies Round Table Discussion: Lessons Learnt	
13:00-14:30	Lunch Break	
14:30-16:30	SESSION IV. WP6-WP9 WORK CARRIED OUT SO FAR & NEXT STEPS	
14:30-15:10	WP6 - Integrated Assessment	Gustav Resch (TU-WIEN)
15:10-15:30	WP7 - Action Plan and Policy Recommendations	Francesco Dalla Longa (ECN)
15:30-15:50	WP8 - Stakeholder Consultation	Emanuela Menichetti (OME)
15:50-16:10	Coffee Break	
16:10-16:30	WP9 - Communication Strategy	Chara Karakosta (NTUA)
16:30-16:50	SESSION V. INVITED GUEST PRESENTATION	
16:30-16:50	Opportunities and Challenges of Large-scale CSP Projects in MENA: A Discussion of Sustainability Safeguards	Boris Schinke (GERMANWATCH)
16:50-17:20	SESSION VI. CONCLUSIONS - DISCUSSION	
16:50-17:05	Preparation for tomorrow's stakeholder meeting	
17:05-17:20	Conclusions – Discussion	Natalia Caldés (CIEMAT)
“End of the 1st Day”		
20:30	Project Dinner in Athens	

ANNEX B - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS



BETTER PROJECT MEETING

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

19 September 2013

List of Participants – 1st Day

No	Name of representative	Institution Name
1.	Caldés Natalia	Research Centre for Energy, Environment and Technology - CIEMAT
2.	Dalla Longa Francesco	Energy Research Centre of the Netherlands - ECN
3.	Ellenbeck Saskia	Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research - PIK
4.	Flamos Alexandros	University of Piraeus, National Technical University of Athens
5.	Karakosta Charikleia	National Technical University of Athens - NTUA
6.	Kern Jürgen	German Aerospace Center - DLR
7.	Lilliestam Johan	Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research - PIK
8.	Marinakis Vangelis	National Technical University of Athens - NTUA
9.	Menichetti Emanuella	Mediterranean Energy Observatory - OME
10.	Pasicko Robert	United Nations Development Program - UNDP
11.	Resch Gustav	Vienna University of Technology - TU-WIEN
12.	Santamaria Belda Marta	Research Centre for Energy, Environment and Technology - CIEMAT
13.	Steiner Daniel	Joanneum Research - JR
14.	Totchning Gerhard	Vienna University of Technology - TU-WIEN
15.	Trieb Franz	German Aerospace Center - DLR
16.	Tsotsolas Nikos	University of Piraeus - UNIPI
17.	Tuerk Andreas	Joanneum Research - JR