

# Minutes

---

<b>Subject</b>	<b>INTENSE WP6 – Conceptual workshop 1</b> <b>INTENSE WP6 – Meeting with the partner municipalities</b>
<b>Place</b>	Hamburg (17.11.2009 - 18.11.2009) Koprivnica (26.02.2010)
<b>Reporter</b>	Philipp Engewald, Matthias Grätz (BEF Germany), Péter Szuppinger, Éva Csobod ( REC Hungary)

---

## 1. General information

### 1.1 Frame of the communication strategy

- The communication strategy will consist of two parts. First, there is a common part for all partners which will be prepared by the WP6 lead team and which will be translated into local languages by the country coordinators. The second part will be individual for each municipality and will be filled in cooperation country coordinator – municipality with support by the WP6 lead team.

Discussion points:

- The country-coordinators functions as the active interface between WP6-lead and municipality (no “post box approach”)
- The surveys will help setting a baseline for each municipality
- WP6 will provide just a frame and the content needs to be developed individually by each municipality
- It can be better to use another term, then “strategy” as this might sound scary to some people. → this is an individual decision

Question: What is actually the goal of the planned strategy? Behavioural change takes time and cannot be realised overnight and cannot be measures so easily. Emission goals on the other hand are not so easy to communicate – so which goal should we communicate and what do we need to communicate?

### 1.2 Indicators and targets

- Find Matthias’ presentation with details in the intranet
- There is a proposal to strengthen the role of the organisations involved in INTENSE, e.g. take over the verification of success as a follow-up project

Comment: Sometimes it can be a problem to get a hold of the data. Some organisations or supply companies are not giving out needed data, although they have them at hand.

## 2. Partner municipalities

The partner municipalities were group according to the starting situation in each municipality. This grouping will be kept for the development of the communication strategies. Group A: Riga, Cēsis, Ružomberok, Veszprem, Koprivnica, Sapareva Banya. Group B: Saku, Elekrénai, Ożarów, LAG, Ptuj, Samobor, Băile Tuşnad.

### 2.1 Working group sessions with country coordinators (Hamburg)

2.1.1 Group A: Information about the cities

- *Riga* is focusing on heat supply. A strategy for that is adopted by City Council, an implementation plan is currently finalized – and will be later implemented - by the Riga Energy Agency (REA). Currently, suppliers communicate via Riga Energy Agency to the citizens. REA is already actively communicating to the citizens through various media (leaflets, website, and exhibitions) and offers also direct consultation in their office.
- *Cēsis* has an active and experienced administration, but the citizens are passive. It will be difficult to develop a strategy in this town.
- *Koprivnica* will have a regional plan which is under development by the newly founded regional energy agency. There is an idea to install an

“energy office” in Koprivnica which could advice the local citizens. This could be matched with the communication strategy in WP6.

- *Samobor* is a less active than Koprivnica and has probably no clear idea yet.
- *Veszprém*: The idea behind is the operation of municipality, all public buildings, services; and partly because of INTENSE now it is addressing citizens as well. Wide range of stakeholders, good cooperation. Main part of the activities in INTENSE are about making a baseline, then setting targets and actions, implement, and addressing citizens, here communication is important. The service supply company will play a crucial role in implementation. They will also set up an energy expert group.
- **Stakeholders:** *Cities (administration)*: are the driving force, responsible for implementation, own actions such as an energy office, have a supervising role (e.g. in case of energy agencies); *Energy agencies*: development + implementation of strategies; project development (ideas, getting finances....); the problem is the financial sustainability of EAs, if their funding is solely based on projects; *Service suppliers*: Can play an important role, e.g. in Veszprém, depends on influence and structure of the suppliers (city-owned?) *Specialised NGOs*: Can be multipliers; can run campaigns; can take over the monitoring (Veszprém); have a role when it comes to public participation; in bigger municipalities they can be less important; representing citizens, e.g. in the case of the Latvian capital of Riga *Citizens*: important when it come to public participation; is the ultimate target group; the more actively you involved the citizens the better the result is; the level of satisfaction & the expectations of citizens should be taken into account; the motivation for acting is often the money saved; *External experts e.g. universities*: can deliver some consultancy, however this is usually a question of available financial means (contract) *Political bodies*: e.g. ministries, higher level => hierarchy; setting the frame or the background; no direct involvement usually
- **Media:** In some cases, such as energy agencies, there is a need and an obligation for active communication. Possible ways to distribute information and to use media: regular updates of web sites, exhibitions, seminars, brochures and leaflets for citizens; direct consultation; interviews in local TV and radio stations, newspaper articles → the challenge is to think of new formats for messages or new messages; internet can be used for consultation and polls and a interface for communicating with citizens: presentation of the strategy, FAQs, forums. Makes the process more transparent; media need an innovative design (what about cross-words for example?)
- **Collection of ideas for possible actions:**
  - Energy office for citizens: Advantages: Face-to-face contact, expert advice, up-to-date information, trust increase to the municipality; disadvantage: financial issues (beginning)
  - Education for schools: Advantages: For many activities (50/50; Eco-school) is already material available;
  - Competitions: possible role for NGOs, spur participation; disadvantage: sustainability of the action sometimes questionable
  - Campaign: Advantages: Increased dissemination and visibility, is often easy to attract funds; disadvantage: sustainability of the action sometimes questionable
  - Selfcommitment: Advantages: Direct benefit for citizens, Disadvantage: Check-up & sustainability; the background of knowledge is an important influencing factor; it is possible to sent a reminder by post-card; can be combined with political issues -> these can be motivators
  - Info-days/ energy days: Individual approaches in each city possible
- **How to start:** It became clear that individual approaches are necessary in each city. While it will most likely be not a problem to get started in Veszprém and Koprivnica, Cēsis (passive citizens) and Riga (not to interfere with REA's tasks) will be more difficult cases

## 2.1.2 Group B: Information about the municipalities

- *Sapareva Banya (BG)*: Tourism is the focus of the municipality. The tourism industry could probably be self-sustainable → there are guidelines prepared in other projects which could be used for communication strategy
- *LAG (CZ)*: Two NGOs involved in INTENSE; the task sharing and clarification of roles will be an important step in the beginning → Question: How to get this issue to the administrative level when they are not directly involved? The problem is further, that the main source of energy is coal and that the priority in the region will be sustainable tourism. One way to go could be to get people to renovate their houses (using structural funds?) – the need for new houses seems comparatively small.
- *Ożarów (PL)*: A new environmental protection plan (strategic environmental plan) will be developed in 2010 and should be utilized for the communication strategy which can be a part of it. However, the implementation of the document in “real life” will be difficult.
- *Elektrėnai (LT)*: Elektrėnai has the reputation of being a “dirty town”, due to the heavy oil industry and the thermal power plant. The challenge is how to make such a communication strategy in an energy producing area? For the municipality it could be attractive to have a communication strategy also to get rid of the negative image. The PR department is taking care of strategic planning in E., so that would be a good contact point for INTENSE
- *Ptuj (SI)*: all strategic planning and communication is targeted at 2012 (cultural heritage capital); maybe it is an option to propose to make the city more energy-efficient and liveable. Several stakeholders should be involved for the further planning: Project management of cultural heritage capital process, the energy agency;
- *Saku (EE)*: currently identifies the potential to use bio fuel. Awareness raising is explicitly mentioned but this phrase needs to be filled with life. The problem is, that it is a suburban town with a high share of commuters; Kredex is running awareness raising programmes already, however nation wide (but maybe link/involvement is possible).

## 2.1.3 Concerns uttered by the country coordinators, suggestions

- How to justify it to the municipality? How to make the strategy “catchy”?
- How to share the work-load between municipalities and country coordinators?
- How to utilize the results of WP4?
- More cases needed. → read background document from WP6
- Make a sample presentation based on the Veszprem case.
- **Several remarks about the peculiarities of the partner municipalities showed that there is a highly individual approach necessary! (e.g. geothermal energy supply in BG, cultural heritage issue in SI)**

## 2.2 Working group with municipalities and country coordinators (Koprivnica)

## 2.2.1 Group A (Veszprem, Koprivnica, Ružomberok, Cēsis, Riga, Sapareva Banya)

- There were guiding questions for the discussion.
  - How? (How can the municipality start to develop the strategy? What are the main advantages/disadvantages now? How is the communication of the municipality with the citizens/target groups?)
  - Who? (Who are the partners now and who should be?)
  - When? (Timeline for the preparation)
- **Veszprem: How to start?** they have the results of the *survey* + they are gathering essential *data* => on the basis of these they could make a *draft* of the strategy => this draft could be consulted with a an *Energy Council* (involving experts) => and after with an *Energy Forum* (involving citizens). **What are advantages and challenges?** advantages: support of the mayor; existing data; expertise of the university; disadvantages: financial problems; individualism of citizens; national background not very supportive; neutral: role of local NGOs. **Which communication channels are available?** The municipality owns the local media (TV, newspaper) and have good cooperation with them; municipal schools

are also useful channels to citizens; municipality organizes several cultural and environmental events, these could be utilized.

- 5
- **Koprivnica:** They started the thinking with the end-user, this is the CITIZEN who cares mainly for two things: how much does it cost and how much he/she could save, i.e. „HOW TO SAVE MONEY” is the final goal of the strategy; so to give a kind of cost-benefit analysis for citizens. **Which communication channels are available?** They could use the municipal website; citizens check it, as they already used it for this kind of campaigns. And for those who are not using web: brochure, leaflet; it could be disseminated with the utility bills (they used this method to inform citizens about how their tax is spent and they found it very useful.) + local events are good for dissemination. **What are advantages and challenges?** Advantages: from their earlier experience they suppose that most of the citizens could be involved. Disadvantages: as a public body they could not recommend or give details on exact products and say “Go and buy this special insulation!” The only thing is to refer to links or show best practices. **Who?** Key actor is the „Local Agenda Team” at the municipality + REA (Regional Energy Agency) gives expertise on calculations. **When?** As for timeline: first steps on the website May 2010, brochure in June.
- 10
- **Ružomberok: How to start?** they would start with disseminating the ideas of the mini project and results of the INTENSE project. **Which communication channels are available?** they could use local TV, newspaper + they have a quite good and updated website. **Who?** Main partner would be the PR department of the municipality. **When?** As the mini project (general binding planning regulation would be ready by November and put in front of the City Council, the strategy could be connected to this.
- 15
- **Sapareva Banya: How to start?:** they will rely on existing “Municipal Development Plan”. First step is a decision from the mayor and then they would organize a workshop in April => set up a working group (Participatory approach). Then the next steps: data collection, analysis => target settings => strategy. **What are advantages and challenges?** advantage: existing “Municipal Development Plan”, which is quite good disadvantage: data collection is problematic. **Which communication channels are available?** For this purpose generally website is used very much
- 20
- **Cēsis: How to start?:** first step is to set the target groups. **What are advantages and challenges?** Advantages: within the municipality’s 2005-2017 Environmental programme the new Action Plan for 2010-2013 is just being planned, there is a working group for Communication; + they have a PR Department, which is quite active. Disadvantages: lack of data. **Which communication channels are available?** The local newspaper + municipality’s website are very useful. Plus they have very good experience with leaflets.
- 25
- **Rīga: How to start?** first step is to connect this to existing things. **What are advantages and challenges?** Advantages: Riga City Council has a good PR department + Riga Energy Agency also has an Information department.; Riga signed the Covenant of Mayors declaration, now they are making their Action Plan. Disadvantages: communication is not enough, political support is needed. **Which communication channels are available?** They have newsletter; thematic info letters; popular articles in local magazines; they use local TV, Radio. New initiative: Roundtable discussion (experts + inhabitants sit together and discuss specific energy issues)
- 30
- 35
- 40
- 45
- 50
- 55
- 60

Remarks from the discussion

- Financial and staff constraints might make things more difficult

65

2.2.2 Group B (Saku, Elektrenai, Ożarów, LAG, Ptuj, Samobor, Băile Tuşnad – the latter one not being present at the event)

- 5
  - **Saku: How to start?** communication strategy as a part of municipality energy efficiency plan **Advantages?** compact, focusing on target groups of EE plan, synergy **Which communication channels are available?** local newspaper, Municipality webpage, Local events, Handouts, Direct contacts with target group. **Who are the partners now and who should be?** EE plan team, Saku Maja Ltd., Apartment owners unions, Energy agency. **Timeline** in line with EE plan, Data collection: June 2010, First draft: September, Final document: December 2010
- 10
  - **Elektrenai: How to start?** municipality has background to prepare communication strategy, could be part of Elektrenai municipality strategic development plan **Advantages?** economy development division is responsible for energy, saving questions at municipality has possibilities to inform citizens. **Which communication channels are available?** mass media, internet debates. **Who are the partners now and who should be?** LAG Elektrenai municipality, NGOs **Timeline** preparation of strategy 4-6- month, Data collection: June 2010, Draft: October, Final document: December 2010
- 15
  - **Ozarow: How to start?** appoint a planner in the town hall, Cooperation with the REC, KAPE, it is approved by the council **Advantages?** involvement in INTESNE project, Good institution partnership (REC, KAPE), Good cooperation with institutional partners **Challenges?** no defined strategy, lack of manpower and capabilities. **Which communication channels are available?** newspaper publications, website; yearly meetings with citizens **Who are the partners now and who should be?** stakeholders: young people, architects, employers, REC, KAPE **Timeline** 9/10. 2010: swimming pool and sport center
- 20
  - **LAG: How to start?** Present situation: existing regional development strategy for the LAG region. Support for touristic services, SMEs, agriculture, forestry, cultural heritage; so far little about energy. Present “green for savings”, green energy savings cancelling up to 2010, Bi-annual newsletter, 12000 copies, website, e-mail newsletter; Start: gather energy data, set objective, submit project for funding. **Advantages?** experience in setting and implementing strategies; established regional structure, coordinated **Challenges?** no energy strategy; no capacities and formal powers; not widely known in the public. **Which communication channels are available?** bi-annual newsletter, email newsletter, meetings, workshops, seminars; Internet; Media. **Who are the partners now and who should be?** municipalities, NGOs, local entrepreneurs; Links to international NGOs **Timeline** 2010: development start, 2011: applying for funds, 2012: realization -> 2015, EE strategy as a project realized if it gets external founding
- 25
  - **Ptuj: How to start? - Advantages?** professional PR person, Communication strategy for the municipality is already made. **Which communication channels are available?** local newspaper, e-news, mailing list; press conferences, brochures, posters, education materials for schools, local TV channel **Who are the partners now and who should be?** local energy agency **Timeline** -
- 30
  - **Samobor: How to start?** include proposal to develop city energy strategy into general urban plan **Advantages?** general urban plan currently in amendments procedure; Internet site: optional polls **Challenges?** no previous EE communication practice / studies **Which communication channels are available?** weak on EE <->INTENSE link on web only **Who are the partners now and who should be?** better cooperation among departments; utility companies as distributors of information **Timeline** leaflets immediately; 01/2011 upon adoption of general urban plan