

MUNICIPAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME, Bulgaria		Elements in decision making / planning					
		1 Relevant considerations for planned activities	2 Tools, methods, indicators	3 Public	4 Decision makers	5 Communication	6 Expected Outputs / Deliverables
A Describe the CONTEXT, setup the BASELINE, formulate PROBLEMS, identify NEEDS	QUESTIONS - stage A						
	A1.1. What is the context, the baseline and are the key problems?	A2.1. What tools are currently applied?	A3.1. Who might be influenced - whose problem is it?	A4.1. Who are the decision makers and main sectors involved?	A5.1. What kind of communication strategy do you plan to establish?	A6.1. Do you plan to give an output at an early stage? To whom?	
	A1.2. What are the urgent priorities herein?	A2.2. Do you plan to use a new / different tool?	A3.2. How does the public define sustainable development?	A4.2. What types of expertise are needed?	A5.2. What do you plan to communicate and to whom?	A6.2. Do you plan to prepare e.g. a context report, data base information, a summary of identified problems?	
	A1.3. How would you define sustainable development within the context?	A2.3. What basic or additional information is needed for using the tool? And is it accessible?	A3.3. What are potential conflicts?	A4.3. Is there a need for external expertise and who (what organization) could provide it?	A5.3. What feedback (ideas, recommendations) do you expect from communication?		
			A3.4. At what stage do you plan to involve them?		A5.4. What kind of information is planned to be accessible?		
			A3.5. What would be their role?				
			A3.6. What is your interest to involve the public?				
	ANSWERS - stage A						
	A1.1. estimated low energy efficiency; bad technical conditions of the sector infrastructure; high expenses on energy and lack of money; low quality of the environment (insufficient heating) in residential, school and administrative buildings; insufficien	A2.1. no previous experience of the Municipality in evaluating energy efficiency at the local level	A3.1. citizens, local business	A4.1. Municipal Council and technical experts	A5.1. communication strategy aimed at increasing awareness about energy efficiency and possible measures to achieve it, flexible enough to match the needs of various target groups involved and to build up motivation for action.	A6.1. to the public: information about possible EE measures and about future activities	
	A1.2. diminution of expenses for energy consumption and increase of the efficiency of the city energy infrastructure	A2.2. estimated need of new evaluation tools - the <b>Ranking Criteria for Priority Assessment (RCPA)</b> tool was developed based on Norwegian and Dutch methodologies that were adapted to local climatic, social and economic conditions	A3.2. no information available as no inquiry on this was carried out Expert assessment: diminution of expenses for energy consumption and improvement in the quality of live	A4.2. technical, political, social and environmental	A5.2. communication with: (i) the public and (ii) different municipal departments, in order to: provide information on the current state in the municipality concerning energy consumption and expenses; share practical experience in the field of energy effi	A6.2. database of technical, economic, regulation, etc. information presented in: baseline report, brochures, leaflets, a movie, Radio&TV broadcasts,	
	A1.3. overcoming the economic crisis; providing long-term development of local economy; providing employment; guaranteeing the quality of the living environment for all citizens. The Development Priorities of the municipality are stated as "initiation of growth and economic development; harmonious development of the population; protection of natural	A2.3. need for data about energy consumption at the municipal level ( <i>the database was created within the project</i> )	A3.3. the low income of the population and the restricted budget of the municipality were not sufficient to meet high energy supply expenses	A4.3. yes, need of external expertise - an organization with energy efficiency expertise (Eneffect) and the Technical University of Gabrovo	A5.3. identification of existing barriers to the implementation of energy efficiency policy: psychological, financial, behavioral, organizational, etc.		
			A3.4. stage of formulation of policy objectives		A5.4. information about baseline conditions; Information about municipal energy planning (Municipal Energy Efficiency Programme)		
			A3.5. to state their problems and needs				
A3.6. to be sure that all the needs and potentials are fully/adequately met by the MEPP							

MUNICIPAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME, Bulgaria		Elements in decision making / planning					
		1 Relevant considerations for planned activities	2 Tools, methods, indicators	3 Public	4 Decision makers	5 Communication	6 Expected Outputs / Deliverables
B Describe OBJECTIVES, identify ALTERNATIVES, define the LEVEL of DETAIL	QUESTIONS - stage B						
	B1.1. What are relevant objectives in the overall context and connections between them?	B2.1. With respect to new/chosen alternatives: Would you need or have you considered to use a new/specific tool or method?	B3.1. What inputs would you expect from the public?	B4.1. Are political and experts' issues clearly identified?	B5.1. How do you explain the objectives to the stakeholders?	B6.1. Would you consider an announcement of objectives, scale, major steps, the level of detail, available and required capacities and alternatives to other stakeholders conducive?	
	B1.2. Have you considered alternatives (of problem solution)?	B2.2. Have you considered eventual changes of the time-frame as a result of changes/innovations such as new implemented tools or methods?	B3.2. Are their visions regarded?	B4.2. Which key issues are relevant to select alternatives?	B5.2. What feedback and positive impulse would you expect from that step (response, different attitudes, participation, commitment)?		
	B1.3. What would be the scope of the planned activity in terms of duration and scale?		B3.3. What would be paying partnerships - who should be considered in each alternative?		B5.3. How could the readiness to accept others' visions be achieved?		
	ANSWERS - stage B						
	B1.1. local capacity building and demonstration projects for different types of buildings and infrastructure in order to study the applicability of the measures under the peculiar conditions and to provide practical proof of the benefits achieved.	B2.1. estimated need of new tools and methods - the RCPA	B3.1. changes in behavioral patterns; support for municipality initiatives	B4.1. yes, political: formulation of policy aims; expert: choice of approach and methodology for policy implementation	B5.1. information dissemination - meetings, brochures, broadcastings; non-expert language was considered of particular importance	B6.1. only to experts	
	B1.2. no reasonable alternative to MEEP was found	B2.2. Yes, political and organizational reasons were considered	B3.2. yes, where possible	B4.2. cost-effectiveness of the measures (to combine long-term goals with visible short-term effects)	B5.2. increased awareness and willingness for participation in municipal activities; changes in the patterns of energy consumption		
	B1.3. scale: municipal energy infrastructure duration: long-term goals with visible short-term effects (the most demonstration projects were accomplished within 3 years)		B3.3. not clear		B5.3. public dialogue about the objectives and possible measures		

MUNICIPAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME, Bulgaria		Elements in decision making / planning					
		1 Relevant considerations for planned activities	2 Tools, methods, indicators	3 Public	4 Decision makers	5 Communication	6 Expected Outputs / Deliverables
Stages of decision making / planning	C For all ALTERNATIVES: Define KEY IMPACTS, describe and chose on INDICATORS, METHODS and TOOLS	QUESTIONS - stage C					
		C1.1. How would you describe the expected key impacts?	C2.1. To which extent are problems and key impacts addressed by indicators, tools and methods?	C3.1. Is the public invited to define their priorities?	C4.1. Who will carry out the evaluation?	C5.1. How would you approach the stakeholder's attitude to risk and failure of the chosen alternatives?	C6.1. Do you plan to inform other stakeholders about alternatives, including information about key impacts, indicators, methods and tools?
		C1.2. What indicators would you chose (according to key problems and impacts and objectives)?	C2.2. Is there a need for new tools and data?	C3.2. Have you considered information about chosen indicators, methods or defined impacts helpful to get closer to the public?	C4.2. Which key impacts (social, environmental, economic) have you regarded?	C5.2. How would you communicate "uncertainty" in terms of considering potential risks and the possibility of failure?	C6.2. How would you present it (report, internet, information flyer)?
		C1.3. What are likely barriers for not achieving the aims?			C4.3. Are people's concerns and ideas considered?		
					C4.4. Are quantified and non-quantifiable facts even balanced in the evaluation?		
		ANSWERS - stage C					
		C1.1. comparison between baseline (present) condition and expected impacts in terms of lower expenses on energy consumption, better living environment in buildings (heating) and higher safety in urban space (street lighting)	C2.1. chosen indicators and methods addressed economic, environmental and social aspects of the problems	C3.1. yes, public discussion	C4.1. local (municipality, Technical University) and external experts (Eneffect)	C5.1. the demonstration projects were aimed at reducing the risk of failure when applying measures from elsewhere	C6.1. not clear
		C1.2. ENCON (energy conservation) potential, CO2 savings, SPB (simple payback), technical state and exploitation conditions of the objects, etc.	C2.2. yes, need for new tools to match local context- RCPA	C3.2. public dissemination of information about MEEP impact was considered but there is no information available about implemented evaluation methods;	C4.2. social - providing a better quality of the living environment for vulnerable social groups; environmental - reduction of GHG emissions; economic - lower expenses on energy consumption	C5.2. A business plan was developed to address possible risks and alternative actions	C6.2. information flyer
		C1.3. lack of adequate experience and skills; regulatory and financial constraints; absence of mechanisms for rapid and easy exchange of			C4.3. yes, external expert evaluation of public attitude		
			C4.4. yes, balance between quantified and non-quantifiable facts				

MUNICIPAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME, Bulgaria		Elements in decision making / planning						
		1 Relevant considerations for planned activities	2 Tools, methods, indicators	3 Public	4 Decision makers	5 Communication	6 Expected Outputs / Deliverables	
D EVALUATION of ALTERNATIVES, select the final alternative / solution	QUESTIONS - stage D							
	D1.1. What needs to be evaluated and why?	D2.1. What tool or method would you use for the evaluation and the selection process?	D3.1. Who should be invited for the evaluation?	D4.1. Who should do the evaluation?	D5.1. How and to whom would you communicate about evaluation, selection results and selection process?	D6.1. Would you consider a written statement of evaluation results?		
	D1.2. What would be the aim ?		D3.2. How could you guarantee sufficient transparency for non-experts?	D4.2. How will the final alternatives be validated?	D5.2. Do you plan to present or explain the results?	D6.2. How would you report about the results?		
	D1.3. What social, environmental and economic aspects should be taken into consideration?					D6.3. Which alternative has been chosen - explain why?		
	ANSWERS - stage D							
	D1.1. cost-efficiency of the proposed measures (to combine measures with short and long-term effect)	D2.1. Ranking Criteria for Priority Assessment tool	D3.1. no public hearing	D4.1. local and external experts, local authorities	D5.1. meetings, consultations, discussions with different experts and politicians; informing the public about the final decisions.	D6.1. a written report to the Municipal Council		
	D1.2. combination of cost-efficient measures		D3.2. Municipality energy department continually informs the public and the municipal authorities about MEEP implementation	D4.2. political decision by the Municipal Council	D5.2. yes, to municipal authorities, public, financing institutions	D6.2. not clear (report about the results to Municipal Council and financing institutions)		
	D1.3. total energy consumption by energy sources; degree of Municipality's influence; motivation and commitment of actors for participation in the MEEP					D6.3. the most cost-efficient measures; the choice was also influenced by political considerations and citizens' attitude.		
	E define/consider necessary MITIGATION and amend details in PLANNING and MANAGEMENT TASKS	QUESTIONS - stage E						
		E1.1. How would you describe necessary measures for improvement?	E2.1. What are the requirements to introduce a new tool or method?	E3.1. What kind of responsibilities could be attributed to different public groups?	E4.1. How are stakeholder relations organized?	E5.1. How and to whom would you communicate required measures for improvements?	E6.1. How would you report / inform the stakeholders about required measures to achieve improvements?	
E1.2. What planning and management tasks would you need to consider?		E2.2. Would that result in additional training and education (capacity building)?	E4.2. What could stakeholders eventually provide for the implementation of measures?		E6.2. What would you expect from that move?			
			E4.3. Who proposes mitigation measures?					
ANSWERS - stage E								
E1.1. lack of information		E2.1. decision of the Municipal Council based on proposal by technical experts	E3.1. to provide that different target groups involved in the project implement proposed measures in respective objects	E4.1. co-ordination of all the actions is provided by Eneffect and the municipal EE office	E5.1. interactive process between technical experts and politicians	E6.1. meeting at the municipality		
E1.2. established working group for project implementation, a consultative council, an		E2.2. yes, should be provided by an expert organization		E4.2. not clear		E6.2. not clear		
	E4.3. project leader, business partners, etc.							

MUNICIPAL ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMME, Bulgaria		Elements in decision making / planning						
		1 Relevant considerations for planned activities	2 Tools, methods, indicators	3 Public	4 Decision makers	5 Communication	6 Expected Outputs / Deliverables	
F Define rules for REPORTING / follow-up ACTION	QUESTIONS - stage F							
	F1.1. What would you report to whom?	F2.1. How would you report about introducing a new tool or method?	F3.1. Do you consider a non-technical summary of the final outcomes?	F4.1. Is there a major target group to report to?	F5.1. How would you communicate results to different stakeholders?	F6.1. How do you plan to present results?		
	F1.2. Would you report on the outcomes & choice of alternatives?		F3.2. Do you plan to provide a draft report for public consultation?	F4.2. Who makes the decision for the implementation of the final plan or project (e.g. which level in decision making)?	F5.2. Where are the final proposal information documented?	F6.2. Is the report understandable also for non-experts?		
	F1.3. What kind of follow up activities would be required for considerations?					F6.3. Have you planned any follow-up activities?		
						F6.4. Have you considered an action or management plan?		
	ANSWERS - stage F							
	F1.1. MEEP implementation results are reported to the financing institution, monitoring body	F2.1. written report to the Municipal Council	F3.1. brochures addressed to the general public with information for non-experts	F4.1. Municipal Council, financing organization	F5.1. meeting of stakeholders with Project leader, Mayor, Municipal Council.	F6.1. reports, presentations, brochures, film, etc.		
	F1.2. yes		F3.2. not necessary	F4.2. Municipal Council took the decision for MEEP implementation	F5.2. not clear	F6.2. yes		
	F1.3. not clear					F6.3. monitoring of the results, information dissemination		
						F6.4. yes		
	G Define rules for MONITORING	QUESTIONS - stage G						
		G1.1. What should be monitored (e.g. the project development or potential project impacts)?	G2.1. Have you considered a specific method or technology for the monitoring?	G3.1. Who could be involved to take over parts of the monitoring process?	G4.1. How would you include new emerging interests?	G5.1. Who should report to whom about the monitoring?	G6.1. Are there regular, periodical reports assigned, e.g. maintenance of the data base?	
		G1.2. What means (e.g. tools, personnel) would be needed to do a monitoring?			G4.2. Which administrative unit would be responsible?	G5.2. Have the original needs of stakeholders changed over time?	G6.2. To what extent was the initial problem(s) solved?	
		G1.3. Have you thought of a certain monitoring pattern (frequency, scope, scale)?			G4.3. Who could take over responsibility to continue after the monitoring?	G5.3. What action would result from that?		
		ANSWERS - stage G						
		G1.1. both	G4.1. different monitoring methods was applied to each group of objects; reported difficulties in environmental assessment	G3.1. Citizens, NGOs, etc.	G4.1. assessment of the changed political, social and environmental situation	G5.1. the organization responsible for the monitoring to the Municipal Council	G6.1. yes, the database initially created by Eneffect is regularly updated by the municipal energy efficiency office	
		G1.2. technical experts, technical instruments, evaluation tools			G4.2. The municipal energy efficiency office responsible for newly arising interests/needs	G5.2. yes	G6.2. Yes, fully solved in administrative buildings that are municipal property and with regard to the street lighting; to a great extent solved in school buildings; to certain extent solved in residential buildings that were	
		G1.3. once per year for all demonstration projects			G4.3. not clear	G5.3. revision of measures and recommendations for new measures		