

PRO-ENERGY

Promoting Energy Efficiency in Public Buildings of the Balkan Mediterranean Territory

4th Project Meeting (online)

July 27, 2021

MINUTES

- Organiser: Region of Epirus - Regional Unit of Thesprotia (LP)
- Duration: 11:00 am - 13:30 pm (Greek time)
- Scope: The main aim of the meeting was to continue discussions in relation to the development that took place with regard to all Working Packages (WPs) and set the main targets in terms of financial and physical progress for the next period. The meeting also aimed at discussing strategic issues in relation to: project prolongation, budget modifications as well as updates in relation to the replacement of the AL partner.
- Participants: Representatives of all partners were present apart from representatives of the Albanian side. Participants' list is being attached in an ANNEX of the present document.

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 4th Project meeting important event and said that there were no specific issues to be replaced from his end.

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 important due to the fact that issues of strategic importance will be discussed. She gave the floor to MM to start with the presentation of the main items in line with the agenda distributed prior to the meeting.

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 July 2021, and on the basis of the data that are presented on the MIS. She asked all partners to provide any updates in this regard. Mr Mr Nicolas Panayides (NP) from PB4, EMS, said that they plan to declare all the expenses of around 28.000 euro, the coming period. Soulla Karra (SK) from CEA, PB3, said that they don't plan to declare more expenses and they plan to certify by mid-September. With regard to the AL partnership, MM gave the floor to ML in order to provide updates in this regard.

ML took the floor and mentioned that most probably the new partner will be the National Agency for Natural Resources that is under the subordinate of the Ministry for Infrastructure. She mentioned that this is just a proposal by the Ministry and that it is planned to have a Skype call tomorrow in order to see to what extent they can follow and be fast and effective. The reason provided by the Ministry regarding the withdrawal was that they don't have the capacity and the money, so hopefully this won't be the case with the new partner. She added that they were informed that they already participate in an approved project under the Balkan-Med Programme and they are fast in physical and economic terms. She mentioned that they will know by the end this week and they will decide accordingly. She added that in August no decision can be taken in any case since there is no Monitoring Committee taking place. Also, the procedure does not need more than two weeks to be finalised. She estimated that the whole procedure will be finalised by mid-September, so by end of this month the new partner will be able to start working in all the Working Packages. She highlighted that one of the reasons it was suggested for the project to be prolonged was also to provide for more time for the new partner to keep up. She said that hopefully by the end of this week there will be a relevant approval for the prolongation as well.

Against this background, she mentioned that partners will need to review also possible modification with regard to the budget. She highlighted that discount are locked and cannot be used by the PPs and they will have to come up with innovative activities. She added that travel most possibly will not be able to take place and also with regard to the activity under WP6 she mentioned that the LP plans to participate in the virtual event of EUSEW that will take place late October. Mr Velizar Petrov from RDA said that provided that the project will be prolonged they plan to transfer money for staff and the FLC as well as from travel to staff in particularly for the WP1 (verification, progress reports) as well as WP2 and WP5. SK from CEA added that in their case they plan to transfer from WP4 to WP5. ML added that preferably they expect partners to send their requests modifications by the end of August. NP from EMS took the floor in this regard and mentioned that they might need to add more smart meters so they will need to update this in their budget. He added that they will need to have the specs as discussed in

previous meeting. She said that there might need to add more smart meters or more trainings under WP4 with the remaining amount. Specifically, with regard to the WP5, she said during the preparation of the specs they realised that is not only the installation of the smart meters but it will be required also the supply of the panels that will submit data for the platform, to cloud. If only smart meters will be installed it will not be possible for the platform to receive the necessary data, analyse them and give results. She said that she is not in the place today to provide figures and attributes for the procurement of this equipment but for sure more money will be needed for all partners under this activity. She added that by end of August they will be ready with that. She mentioned that they would like to delay this activity in order to be able to see what will happen with the AL partner. Now that we have a clearer picture and we know that they will be in and we can count them for all the deliverables including the platform. Provided also that, during the meeting they will assure that they have a pilot building to work and they can implement the energy audit very fast. She said that this is the reason why the development of the platform was delayed. There is the need to see the final building, the final need for smart meters, for example we might need more compared to what was foreseen. We need to customise these issues to the buildings and that is why it is important for the AL partners to be in to know the details of the building. The other parameter is the fact that we will need to have common features, you cannot supply smart meters that will not be compatible to what the system can do or you might need to supply additional equipment that was not foreseen at the beginning. So, we need to justify the budget accordingly. That is why these activities go hand in hand meaning the implementation of the WP5, the budget modification and the prolongation of the project. NP said that this is understood from their end. He added that the smart meters will provide data to the partners to analyse the user behaviour. So, the earlier they are installed the better in order to be able to make some conclusions in this regard that was the initial target. Also, they need time to order them, prepare procurement so it will take some time. ML said they will do their best. So far, the schedule is that by end of August they will send the specs and they will have at least two months to install them. NP added that then the partners will have 3 months to get data. So, the fastest the better. He said that in any case they will need the specs in order to see the cost and put forward the request for the modification.

VP from RDA took the floor and said that in fact in Plovdiv they finished the audit and they have also the report and recommendations of what should be done. In their case, it is written only smart meters at it is in the proposal. If we put additional devices maybe there will be a need to put additional information in the report of the energy audit. Otherwise, we don't have a clear

explanation of why we need additional devices. Another question is when they plan to establish this platform cause, it is closely connected to the audit meters etc. ML said that there is no need to change the report since this is a technical issue. The installation of smart meters is to collect data. The technical issue is how to transmit such data on the cloud platform. She said that in their case in Thesprotia the report mentions the installation of BMS that is partly what we do with the platform. It not necessary that all recommendations will be implemented. The energy auditor might suggest a lot of things or less. Regarding the time schedule, we know that will go for an extension by end of February 2022 but we don't intent to use all this period for the platform. The platform will be ready by the end of 2021. That is why she said that as soon as partners will have the specs, they can proceed with the procurement procedures by end of October. In the meantime, the platform will be ready and it will be connected to the smart meters as soon as they will be installed. Some tests will be done and a better version will be ready in order for all of us to use it and see what can be improved. Yes, it is true that we won't have time for critical time for the implementation and operation of the system. This was not also foreseen in the project, that the platform will be installed at the initial stages and be operational for two years let's say to see the results within the framework of the project. Yes, ideally that would be the case but there is no time. She said that all activities under WP5 will be finalised by the end of 2021 and they will be able to validate them and leave for the new year small fractions. SK asked to have some dates with regard to WP5 in order to inform their expert when they expect to have the deliverables. ML said that they will prepare the table of deliverables with the proposed dates for WP5. She mentioned that we have already sent the revised AF to the JS with all the deadlines for all WPs transferred by the new end date of the project. She said that they can share per deliverable the proposed timeframes within the consortium considering that WP5, and for sure the platform will be closed by end of 2021. ML added that Cost benefit analysis and Energy performance contracts might take a bit longer. SK said that in their contract they mention end of September so they will need to update this accordingly.

VP from RDA, said that they finalised their audit and they had the certification for the building, but there is no reference to this on their SoB. He said if this might cause a problem with the JS what can be done in this regard. ML said that this is not a problem but this is an additional deliverable produced and this applied to all since there is no audit without a certificate. VP mentioned that is included in the budget available but in order to be more precise there might need to have a specific reference in the SoB in this regard, since this is part of the process. ML asked CEA whether they faced any problem. She said that EMS had the audit in their case. PF

the consultant of EMS said that the Energy Performance certificate, according to the national legislation this is delivered at design stage and only in cases where we have an upgrade of over 20% of its area. He added that the building in which they have performed the audit has already its certificate. Concerning the audit all public buildings are required to have a certificate. What they have done was to upgrade the energy audit with some additional scenarios. According to the national legislation the new energy audits may be submitted to the service once a year. So, they can request EMS to submit the energy audit to the energy service as an updated one. In any case the building that they were requested to provide for an energy audit has already a certificate and had an audit registered. Thus, they don't see any issue with the selected building. They can, if required, redeclare the energy audit. VP said that the same applies in Bulgaria. Still, he added that the question was about the certificate following the audit. PF said that in Cyprus the certificate is issued at design stage only if they have the upgrade of over 20% of its area. He added that in their case there is already an available certificate and the budget available does not include an upgrade of the building. It doesn't make any sense to recertify the building with the same data. ML added that in the original budget there was no clarification this was not clarified since it was not sure at that point whether there will be a certificate or not. The same applied in Thesprotia since there was also already an energy certificate. She added that if they see any issue, they can write in the budget modification a relevant reference. MM continued with the presentation. She provided a brief sum up with regard to the issues that were discussed so far (eg budget modification, project prolongation) and presented the timeframes on the basis of the prolongation suggested (end of February 2022) until the end of the project for all the activities and actions under all Working Packages. With regard to the WP2 and particularly the events she gave the floor to the RDA and EMS in order to provide some updates with regard to the events implemented in their case. VP said that they had a mixed event and they plan to organise another one but this will depend on the situation with the pandemic. PF on behalf of EMS said that they didn't have an event so far. They organised the seminar and they participated also in the seminars organised by the CEA in Cyprus. NP mentioned that they have to organise a project meeting as per SoB. MM said that we might see after September on the basis of how the situation will evolve. She added that they might consider to allocate an amount from travel when they apply for a modification. She also invited all to send her material for the finalisation of the 2nd newsletter. SK advised MM to use the material they have sent with the Progress Report (publicity section). She said that she can send any additional if required. RDA confirmed also that the material sent can be used accordingly. SK said that as soon as the new AL partner will join the project, they will need to update them accordingly. MM said that by end

of September, hopefully, everything will be in place. With regard to the WP4, MM said that while the Greek partners have set timeframes, they didn't manage to realise the seminars since it was not easy to move in July. PF said that there is no an issue with them and referred to the set timeframes to be realised in June. He mentioned the seminars realised so far by the other partners in the months of June, July (online for CEA) and added that as soon as the seminars will be finalised in Greece this activity will be closed. He added that the material is already finalised on the basis of the study guide that was prepared by them. With regard to the evaluation form under 4.4, he said that they have already sent the evaluation form following their seminar that can be used by all partners. In the case of CEA, they did the evaluation following the completion of the seminars. SK said that she tried to contact them but they were off at that point. She added that they will send the evaluation by mid-September. FP said that they can evaluate in any way they wish but they have sent their proposal. VP said that they plan to do another seminar. FP said that they will send again the form. VP said that they had the same difficulties due to the fact that there was a similar seminar at the same time and there was a competition issue due to the fact that the audience was the same. MM said that they will send the actual dates the soonest possible. MM said that she will be sending the minutes of the 3rd and 4th meeting the soonest.

MM provided a brief sum up with regard to what was discussed. More specifically, with regard to WP1 she said that all partners will be declaring and verifying expenses by the end of August. With regard to the Progress report, she will be finalising the submission and send to PO and MIS. With regard to the AL replacement, she said that they would plan to have a discussion with the Agency the following day and they expect all to be finalised by mid-September so they will be part of the consortium and see how they will continue with the implementation of the activities from their behalf. With regard to the prolongation, she assured that there will be updates by end of the week. She advised the partners to have a look with regard to the budget modification and changes in the SoB, they would like to apply as soon as the prolongation is approved. Ideally, by the end of August. SK said that it won't be easy for them to send it by then. They concluded that they can have by the first week of September. With regard to WP4 they will be communicating the dates the soonest, by the end of August, and with regard to the specs for the platform as well. ML made a short reference to the WP6 and said that they will submit by the end of the month the application for their participation in the Energy Talks under the network village. ML added that they will notify all partners as soon as they will have the approval. In any case she added that there are plenty of opportunities to participate in alternative events related to energy that will take place across Europe-or virtually. She mentioned that if any partner

doesn't have any budget in relation to this activity, they can allocate also some money now and also to see if they can use an amount in the frame of the European Cooperation Day to hold a local event, as well as other promotional events. VP asked whether it would be obligatory to allocate the amount for travel since the event will take place online. ML said that as mentioned they can plan to organise a local event and then allocate budget from travel to staff in this case that will be positive for the project also in terms of communication goals.

Working Package 1

Deliverable 1.3: Submission of the Progress report by 30/07/21

Deliverable 1.4: 5th project meeting 30/10/21 (to be confirmed)

Deliverable 1.5: Verification of expenditures by end of August (31/08/21)

Working Package 2

Deliverable 2.3: Joint strategy brochure and 2nd newsletter to be finalised by 31/08/21

Working Package 4

Deliverable 4.3: LB and PB2 to send dates for the realisation of their seminars

Deliverable 4.4: PB4, EMS to resend the template for the evaluation

Working Package 5

Deliverable 5.1: agreed that this will be sent by end of August



PARTICIPANTS LIST

No.	Full Name	Title / Role	Organisation	Email
1.	Thomas LOGOTHETIS	Project Manager	Region of Epirus – Regional Unit of Thesprotia	th.logothetis@php.gov.gr
2.	Melina LAZAROPOULOU	Technical Assistance Director	TREK Development	melina@trek-development.eu
3.	Maria MIKRONI	Technical Assistance Manager	TREK Development	maria@trek-development.eu
4.	Nicolas Panayides	Mechanical Engineer	Department of Electromechanical Services (EMS)	npanayides@ems.mcw.gov.cy
5.	Soulla KARRA	Technical Assistance	Cyprus Energy Agency	soulla.karra@cea.org.cy
6.	Paris FOKAIDES	Coordinator of the Contractor	Frederick University	eng.fp@frederick.ac.cy
7.	Phoebe Zoe MORSINK-GEORGALI	Researcher	Frederick University	res.gp@frederick.ac.cy



pro-energy-project.eu

No.	Full Name	Title / Role	Organisation	Email
8.	Nikolas AFXENTIOU	Researcher	Frederick University	res.an@frederick.ac.cy
9.	Atanas Tonkov	Project team member	RDA BSC SMEs	a.tonkov@rda-bg.org
10.	Velizar Petrov	Manager	RDA BSC SMEs	rdaplovdic@gmail.com