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The coordinator of the meeting, Ms Maria Mikroni (MM), technical assistance manager of the Lead Partner from TREK Development SA, opened the meeting by welcoming everybody and made sure that all participants were identified. She informed the partners that the meeting is going to be recorded and asked if there are any issues in this regard. No issues were raised. In line with the agenda items, she gave the floor to Mr Thomas Logothetis (TL) from the region of Thesprotia to intervene.

TL welcomed everybody to the 3rd Project meeting on behalf of the Vice President, Thomas Pitoulis. Before starting he informed the Bulgarian partner that they have not yet received the amount of 15.051 euro that they will need to transfer to them. They received an email on 15 May 2021, from the Greek Ministry for Development and investments informing them about that but their account has not credited yet. He said that they will transfer the money as soon as they are received. He also informed the partners that they are at the final stage of signing an agreement with their auditor for the certification of expenses. He also informed the partners that every last Sunday of every May each year, is the memory day for Souli and they have to organise an important event. Due to COVID they were not able to implement this event. However, they were urgently notified that the President of the Hellenic republic will be present to honour the sacrifice of the compatriots in Souli. He said that he is in charge of this and fully busy in organising the event. He gave the floor to the external expertise to continue with the coordination of the meeting. Before leaving the meeting, he mentioned also with regard to the seminars, since they will take place most probably in June, that of course they prefer to take place physically but still they can be flexible depending on how the situation with the pandemic will evolve due to the current official restrictions. MM added that they will be discussing this later on and at this point they will take note of this.

Mrs Melina Lazaropoulou (ML) partner at TREK Development took the floor in line with the agenda items and welcomed all the partners. She said that today’s meeting is very fruitful since a lot of issues will be discussed. She added that MM will lead the discussion and will deliver the presentations and she will take floor for any additional information and details.

MM started with the first item on the agenda and more specifically, with the presentation of the main updates with regard to WP1 regarding Project management and coordination. She said that they will be discussing the physical and economic progress, issues related to the verification and reporting, the partnership, the project prolongation and the time schedule for the next period. She started with the economic progress up to this day, 27 May 2021, and on the basis of the data that are presented on the MIS. She noted that excluding the partner from Albania. She continued with the physical progress and then she presented briefly the main outputs that were developed during this period with regard to the WP2 (project website, 1st newsletter and project brocure), WP3 (Joint Strategy and benchmarking tool) and WP4 (identification of trainees and training needs) adding that confirmation is pending on the submission of the last deliverable on behalf of CEA. With regard to the verification of expenditures she delivered a presentation on the planned amounts to be verified by the end of June. More specifically she presented the amounts that are planned on behalf of the Greek partners, LB and PB2. She added the ones that are declared by the other partners on the basis of the information provided on the MIS and she asked the partners to confirm and provide additional information in this regard.

Soulla Karra (SK) from CEA, PB3, took the floor to confirm that they planned to verify expenditures by the end of the month of June as well.

ML took the floor adding that all partners should be mobilised in this regard. On the basis of the slide presenting the economic progress of the project, she said that almost half year since the beginning of the project we are very low with regard to the absorption rate that is indeed a very bad situation that will cause for sure problems with the Balkan Med programme. This regards all the partners with the exception probably of PB5, RDA that has a good rate in financial terms in comparison also to the physical progress. We have almost implemented WP3 and WP4 and only WP5 is left. This financial situation is not appropriate considering the physical progress. We need to spend and it is unacceptable to have less than 10% in declared expenditures, not to mention the verified ones. She stressed that all need to be mobilised. She added that her major concern was what you happen in the case of a potential decommitment or other issues, this is not a very helpful image in order to support arguments with regard to prolongation and other issues that we want to discuss with the JS. Especially in the case of some partners we have no idea of the status. She mentioned specifically, EMS, PB4 for which they have no idea why they have not spent a cent so far. They have not declared any expenditure till yesterday. This is not a personal issue it concerns all the partners. She stressed that they are seriously lagging behind.

Mr Nicolas Panayides (NP) from PB4, EMS, took the floor in order to provide relevant clarifications. Firstly, he said that since the meeting is recorded, they would like the records to be sent to them. He said that they will accept the recording as long as this is sent to them following the meeting. He added that there is a delay in the project that is not due to EMS and this is something that they cannot accept. He added that there was lack of coordination and actions. With regard to WP4 this is not completed and it is far behind. He mentioned again that there was a lack of coordination from the beginning and until now. There was a delay in starting, it changed since the beginning a number of Project managers and there were also delays due to the pandemic. So, we ended up at this point today.

ML said that this quite misleading and she doesn’t understand why this is raised when at the same time a very important fact is not answered and that is why PB4 has zero expenses.

NP said that they have sent an email to MM with regard to their expenditures that were not declared on the MIS since they needed to complete the procedure in order to accept the auditor. Still, he added that he has informed MM with an email sent on 20th April exactly the amount that was spent until now. Unfortunately, they haven’t yet entered this in the MIS but he added that they are aware of the amount that they have spent. He added that up to the June 2021 definitely they will have more expenditure. He added that there was a misunderstanding and it is not zero the spent amount.

ML took again the floor adding that there is nothing personal to EMS and what is depicted on the presentation is the current status and on the basis of what is included in the MIS. This is our official tool, common to all Programmes. We can accept of course other statements, let’s say unofficial, but she added that not having an auditor is not binding for inserting data on the MIS.

NP intervened to clarify that they have already an auditor and they signed also the contract but they still wait for the necessary approval by the Ministry of Economics in Cyprus. He also shared a screen with the email informing about the amount spent by EMS and that was 5.512,86 euro adding that they would not be able to add such information since they waited for certain approvals with regard to the auditor. It was clarified that it is not necessary to wait for approval with regard to the auditor in order to declare certain expenditure on the MIS. NP following that he assured all that they will declare expenditure by the end of June, an additional amount of 5.000 euro. They have also an agreement with their consultant and they plan to pay them for some WPs.

ML underlined once again that they can enter expenditures without any approval even now if they wish. This is the information that the LP asks and not to send emails but to enter expenditures on the MIS. She added that the Project Officer sees only the MIS and at the moment she can see zero expenditures. She added that the approval is required in order to verify the expenditures. NP added that he will try to add the amounts within the next two weeks.

ML came back in order to resolve the issue that was raised by PB4 and more specifically the reference made that the project has shown no progress till today. NP clarified that what he mentioned was that since the beginning of the project there have been three Project Managers. NP clarified that at the beginning the representative on behalf of TREK Development was Mr Nikos Vasileiadis, then Mrs Melina Lazaropoulou was involved in the project. ML clarified that she was involved as a Project coordinator and not a Project manager.

Following this MM took the floor in order to continue with the presentation of the items under this WP. With regard to the verification of expenditures, she gave the floor to RDA, PB5 in order to confirm also from their end if they plan to declare any amount by end of June. Mr Alexander Tonkov (AT) confirmed that they will have declared expenditure till the end of June and they also plan to have verified expenditure by 20.07.21. They think that this will depend on the events and on how these will take place-physically or online- the amount 67.000 euro is planned to be verified until that point but this will also depend on the physical progress. He said that they can send the table by email.

MM continued with the partnership and informed, as also mentioned during the previous meeting, that the Ministry for Infrastructure and Energy has withdrawn. So far, they have been in contact with the PO and she is aware of this development. They look into a possible replacement but as understood due to the pandemic it is not possible to have physical meetings and she highlighted that this is a sensitive issue. She confirmed that they won’t be the 6th partner for sure.

ML took also the floor and added that they are in contact with an entity that belongs to the Ministry and they are very competent and willing to joint the project. However, it is important to meet in person, that is necessary for both sides and PO agrees on that. To facilitate our work, she added that it was decided to continue with the activities as if the Albanian partner does not exist so as to move with the Work Plan. Otherwise, everything will need to be postponed and this is something that we don’t want. That is why we decided to close some deliverables, such as for example, the Joint Strategy even without them as well the deliverable 4.1. SK confirmed that all deliverables with regard to WP3 were closed without the input from Albania. ML added that it was internally decided that as soon as we have the new partner from Albania, they will be mobilized to implement most of the deliverables and they will share this with all WP leaders in order to integrate this to the final deliverables. At this point we can finalise, let’s say, artificially some deliverables. She asked the partners to confirm this. She asked also EMS to confirm since there have several steps and activities whereby this kind of input might have impact, for example there is the needs assessment, the curricula, perhaps we will need to find a new curriculum for the Albanian Partner to develop, at least a new thematic area and then the evaluation of the training seminars. She said that this is lengthy procedure and she doesn’t know when exactly they will join. She added that even though they were chosen, in order to have everything modified and have an agreement signed and so on, it might take some months so we don’t know when they will join.

NP said that with regard to the WP4, it is the obligation of all partners to create the identification of trainees and needs assessment as well as to create the curricula and the seminars and evaluation. He added that the role of EMS is strictly based on coordination, that means to communicate with all partners, receive the material and then publish the results. He said that for sure they intend to help the partners from Albania in this regard. They will send them the material that will be sent by all the other partners, the training assessment etc. Of course, at the end of the day they will need to develop their material. But he said he thinks that we are in a good state since there is expertise by all partners and they will have the support of their consultant also.

SK from CEA took the floor and added that it is also confirmed from their side. She added that they expect to see if there will be an extension in the project and the deadlines of the WPs. ML said that this is something to be discussed later on since several options will be examined. She added that it is expected that by the end of June there will be a confirmation in order to know if we will go on with one that we have in mind or not. If yes, we will need how much the procedure will need in order to finalise the formalities and catch up with the activities of the project. If not, this is also an option, we will see with the PO if we can close the project without the Albanian partner. As mentioned in previous meeting, we don’t have a problem in terms of eligibility criteria if we lose, let’s say, one partner, in this case the Albanian one, since we are still three countries, Programme countries involved in the project so we can go on. We still need to confirm this with our PO as well as the MA of the Programme. She added that at this stage we have two options, each one having pros and cons. Nevertheless, we will see by the end of June and decide how we will move on. NP said that they are in agreement with this way forward.

MM continued with the presentation and added that with regard to the project prolongation this is something to discuss later on. She added that this cannot go beyond 2021 in any case. She further mentioned two requests that she has so far by CEA and RDA with regard to certain budget modification they want to apply and she said that there is a need to discuss these.

SK said that she plans to have a discussion with her director in order to see the adjustments that they can apply with the budget and they will confirm next week.

NP also took the floor to clarify something. He mentioned that they have for their consultant, Frederic University, around 51.600 euro for their services and since that was on the basis of a public tender award the amount was around 33.800 euro. So, there is a difference. He added that they would like to use this amount to be transferred to the equipment in order to purchase more smart meters, if this is acceptable.

Mr Paris Fokaides (PF) the technical consultant on behalf of PB4, EMS took the floor in order to add some comments in this regard. He said that in their contract they had the purchase of 12 smart meters for 5.000 euro. That was included in the proposal. On the basis of the available budget, it is assumed that 12 smart meters can be bought. He added still that they will not cover sufficiently the needs of the building that is the objective of the project. To this end the request is the shift part of the budget to another category in order to better monitor this. Certainly, we intend to send our request written and you can revert accordingly.

ML took the floor and added that there won’t be a problem for sure for such small shifts since these are allowed by the Programme, there is a flexibility rate of 20% if not mistaken. What she wanted to underline to them since this is a very sensitive issue for the Programme as well. What happens with the discounts in tenders – how these are being moved to other categories. She added that if they wish to do something new, like in their case that they want to purchase more smart meters, she believes that this will be accepted without any problems. She highlighted that they will need to justify it very well, why they need more smart meters, they need to pay attention on that and when they send the justification (for example that this came up during the energy audit etc).

NP said that they will make the exact table with regard to what is the initial amount and the one awarded and they will make their statement and a report with regard to the necessity for these smart meters. ML said that this applies to all the partners that will need to apply a modification they will need to provide for a justification as well. Following a relevant question raised by NP regarding the discount, she clarified that for example when there is a tender, the initial budget for the tender is 100 euros and also there is a wage factor for the technical and financial offer based on the more advantageous offer, for example 82.20. That means that each tender will give a discount in this initial amount, for example 90 or 80 and that is the discount, that the tender was announced for X amount of money and at the end a lesser amount was contracted.

NP confirmed that this is their case and following the award there is a difference of 17.000 euro that is the amount they were referring. PF also asked if it is ok to communicate with them first before submitting the formal request for the modification. ML agreed in this regard and added that all communication at this stage is not binding so if there is something, let’s say, challenging we will come to you and ask for you to rephrase or provide ideas on how to make it good in the frame of the Programme. NP said that EMS will prepare the report and they will send it to the LB.

AT from RDA took the floor. Firstly, he asked the partner from Cyprus to send them the specifications for the smart meters. ML intervened to clarify that this is not their responsibility.

PF intervened also in order to inform that in their contract there are already specification with regard to the smart meters. So, the specifications provided by the consortium may deviate. He also added that they have placed their price on the basis of that what described in the document presented by the EMS. If there is a deviation on what was promised by them and what is requested by the project then we will have an issue to discuss in this regard. He added that we don’t need to clarify it at this point. NP intervened also and clarified that EMS at the beginning asked the consultant to provide for their specifications. EMS sent the specifications to all the partners. He said that he doesn’t know if there will be a deviation.

ML intervened and mentioned the last meeting of December where it was clarified that we cannot purchase right now the smart meters since these will be specified during the functioning and technical requirements of the ICT platform. She said that at the moment she is not aware whether the specifications prepared by EMS will be good or not. Currently we work on the functional and technical specification. She said for sure it was very clear that smart meters have nothing to do with the energy audits, they belong to WP5 and as such they will need to be specified in terms of features and technical characteristics when we will develop the functional and technical specs of the platform. Because above all the smart meters will need to communicate with the platform. The specs have not been finalised yet. In any case we will check what EMS has prepared. We cannot assure you that this will be operational and functional for our project. She added that they will need to wait since the purchase will start only when the LP will send the specs.

NP said that they agree in this regard. He added that if the ones they have are not adequate, they will make all the arrangements on the contract with the consultant when the specs will be sent to change them accordingly. ML asked NP to send the specs that they have shared in the past. He said that he will send them by end of the meeting. He said that their consultant has great experience and some additional ideas in this regard and they would like to coordinate with the technical staff of LP in this regard to define the best meters and the best product and results for the project.

PF took the floor and said that he understands that we have to wait for the specs in order to proceed. He added that they had meeting the next day in order to proceed with the purchase. He added that they will discuss internally with EMS in order to freeze the process for the time being until we have the final specs. NP added that this new for them and he added that they need to know as soon as possible in order to order them. It might be from USA or the local market it is not yet sure, so they may need two-three weeks. He asked, if possible, to be sent within the current week. ML said that it will be feasible within next week.

AT, took the floor in order to intervene with regard to the budget modification they have requested. More specifically he said that they asked to increase the staff until the end of 2021. He added that this will not exceed the 40% of the budget and 10% of the project management. MM said that this is aware of this and she added that it is planned to send one mentioning also the one that EMS put forward previously.

MM continued with the time schedule for the next period. She said that partners will need to submit the progress report by the end of July, 31st of the July. So, she mentioned that partners will need to submit their contribution by 20th of July the latest. She mentioned that the timeframes were set on the basis of the project prolongation and progress made. Against this background she proposed that the next meeting will take place at the end of June, 30th June when it is expected that there will be progress. She continued adding that the 2nd Newsletter is planned to be finalised also by the end of June. The same applies also for the Joint Strategy brochures. With regard to the implementation of public events, she mentioned that these may also be organised in June. She added that issues related to the organisation will be discussed later on. With regard to the WP3 what remains to be closed is the deliverables 3.4 and 3.5. The deadline to finalise both is the end of May. She said that SK will refer to this in more detail later. With regard to the WP4 it is planned to finalise the training curricula by the end this month, May and training seminars will take place in June. With regard to the evaluation, we will see later on more details. With regard to WP5 and more specifically the 5.1 that refers to the specs she said that this is planned to be finalised by end of June.

NP intervened and said that so far, they haven’t yet received any material by the partners so he doesn’t know if the deadline of 31th May is feasible or not for them to finalise this deliverable. He said that this is up to the partners. Maybe it can be shifted to a week later but in any case, partners will need to be asked in this regard. MM said that this can be discussed later on since this is indicative.

ML also intervened and said that their initial thought that they also want to share and agreem

upon with the partners, is to finalise all the WPs except WP5 by the end of June. Because in WP5 we have a lot of things to do. We have a lot of pilot actions (platform, energy performance contracts, cost-benefit analysis modeller). We can see some small extensions with regard to some actions under such WPs, but we need to think about it. We have to finalise all seminars and the evaluation also by end of June, preferably. In this way we will be more comfortable in implementing the activities under WP5. EMS has set the deadline for the curricula by tomorrow, 28 May 2021 and EMS to incorporate by Monday 31 May 2021. NP added that if partners have the material their role, then is to coordinate to receive them and submit to all. He added that if we need to keep up with the timeframes, partners will need to speed up.

PF said that there is the deadline for tomorrow on the basis of the study that was delivered. They expect that then they will collect the material and if everything is fine, they will send this by 31 May. He added that these were on the basis of what was discussed and agreed upon following the meeting of 6 April 2021 where EMS had also some objections regarding some decisions that were taken that were then revised.

SK asked about the date set for the next project meeting on 30 June 2021 since she won’t be able to attend due to other engagements. She proposed, if possible, to take place on 1st of July instead. MM said that they can be flexible in this regard.

AT took the floor and said that he is not sure with regard to a number of timeframes mentioned. More specifically, he said that he is not sure whether the brochures will be finalised by end of June as well as the training seminars. He added that if there will be a prolongation of the project some of the deadlines could be transferred until the end of July. He said that they have asked for budget modifications with regard to training depending on whether these will be online or organised physically. He said that they plan to do these physically but for sure they will not manage to do so until the end of June. MM said that we can discuss this later on and all partners can intervene in this regard.

PF took the floor and said that he understands the timeframes set but this doesn’t mean that we cannot work in parallel. For example, we could extent some of the actions in July, since it is already 27th May, but this is up to the consortium to decide. He said that even if these will take place in July, this doesn’t mean that WP5 cannot start, such as dissemination issues etc.

AT said that he thinks that some seminars and events can take place until the end of July. Maybe they will not succeed by end of June. MM said that this can be discussed later and all partners can intervene.

MM continued with the presentation clarifying that the timeframes were set taking into account the prolongation of the project. That is why all further to September 2021 (the current end date of the project) are highlighted in red. She added that there is the 3rd progress report for the period until the end of this year that will be submitted at the end of January. With regard to the meetings, she mentioned the future ones as follows: 4th Project meeting on 30th June 2021 (to be discussed again), 5th Project meeting on 30th September 2021 and 6th and Final project meeting on 30th November 2021. She continued by mentioning the deadlines for the newsletters: 2nd by end of June, 30th June 2021 and 3rd by the end of September, 30th September and the 4th by 30th November accordingly. With regard to the brochures, the one of the Joint Strategy is proposed to be finalised by the end of June (30th June) and the one with regard to the Joint Platform by end of September (30th September). With regard to the events these are proposed to take place by the end of June, the local intermediate conferences by the of September (linked to the realisation of the platform) and the final conference by end of November 2021. The roadmap is suggested to be finalised also by then.

NP intervened and asked for the material to be sent for the realisation of the events and seminars (brochures, leaflets, etc) so they can print and present. MM said that they have already finalised the brochure in English that was sent to them. Still, they need to finalise the Greek and Bulgarian versions. NP asked when they plan to send them. MM clarified that the English version was already sent to all partners. ML intervened also added that they have developed also the project communication material that includes all promotional material that can be used and printed (banners, design in proper format and include their text). NP asked to circulate this even in the English version. ML clarified that only brochure are in Greek all the other material is in English (logos, stickers, etc) so they can use what they wish. So, they can see all the material and decide accordingly.

MM continued with the presentation saying that as suggested before the training seminars can take place in June, still this is something to be discussed also later on and the evaluation, considering that they will have the form and it will take place following the finalisation of the seminars, can be completed by 9th of July 2021. With regard to the WP5 she reiterated that the specs will be finalised until the end of June. Then all other deliverables are proposed to be finalised by end of September, apart from the Follow-up of the project that will be finalised by end of November. Finally, she mentioned under the WP6 the EUSEW 2021 that is planned to take place on 25th to 29th October 2021 and they plan to participate. She added that it offers the opportunity to participate as a project in the frame of the network village. This is a separate platform where projects can participate and network. She said that there is still a lot of time to discuss this (there is a deadline by end of July to submit the request).

(15min Break)

Following the break, MM continued the WP2 and the presentation of the main activities for the upcoming period. She said that this is about the promotional material as well as the events. As mentioned, before they have already sent the project brochures in English and she said that she will send the rest of the communication material in order to be used for the purpose of the events and seminars. She added that they will prepare the brochure for the Joint Strategy since this is finalised as well. She also referred to the 2nd Newsletter that will be prepared within June to be finalised by 30th June and it will be similar to the 1st in terms of its format. With regard to the events (excluding the Albanian partner as mentioned before), there are 3 Local Events that are proposed to take place in June (linked to the Joint Strategy), the Local intermediate conferences, four in total that will take place in September (Linked to deliverables 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4), the EUSEW 2021 that will take place in October 2021 and the Final Conference in Igoumenitsa that will take place in November 2021 (all project outputs). She further presented the partners who will organise the events. EMS will organise the one in Cyprus and CEA will participate. MM asked the partners to confirm whether they will implement this physically or via web means. NP intervened and said that they will need to discuss this with the manager of the building. Their intention is to keep the WPs as mentioned in the agreement with physical presence. They will proceed with that if feasible and in line with the COVID requirements set at national level. Overall, he said that they don’t plan to apply any amendments on the contract agreement. ΑΤ also confirmed that they will try to organise these also in June, depending on the restrictions they have the presenation of the Joint strategy and the promotional material. ΜΜ added that the same applies for the Greek partners. They will try to implement these physically but then it will also depend on the circumstances, and always in line with the national rules.

With regard to WP3, SK from CEA took the floor. She said that D3.1, D3.2 and D.3.3 were finalised and submitted. With regard to D3.4 and D3.5 the criteria were submitted by EMS and RDA. Also, the Greek partners will send them by the end of month. She asked MM to confirm this. MM confirmed so. With regard D3.5 this is still pending on behalf of EMS and RDA. FP said that concerning the energy audit for the building in Cyprus, this will be the building of PIO, that was requested in their contract, he said it seems that there is already an energy audit in the building that was conducted in 2019. He said that currently they are revising and reevaluating this audit in order to submit to EMS some additional suggestions and then to consortium to conclude. He added that they have also some issues to discuss about the monitoring of the building that as he realised is under the WP5. Another suggestion is expected to be adopted after the collection of the measurements within the building. This is for later on but for sure early June they will be able to submit the evaluation of the audit of the building. With regard to the timeframes, he said that for D3.5 they plan to finalise this at the beginning to mid of June. NP took the floor to provide some clarifications. He said that they have done energy audits in 90% of the public buildings in Cyprus. In their contract with the consultant, they have clearly mentioned that the audit will be on the Press and Information Office (PIO) building and it is going to be evaluation of this, or its modification or the creation of a new study. He added that the consultant has the option on the basis of the contract to opt for one of these.

PF intervened to clarify that on the basis of their contract the easiest way was to approve what was already done and move on. He mentioned again the three option they have on the basis of their contract and he added that the quality of the existing audit is very good. Currently what they do is to provide for some improvements, suggestions, revisions etc, and he added that it is important for them to deliver a good output and in this regard, they need some days for processing, reevaluation etc. but also since the actual audit needs more days. ML added that in Thesprotia the building has already a certificate since 2015. She said that it is important to show that they have made something and put some effort. If a building has already a certificate there are two options in fact, either to start from scratch or build upon this and then integrate the results. She said that she understands this discussion started some time ago and asked them to try not to exceed mid of June since this is linked strictly to smart meters and steps under WP5.

SK said that RDA also has some issues and they plan to submit mid of June.

PF intervened and said that they have been in the project in less than a month and they their best to catch up. They ask for partners’ understanding and if possible, to send these by mid of June the latest. ML said that could be ok for both partners. SK confirmed that it is ok for them also and also that only one energy audit will take place in Cyprus. ML asked for a clarification with regard to the building and it was confirmed that this is under the Ministry for Interior. She added that they need to be aware regarding jurisdiction issues. For example, she mentioned that in Greece it is vert difficult for a partner, let’s say DAE, to install smart meters to another entity since they are two different legal entities. Then they have the register of assets that might create difficulties. NP said that they are aware of this and they will not have any legal issues in this regard.

AT took the floor and said that their contract is till the end of June but they will do their best to finalise the audit by mid of June. Against this background, SK from CEA added the new timeframes as follows: the submission of the pending deliverables by 18 June 2021 and the submission of the synthesis report on 25 June 2021. That was agreed among partners. So, the WP will be finalised by end of June.

With regard to WP4, NP took the floor in order to present the current status. He said that on the basis of the contract agreement each WP has a lead partner. He said that there was a misunderstanding that EMS had to create the deliverable under D4.1 and D4.2. They have notified this and they sent an email in this regard, specifying that these deliverables based on the contract terms and the budget are supposed to be done by each partner and they will coordinate and make sure that these will be submitted in time. He recalled the email that was sent on 13th April 2021 mentioning all the above. He referred the conversation with the consultant of the LP, MM and mentioned what was decided that EMS will not design, will not create the curricula, but they will receive it and coordinate and make sure that this is done by the partners. He added that there is no budget for external expertise also in this regard. Whatever was done is ok is for the benefit for the project in any case.

ML intervened said that each WP leader is not obliged to do any work that has to be done by the partners. In their case their work refers to coordination regarding three kinds of activities: the training assessment where EMS was supposed to design the questionnaire upon which the needs will be measured. Then each partner will run the survey at local level then the results are collected and processed. He said that there was no responsibility for them to create the questionnaire also since there is no budget foreseen for external compared to the other partners. He said that maybe there was a mistake on the budget. He said that considering this they cannot hire the consultant in this regard. He added that if there is a mistake in the budget, we can try to transfer an amount there. He added that he has clear instructions by his director to follow the contract terms. ML added that they might need to have an extra amount under some activities of the WP4. NP mentioned the possibility for someone to hire the consultant or to transfer money in order to have budget for the consultants. He added that they have done some analysis out of good will. He added that since there is no budget, they won’t be able to pay the consultant for this work. He suggested that someone could hire them or we increase the budget for this activity by adding an amount so they will get paid for the analysis that they will do. ML continued to clarify and provide for the whole picture of WP4 and the role of EMS as coordinator. She said that the questionnaire was already discussed and also the training assessment needs is closed. She said that MM might need to say something in this regard later on. The second task that the coordinator had to follow, was upon this training needs assessment to highlight the common aspects and the common thematic areas of the training curricula that will have to be developed by all the partners and it was coordinated very well by EMS. NP added that this is not strictly being referred in their contract but still the consultant did this. He added that he understands that each partner has different requirements and it’s a different country and different people. We are in different areas. So, we need indeed to underline and define which are the common areas of focus and then make the results. He said that the most important for him was that when the questionnaire was sent for Greece and Cyprus this was not sent separately to the partners. So, we have 83 answers on that and on this basis, it was easy to see which one was what, which partner answered those questions. Adding to that he mentioned that when we were analyzing the data, we didn’t have any replies from PIO, that is the pilot building in Cyprus. He said that the first draft analysis was created by their consultant, Frederick University and for us it is the first good draft that we have. He added that after the email that was sent, he received the training assessment from all the partners. On the 20th of April, Evia sent the results and Thesprotia sent on 6th May their results and on 11th May RDA sent their results. He said that he still waits for CEA to send the results, they have discussed and they decided to go directly to PIO to provide feedback. So, within the next couple of days when they will have all the results, they will finalise the deliverable. He added that since their consultant is already delivering work if there is a budget that they could transfer he would like to do so. FP took the floor and mentioned that with regard to WP4 they have a short presentation on the basis of the activities that were done so far and the ones that are planned for the next period. NP took the floor and mentioned again that on that package there is no contract agreement for them to do anything, so they were saying that there might be a mistake in the initial contract terms. It is clear that the budget is zero and this was clear also in their contract terms. He repeated that EMS in terms of the contract is in charge of doing project management coordination of the activities, analyse briefly what the partners did and sent it back. FP said that they have never requested any additional amount and he can send this in written. ML intervened to say that this out of the discussion and at this stage the issue to be discussed is regarding the whole picture and strategic approach with regard to this WP. She added that what she will explain will also allow them to see whether they will remove budget from other budget lines to this activity. She said that now they have a third activity as a WP leader that is the following: they dispatch the training curricula and each partner will develop its part and shares this with all the other partners in order not to reinvent the wheel. She highlighted that they don’t need to do something for the training material, no need to spend any time or euro. They are not responsible for the quality of the material and they did what they had to do so far. Still all partners will have to use the same material translated in their own languages and each partner will implement its seminar. NP said that they are in agreement with this. ML continued by saying that moving to that the seminars will need to be evaluated. This can happen during the seminars or afterwards by the use of a questionnaire. EMS as the WP leader will need to provide for this evaluation form to all partners in order to evaluate in the same manner the quality of the training but its one will collect the results and process the seminars on his own and then send synthesis of the results to the EMS that will integrate into the final report for whole project. It was agreed that EMS will don’t have to do anything apart from project management and coordination in this regard. Still, ML highlighted that they will need to be proactive and send to all partners an evaluation form to be used for the seminars prior to their implementation in order to be able to assess the satisfaction of the trainees. Partners might need to translate the questionnaires sent by EMS in English in their own languages. Each partner will collect them and process the results and send a final report to EMS with regard to the satisfaction of trainees for the training. EMS will need to synthesis these local report to one single one at project level. The purpose of this is that maybe following the seminars we might need to change some thematic or increase the material in others and overall make improvements. NP said that we will keep the contract terms, nobody will need to do any work that doesn’t need to be done and we are all in a good understanding. He added again that their role is project management. ML agreed that indeed some misunderstanding occurred but still they are open to discussion and now is the time to underline that if they wish for the remaining tasks to move some budget from their own to another category to external. NP said that they will discuss with the consultant if there is a need and they will inform them. He added that they will propose the change, if need be, for the smart meters and will include that one also if so. FP mentioned again that they have never requested any additional amount and he would like this to be written down in the minutes of the meeting. He added also that they are in agreement with the presentation of how the activities of this WP will be implemented. He also said that anything related to their contract with EMS will be done between them and there is no need in discussing this during the meeting. NP added for the minutes that in their agreement there is no word describing for any work done by the consultant for the 4.1 and 4.2 deliverables. He wanted to clarify there is no bad intention from their end and he just wanted to clarify that there is no budget for this activity and whatever the external did was out of good will and EMS appreciates that.

FP continued with the presentation they have prepared. He mentioned the activities that are planned regarding the assessment of training needs and the development of the curricula study on the basis of the results and the implementation of the seminars. He clarified that these are the targets of the WP and not what EMS is going to do. He continued by presenting the progress made so far: they received the evaluation of the questionnaires (still pending for EMS to evaluate some questionnaires to be received by PIO) they have assessed the ones received and sent a study guide. Currently the training material is being developed by the partners. He then presented the table with all the thematics and how these were distributed among the partners. With regard to the seminars, he said that we need to finalize the dates, the programme and presentations, we need to finalize the minutes and supporting material and prepare the evaluation questionnaire that will be discussed together with EMS. He then presented all the final deliverables that EMS will need to submit. The first on the training assessment was already sent. The training curricula is being developed on the basis of the study guide that was sent to the partners. Seminars will be held most probably in June. EMS will organise them physically. Overall, in the case of other partners this can be discussed on the basis of the restrictions due to the pandemic. Finally with regard to the evaluation, EMS will send an evaluation questionnaire to all partners and it will then resume partners replies. The material following the agreement of the meeting that took place on 6th April is expected by the 28th May. The following steps are: to finalise the training material, organise the seminars (June) and ensure alignment with the other WPs (capitalization of results under WP3 and support of EPC under WP5). Following a relevant question by ML it was clarified that the first deliverable 4.1 will be updated on the basis of the additional replies that EMS will receive by PIO. Going back to the presentation with the thematics distributed under each partner, ML added that this was the concluded following a discussion between FP and MM. She clarified that in some cases where there are two partners on the same topics there will be a separation of sections so there will not by any overlapping. With regard to the legislative framework DAE can develop the one with regard to EU, Greek and Cypriot legislation. RDA will develop the same of Bulgaria. She highlighted that all the material will be circulated to all and all will decide whether they will use this material for seminars or not. If they wish to do so they can translate it in their native language. Other thing to highlight is each material will need to be developed in power point in order to have a common image as a project. We don’t need research papers or any other hand outs and references can be added on the last page of the presentation. This was clarified for all. She mentioned also the section on the website with regard to E-learning and that material can also be used there. There we will develop Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs) but we can also develop links from this material to all partners in all languages in order to capitalize this work and make it free for everybody and every visitor.

Following that MM added that with regard to the first deliverable and since the results were all for Greece and Cyprus (87 in total) in their case they have identified the ones that came from Evia and Thesprotia and created separate forms that is part of their deliverable. She also mentioned that the one created by EMS was on the basis of all the replies. NP confirmed once again that in April and beginning of May he received separate reports by all partners. He added that further to the clarification via emails the partners proceeded by sending exactly the number of trainees who participated. MM continued and said that with regard to the training material that is ongoing she added that she could not find the national, transposed legislation on behalf of Cyprus. FP confirmed that they can send her any information needed. MM said that with regard to the deliverable of the training curricula, the first part is going to present an introduction to the module, including a general description to the thematic, the aim etc. All this can be included in the deliverable and then the actual material that is going to be the presentation is going to be included in an Annex. FP clarified that this actually what the study guide does. It was confirmed that each deliverable may have the presentation of the study guide that refers to each specific module and then add the presentation. MM added that with regard to the references they will use the ones presented in the study guide but they also plan to add more updated ones. Before concluding with this WP, ML said that if the partners plan to implement these virtually and on the basis of what the PO asked, they will have to justify the cost. In some bilateral communication it was explained that even if we turn some events in virtual mode, we will not reduce the cost. This is because we think that the cost is if not higher at least the same since you have to occupy people but also have the license for the platform for the meeting. To have more man hours devoted to the events, technical personnel, make tests, sound tests, etc. We suggest that our common approach is that we don’t reduce our budget due to the virtuality of the event and we justify the cost. She added that they can provide them with examples and templates in this regard. Nothing should be reduced. She mentioned the opinion of the PO that the cost is less. NP took the floor and mentioned that in their contract terms this is reduced in fact. He said that for example they 3.620 euro for the organisation of the event (external expertise subcontracted services) and support to other events. For the support to other events of other partners they have 610 euro. So, they broke this down. With regard to the organisation of training seminars in Nicosia they have a budget of 1.490 euro and for the organisation of training seminars (elearning) 370 euro. He mentioned that he will send the contract terms to the LP and if they believe that this will need to be equalized, they will change it. But it will have to come from them. ML invited them to send it as soon as possible in order to ensure that we work on a common ground. NP said it makes sense from his point of view that the physical meetings cost more (including renting a place, the catering, etc) so it might raise questions. ML said that it depends. For example, she said that MOOCs cost a lot because you have to find the professor and pay him for the preparation of the seminar. You have to make the production of the video, the handouts and references, etc. She said that the cost might be more in the case of elearning. NP said that in their case they will evaluate and proceed with any changes if needed and justified. ML underlined in general that partners will need to have a common approach. She hopes that there is an agreement in this regard and invited the partners to confirm that if they proceed with the virtual events and they will be invited to present a justification in this regard they will follow a common approach. FP said that this is understood. He added that EMS most probably implement this by physical means and added that since they coordinate this WP if partners decide to proceed virtually, they might need to provide for some guidelines. He said that they already have such guidelines. He continued by asking the LP to provide, if possible, some suggestions or guidelines with regard to the minimum prerequisites or evidence for the virtual training that they might have. NP added also that their department considers that the physical meeting will cost more and on basis of what was also presented before the budget for the physical training is much more. He added that this is their decision but of course other partners can present another justification since we talk about different countries and realities. So, he added that it doesn’t have to be a common approach but by each partner on the basis of the different requirements per country. ML agreed and added especially since they have already signed the contract with clear break down and indication in this regard. SK added that they will have online seminars. ML said that in that case, whereby there is no clear reference in the contract we need to agree that we don’t want to reduce the budget. AT from RDA took also the floor in this regard and added also that they will do the training also physically and the events as well. They will have all handovers and presentation. They plan to use the foreseen budget and to contract a company for the event and perhaps two companies for the seminars. SK confirmed that they will have the common approach regarding the virtual events and seminars. MM presented also a follow up from her end since this was also discussed during the previous meeting that the PO has suggested to split the budget in this regard. FP continued and said that for those partners that will decide to implement the seminars virtually they can be in contact with TREK in order to provide for any existing material in this regard with minimum requirements to coordinate with this.

With regard to WP5, ML started with the presentation mentioning that the first activity is the ICT platform for which the technical specifications are being prepared as they are already aware and will be ready by end of June. So, she provided an overview of the preparatory activities: they will prepare the functional and technical specifications and share these with them accordingly. She added that is a cloud-based platform that is not hosted on a specific server. She added that the platform will be based on the private area and it will accessible only to the partners and not any other visitors. She mentioned that the platform will be interlinked to the smart meters that will be installed in the pilot buildings of the partners. That is why the smart meters will need to comply with the platform. We will need to have the specs of the smart meters hopefully by the end of next week. With regard to the platform, having installed the smart meters in the buildings, they will receive the data close to the real time and will send via cloud this information to the platform. Through the platform each user will be able to see the actual spending of the building in terms of electricity or energy saving overall. The system will have some algorithms and upon that data and it will integrate other data from other sources (for instance weather forecast, etc) and it will guide the user on how to spend less and make some cost benefit options. For instance a simple recommendation would be that we foresee that the temperature will be that in two hours from now so you can turn off the air-condition. It may also give metrics with regard to specific parts of the building where you will see the behaviour of the employees (for example the level of consumption in the meeting room that might not be occupied-lights are left on etc) the aim is to change the behaviour of the occupants of the building. With regard to the term user, she said that for those partners that are also administrators of the building where the actions will take place, the users will be partners. For example in Thesprotia it wont be necessarily Mr Logothetis but it will be a person from the Regional Unit who will be responsible for this specific task (pay bills, check the consumption, inform the occupants, etc). For example, in the case of Cyprus it could be personnel from PIO. Partners will decide this. It is meant to be people directly responsible and have the jurisdiction to do so. FP commented on this by using the example of the consumption of the seminar room used before. He added that this means that we measure all consumptions in one room and this is what will increase drastically the cost of the sensors and the installation. He suggested that before preparing any requirements and deciding the lead partners should be given information about the building: the area of the buildings, number of thermal zones, etc in order to decide what will be measured and how considering the available budget since the cost might differ. He assured on behalf of EMS that they will the best possible to deliver the highest quality of monitoring but any budget restrictions will need to be considered also in the guidelines and minimum requirements concerning the measurements. ML agreed adding that is linked to cost issues and also time depending on how much time the installation will take. She added that this is a pilot project. What is aimed to be demonstrated is via small interventions energy efficiency can be improved and specifically through behavioural change. She added that in Greece in some building they don’t have the opportunity to place more than one smart meter cause even if it is a huge building it has only one supply unit, so it not possible to put smart meters in one than one room anyway. She added that this was dealt when the energy audit took place so for example we know where exactly we can place the smart meters in Evia and Thesprotia (and this is how WP3 and WP5 are interlinked). FP proposed that in the guidelines they could have the measurement for the energy behaviour of the entire building and with regard to a specific section (room, thermal zone of specific m2, etc) so it will be more realistic and partners will know exactly. He added that if they could send a template for the pilot buildings where they could retrieve some measures on what we have and make the decisions accordingly. ML said that this is basically what CEA will need to do when synthesizing the audit results and that is why we insist on having this deliverable on time. Otherwise, the specs cannot be produced if we don’t know the buildings and their characteristics. The finalization of D3.5 is a prerequisite in order to proceed with the specs. FP said that with regard to the PIO building they can send after the meeting the document with the existing audit in order to have a picture and the revised audit will be sent as discussed earlier by mid of June. ML still added that it is preferred to have an integrated a final deliverable. In any case there was already an agreement for mid of June to receive the final deliverable. She asked them to take this into consideration. The approach is to have something feasible and realistic that will be also doable. NP said that he will send their specs by tomorrow so they will know what they can increase in their budget. She concluded the presentation by presenting also the relevant timeframes for the rest of the activities.

MM closed the meeting by mentioned the main issues that were discussed under each WP. More specifically, she said that:

With regard to WP1 the most important is that all partners will need to speed up with the declaration of expenditures, she invited all partners to speed up so by the end of June we have a high amount verified. She mentioned that it is confirmed that the Albanian Ministry has withdrawn for the time being and they will proceed without them. With regard to the budget modification, she said that she expects by next week to receive any proposals by the partners in this regard in order to proceed with one request. With regard to the prolongation all partners agree but still we need first to ensure higher absorption so on this basis they might apply in the beginning of July.

With regard to WP2 she said that she will be sending to all the relevant material and necessary username and password for the private interface. With regard to the events, EMS will organise them physically and in June.

With regard to WP3 she said that we expect to have the final deliverable by mid of June.

With regard to WP4, she said that they are in agreement with the set deadline of 28 May 2021 to send the curricula so to have the final one by Monday. The seminars will take place for CEA and probably Greek partners in June as soon as the material is finalised. The other partners will implement them via physical means. The evaluation form will be sent by the coordinator and partners will use this accordingly.

With regard to WP5 the lead partner will prepare the specs and sent to the partners by end of June. Considering the prolongation of the project we have set the timeframes by end of September to finalise the rest of the deliverables, except for the follow up plan. ML closed the meeting by urging the partners to spend and validate the expenditures as much as they can. There is a specific reason for that since the PO will only be persuaded to accept budget modifications in this regard. She added the project is lagging behind in financial terms adding also that it doesn’t mean anything for the Programme if we have very good project without financial spending. Because this is a burden and there is a serious risk of decommitment. NP said that with regard to the seminars and events they have one day for the intermediate event that will take place physically and one day for the training seminar and one for the online training. ML suggested to consult the SoB also that is the basis for everything. She underlined once again that they need to accelerate the procedure with the spending and verification if they want modifications. She added that PO has already a problem with that and it’s a pity because this is a good project and can be also labelled. NP confirmed that they will be able to do by end of June or end of July the latest. LT said that this week they will decide whether the seminars will take place physically or virtually and will discuss with TREK accordingly. MM closed the meeting by thanking all for their presence and hoped that she hears from them soon.

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Package 1** |
| **Deliverable 1.3:** Submission of the Progress reports by 20/07/21 (final report submission on 31/07/21) |
| **Deliverable 1.4**: 4th project meeting 30/06/21 (to be transferred to beginning of July) |
| **Deliverable 1.5**: Verification of expenditures by end of June (30/06/21) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Package 2** |
| **Deliverable 2.3**: Joint strategy brochure and 2nd newsletter to be finalised by 30/06/21 |
| **Deliverable 2.4:** it was decided to oragnise these physically using the promotional material - partners will try to realise them in June |

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Package 3** |
| **Deliverable 3.4:** (04/06/2021) - to be finalized |
| **Deliverable 3.5:** RDA and EMS to submit their input by 18/06/21 and CEA to submit the final report by 25/06/21 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Package 4** |
| **Deliverable 4.3:** (30/06/2021) - to be finalized - RDA and EMS to implement physically and CEA and greek partners maybe online - partners asked for this to be removed to July |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Package 5** |
| **Deliverable 5.1:** (30/06/2021) - to be finalized \_ agreed that this will be sent by end June the latest |
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