

Public consultation on the Energy Efficiency Directive

PU Europe Reaction

Part I – General questions

1. Article 1: Subject matter and scope and Article 3: Energy efficiency target

1.1. What is the key contribution of the EED to the achievement of the 2020 energy efficiency target?

The EED was proposed when it became clear that the EU was not on track to meet its 2020 target. Additional measures were therefore required. The EED provided a comprehensive cross-sector legislative framework for 2020 and beyond, including EU and national targets and minimum requirements for national programmes and measures that build on the EU efficiency standards for products, buildings and vehicles. With this, the EED significantly increased national activities and investments in energy efficiency improvements and provided a first step for correcting the failures of today's supply dominated energy markets. The EED failed however to set clear requirements for the energy renovation of our building stock - the biggest and most readily available source of savings.

1.2. How has the EED worked together with the Effort Sharing Decision, other energy efficiency legislation (on buildings, products and transport) and ETS? Could you describe positive synergies or overlaps?

The EED should be seen as a framework providing the overall direction for all energy efficiency legislation by defining targets and national measures, based on EU standards for buildings, products and transport.

The EED and ESD are intrinsically linked as saving energy is the biggest cost-effective measure to reduce non-ETS GHG emissions. However, they have only worked together to some extent. Additional savings from continuing EED requirements to 2030 will contribute to realising the EU GHG target for the non-ETS sectors.

Certain barriers to energy efficiency are not effectively dealt with by pricing instruments like the ETS.

Synergies exist with the EPBD due to the fact that the EPBD contains a number of gaps that needed urgent action (in particular art. 4). This is not problematic, as the EED provides the framework and the EPBD focuses on the specific details of efficient buildings. The current wording of article 4 (EED) is however too vague to unlock national renovation markets.

1.3. How has the EED worked together with existing national legislation? Could you describe any positive synergies or overlaps?

The EED works in coordination with national legislation / measures, and drives new / extended national energy efficiency legislation. As such it has guided Member States towards the recognition of energy efficiency as the first EU fuel source.

The increase in the number of Energy Efficiency Obligation (EEO) schemes in the EU is a clear indication of its impact.

Another example is the preparation of long-term strategies for the renovation of the building stock under Article 4. Although not always implemented enthusiastically, it opened the eyes of national governments to the enormous benefits of increasing the building efficiency.

In addition, the EED implementation helped to establish, maintain and increase national financing instruments, for example, additional capacities for KfW in Germany and the Dutch government support for Zero Energy Homes at Zero Upfront Costs (Stroomversnelling).

Regrettably, many Member States transposed the directive late or not completely.

1.4. What are the main lessons learned from the implementation of the EED?

- Many countries see energy efficiency as a burden instead of an opportunity for growth, jobs, climate protection and supply security, in particular with regards to building renovation. The delayed national implementation is an indicator for this.
- Commission support tools such as interpretive documents can help governments in designing effective policies.
- Certain articles, in particular art. 7, have become overly complex, thus delaying national implementation.
- Too much "flexibility" (derogations, alternative approaches) does not facilitate implementation, as shown by the failure of article 5. Most governments opted for alternatives to building renovation, meaning that the public sector is not playing the exemplary role.
- Ambiguous wording such as used in art. 4 means that measures are not actually implemented.
- Stable, ambitious long-term frameworks (beyond 2020) are needed. Stop-and-go policies must be avoided.
- The Concerted Action must be maintained.

1.5. Which factors should the Commission have in mind in reviewing the EU energy efficiency target for 2030?

A holistic long-term view until 2050 is required. The Commission must analyse relevant studies on saving potentials, include the multiple benefits of energy efficiency, take into account the Parliament's opinion, apply the Energy Efficiency First principle (see Energy Union strategy) and apply realistic discount rates to energy renovations.

Fraunhofer ISI sets the EU's cost-effective savings potential at 40% by 2030. A lower non-binding target misses this potential and increases the cost of reaching the RES and GHG targets.

Europe must move from least-cost to a cost-benefit-analysis of energy efficiency. The multiple benefits to all dimensions of the Energy Union, as well as growth, jobs, health and competitiveness must be considered.

Buildings use 40% of the EU's energy and offer the highest savings potential. The extreme fragmentation of this sector requires a strong political framework based on a separate EE target for buildings in order to provide a long-term vision for national renovation strategies (EED, art. 4).

1.6. What should the role of the EU be in view of achieving the new EU energy efficiency target for 2030?

The EU must provide a long-term vision to all societal stakeholders, based on the Energy Efficiency First principle. The 2030 target (based on a 2050 vision) must be based on the full cost-effective savings potential taking into account direct savings and wider societal benefits (lower health care costs, more jobs and tax revenues etc.). This target must be accompanied by clear, ambitious and flexible EU policies and measures with a particular focus on the priority sectors (buildings, transport). The principle legal tools are the EED and the EPBD. A specific target for buildings must be set.

The Commission should closely monitor and enforce policy implementation and provide guidance through interpretative documents and the concerted action. The new governance system for the Energy Union must enable the EU to effectively monitor and guide this process. It should include a mechanism through which adjustments can be made if evaluations of progress indicate a risk that the target will not be achieved.

1.7. What is the best way of expressing the new EU energy efficiency target for 2030:

The target must be expressed in hybrid terms: Energy intensity (relevant for certain sectors, i.e. industry) and the absolute amount of energy savings through energy efficiency measures. The latter should include both primary and final energy savings.

1.8. For the purposes of the target, energy consumption should be:

Expressed as energy, regardless of its source (as now).

2. Article 6: Purchasing by public bodies of energy efficient buildings, goods and services

2.1. In your view, are the existing EU energy efficiency requirements for public procurement sufficient to achieve the needed impact of energy savings?

No. There is no coherent and ambitious set of rules in place. Certain rules are part of the EED and others of the new Public Procurement Directive (2014/24/EU). Its articles 67 and 68 stipulate that public contracts shall be awarded to the most economically advantageous tender. This is an improvement compared to its predecessor which allowed contracts to be awarded to the lowest price. Now, the energy use during product use must be taken into account; but no specific energy efficiency requirements are set. Better coordination with the EED is desirable. The current art. 6 (EED) is restricted to central government purchasing, which substantially limits its impact.

Furthermore, EU Green Public Procurement requirements for office buildings (public & private) are being developed, but the process has been lengthy and contradictory. The latest draft seems to require new office buildings to achieve only an energy performance class C which would be unacceptable. Again, a better coordination is needed.

2.2. How could public procurement procedures be improved in the future with regard to high energy efficiency performance?

The requirements of article 6 (EED) should be extended to all public authorities, and clear performance levels should be set for buildings. All (with certain exceptions) buildings, newly built or rented by public authorities, should meet nearly zero energy standards. A cross reference to Article 67 of the Public Procurement Directive 2014/24 should be added to article 6 and Annex III (EED) in order to ensure that contracting authorities base the award of public contracts on total cost of ownership.

2.3. Do you think that there is sufficient guidance in your country to characterise "energy efficient products, services and buildings"?

Yes. Guidance could certainly be improved, but a lot is already available due to the energy labelling requirements for many energy-using products. Regarding buildings, Energy Performance Certificates have been introduced along with performance criteria for the different energy classes. Their quality needs to be improved through the EPBD revision (development of building passports, qualification of auditors).

Furthermore, a clear target has been set according to which all new public buildings must have nearly zero energy demand from 2019 onwards. As to services, we are not aware of any methods to assess their energy efficiency.

2.4. Have you seen information campaigns or other public initiatives in your or in another EU country that explain public procurement of energy efficient products, services and buildings?

No answer.

3. Article 7: Energy efficiency obligation schemes

3.1. Are you aware of any energy efficiency measures that have been carried out or are planned in your country, by the utilities or third parties in response to an energy efficiency obligation scheme?

Yes.

Generally, according to the study Ricardo AEA (2015), 48% of the savings from article 7 were achieved through measures in buildings.

Examples of national measures include the following:

Austria: 40% of measures included in Energy Efficiency Obligations (EEO) have been directed to households.

France: A study on the cost-effective potential of actions in the building sector (40%) has been carried out (http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/151001_Lettre_d_information_CEE.pdf)

Italy: Tax deductions were introduced for energy efficiency improvements in buildings.

3.2. In your view, is Article 7 (energy efficiency obligation scheme or alternative measures) an effective instrument to achieve final energy savings?

Yes.

If yes, please explain your answer:

Article 7 introduces a binding savings target combined with significant flexibility in the way it can be implemented at national level. .

The latest national survey shows that the 20% efficiency target for final energy will probably be achieved. Article 7 has been key to delivering the savings towards these targets.

If well implemented, EEO can become an effective tool to realise energy savings. Their weakness clearly is that obligated parties have only an interest in collecting a certain number of points. This favours a focus on low-hanging fruits without a long-term vision on realising the full savings potential. In particular, in the case of buildings, this can lead to substantial lock-in effects.

At a time when Member States are facing serious budgetary constraints, the EEO approach avoids the involvement of public funding to stimulate energy efficiency.

3.3. What are, in your view, the main challenges or barriers to implementing Article 7 effectively and efficiently in your country?

- Strong opposition from energy suppliers and distributors to set up an energy efficiency obligation scheme
- Ensuring sound and independent monitoring and verification of energy savings
- Ensuring consistent application of the requirements with other energy efficiency legislation (e.g. building codes)
- Limited timeframe (2014-2020) that makes it hard to attract investment for long term measures
- National EEO usually favour "low-hanging fruits" which can lead to significant lock-in effects in the case of buildings. EEO should promote (staged) deep renovation.

3.4. Do you believe that the current 1.5% level of energy savings per year from final energy sales is adequate?

Agree.

The 1.5% is adequate. However, in reality only 0.8% energy savings are being delivered due to flexibilities that allow Member States to exclude the energy used in the transport sector from the baseline applied to the calculation of the target. Another example is exemptions such as allowing

the phasing of savings and counting savings from before 2014. This should be removed to ensure 1.5% savings is truly delivered every year and the article reaches its potential.

3.5. Should energy efficiency obligation schemes have specific rules about energy savings amongst vulnerable consumers?

Yes.

First of all, it would be necessary to develop a European definition of "vulnerable consumer". Is it the same as "fuel poor"? The latter term describes the problem in clearer terms, but a European definition is also missing. For the purposes of this directive, it should be limited to covering the heating and cooling needs of dwellings, as this is an issue of public health and, sometimes, even survival.

As energy renovation is the most sustainable solution to overcome fuel poverty, it should be included as a goal in article 7. A general policy objective to overcome fuel poverty should be added to article 4 (long-term strategies for building renovation).

4. Articles 9-11: Metering, billing information and cost of access to metering and billing information

4.1. Overall adequacy: Do you think the EED provisions on metering and billing (Articles 9-11) are sufficient to guarantee all consumers easily accessible, sufficiently frequent, detailed and understandable information on their own consumption of energy (electricity, gas, heating, cooling, hot water)?

No. The need for information is wider than just smart meters. Consumers should be informed about their consumption as well as about the available savings potential in their building and the various ways to realise it. It is through a managed interaction between an energy efficient building envelope and the installed equipment and controls that the best energy performance results are achieved. The installation of metering and billing technologies should facilitate the implementation of other energy saving measures (through actions taken on the envelope, equipment, building automation technologies and behaviour change).

Article 9 should also specify that consumers shall be charged for their actual consumption and not by square metres, otherwise there is no incentive for behaviour change.

4.2. Do you think it appropriate that the requirement to provide individual metering and frequent billing (Articles 9(1), 9(3) and 10(1)) is subject to it being technically feasible and/or cost effective?

No. Given the need to put the consumer at the heart of EU energy policy, it is crucially important that empowerment of consumers takes place. One of the first steps for empowerment is the delivery of reliable, timely information and the best means to ensure this is through individual metering and frequent billing.

As to the role of metering and cost-effectiveness, see the overview including specific cases for SE, DK, AT and FR at:

<http://www.housingeurope.eu/resource-498/heat-metering-efficient-heat-cost-allocation-and-billing---challenges-and-opportunities>

4.3. Should such conditions of being technically feasible and/or cost effective be harmonised across the EU?

No opinion.

4.4. How would these conditions of being technically feasible and/or cost effective affect the potential for energy savings and consumer empowerment?

No opinion.

4.5. Smart meters: Do you think that A) the EED requirements regarding smart metering systems for electricity and natural gas and consumption feedback and B) the common minimum functionalities, for example to provide readings directly to the customer or to update readings frequently, recommended by the Commission together provide a sufficient level of harmonisation at EU level?

No opinion.

4.6. What obstacles have national authorities/actors faced in introducing on a large scale individual meters that accurately reflect the final customer's actual energy consumption? Do you have any good experiences to share on how to overcome these obstacles?

No opinion.

5. Article 20: Energy efficiency national fund, financing and technical support

5.1. What should be the most appropriate financing mechanisms to significantly increase energy efficiency investments in view of the 2030 target?

- Financial mechanisms must be embedded in coherent long-term policy strategy;
- Stop-and-go effects must be avoided to encourage long-term investment strategies in the construction sector;
- Address specific market failures in order to secure high public value outcomes and enable risks to be shared with the private sector.
- Review General Block Exemption Regulation to permanently increase energy efficiency exemptions to 100% of eligible costs (similar to infrastructure and RES). Energy efficiency funds should be redefined as economically sound entities pursuing a goal of economic viability and cost.
- Review accounting treatment of investment in demand side and energy efficiency to consider off-balance sheet treatment. The Energy Union sees energy efficiency as a priority and it should be treated like other public infrastructure which would require both the Commission and Member States to undertake a full economic appraisal of the costs and benefits on delivering investment programmes.
- Leverage private sector investment through greater use of financial instruments over grants.

5.2. Should there be specific provisions aimed at facilitating investment in specific areas of energy efficiency?

Yes.

If yes, specify your answer from the below list:

- Building renovation
- Energy use by industries
- City and community infrastructures in relation to transport, waste heat recovery, waste-to-energy

5.3. Do you agree that one way to increase the impact of energy efficiency investments could be through making the energy performance/savings monitoring mandatory under Article 20 whenever public funds/subsidies are used for EE investments? Such monitoring could be done, for example, via on-line platforms, by users in the regular intervals.

- Agree

6. Article 24: Reporting and monitoring and review of implementation

6.1. Do you think that the existing reporting and monitoring system under the EED is a useful tool to track developments with regard to energy efficiency in Member States?

No.

If no, how do you think it could be improved in the future?

Generally, the existing reporting and monitoring system under the EED is a good basis to track developments concerning implementation in Member States, but improvement is needed. On the reporting side, the Energy Union governance initiative is an interesting step forward. It should ensure that provisions are transposed and implemented at national level, so that the ambition is achieved and benefits are delivered.

Reporting from Member States should be done more transparently and in a more convergent way. On the monitoring side, more guidance, as well as more systematic and quicker enforcement from the Commission would be helpful in order to ensure that transposition and implementation is undertaken on time using quality provisions. All in all, the new governance system should be viewed as a tool to achieve the long-term ambition for energy efficiency, such as monitoring and encouraging progress on implementation of long-term renovation strategies (art. 4).

6.2. Do you think that the reporting of national indicators (for example, value added/energy consumption, disposable income, GDP etc. for year (n-2) under Annex XIV (1)(a)) of the EED should be simplified?

Yes.

A binding and standardised template for reporting would make reporting easier, more transparent and comparable, thus allowing developments and implementation of energy efficiency policies to be more easily and effectively tracked. Standardised energy data, definitions and indicators should be used to increase transparency and provide clarity.

6.3. Do you think additional indicators (in addition to those referred to in Annex XIV (1)(a) – (e)) are needed to improve monitoring to assess Member States' progress towards their energy efficiency targets?

Yes.

As buildings are one of the priority sectors, and the implementation of art. 4 requires a detailed knowledge of the building stock, indicators should be added on the

- total building floor area of the buildings which do not meet the energy performance requirements referred to in Article 5(1);
- the total building floor area of heated and/or cooled buildings that was renovated in the previous year or the amount of energy savings in the building stock;

More generally, indicators on investments in energy efficiency and resulting indicators such as numbers of jobs created should be added. This would increase the visibility and understanding of the multiple benefits of energy efficiency and how having ambitious targets for energy efficiency can drive these benefits.

Part II – Technical questions (on Articles 6 and 7)

7. Article 6: Purchasing by public bodies of energy efficient buildings, goods and services

7.1. Do you believe that measures on public procurement of energy efficient products, services and buildings should become mandatory also for public bodies at regional and local levels?

Yes.

The current Article 6 links measures on public procurement of energy efficient products, services and buildings to cost-effectiveness. Hence, regional / local authorities would, by definition, save money over the lifetime of such investments.

Clear and ambitious energy performance levels should be set for all new and existing public buildings whether they are owned or rented by the public body.

In addition, there should be a minimum threshold for performance specified, such as the nearly zero energy performance level, as the aim of the provision should be that all public buildings have nearly zero energy demand by 2050.

A cross reference to Article 67 of the public procurement Directive 2014/24 should be made in Article 6 and Annex III (EED) in order to ensure that contracting authorities base the award of public contracts on total cost of ownership.

7.2. In your view, what are the main barriers that prevent the use of energy efficiency requirements in the existing public procurement procedures (please select from the list and explain your reply:

- There is insufficient expertise and/or knowledge on the use of energy efficiency requirements in public procurement
- Thresholds are too high which is why energy efficiency requirements do not apply to many contracts

The main reasons for our reply are the following:

- Awarding contracts to the lowest initial price is fairly straight forward and more easily justified to the public. Other methods, including considering lower life cycle costs can be more complex.
- Since most public authorities work on the basis of annual budgets, they tend to look at expenses during the current year, instead of life cycle costs spread over many years.
- Public authorities are often not aware of the life cycle costing approach and do not understand what it means for a particular public contract (energy-using products, buildings etc.).

7.3. In your view, should all EU public procurement rules relating to sustainability (including in particular energy efficiency in buildings, the use of renewable energy sources, etc.) be gathered into a single EU guidance framework?

No.

It would appear logical to have just one piece of legislation comprising all requirements for public procurement. However, experience has shown that it is very difficult to include ambitious requirements on energy efficiency in the Public Procurement Directive, as it is very much focused on procedures. Therefore, the EED may continue to specifically address the energy-related aspects of public procurement. As regards related procedures, it should refer back to the Public Procurement Directive. Inversely, the Public Procurement Directive should refer to the EED provisions concerning energy efficiency in public contracts.

7.4. Do you think that there is sufficient guidance/framework to know what is meant by "energy efficient products, services and buildings"?

Yes.

Guidance could certainly be improved, but a lot is already available thanks to the energy labelling requirements for many energy-using products. Regarding buildings, Energy Performance Certificates have been introduced along with performance criteria for the different energy classes. They should be transformed into building passports and improve in quality. Furthermore, a clear target has been set according to which all new public buildings must have nearly zero energy demand from 2019 onwards. As to services, we are not aware of any methods to assess their energy efficiency.

7.5. While energy efficient products will be cheaper to operate, their initial cost might be higher and a longer period of time will be needed to "pay back" this higher cost. Is this a problem and if so, how can public authorities overcome it?

This is still a real problem. Since most public authorities work on the basis of annual budgets, they tend to look at expenses during the current year, instead of life cycle costs spread over many years. Consideration could be given to the possibility to account for annual energy savings as income in public budgets during the lifetime of the investment.

The situation should improve in the near future, at least for larger contracts. The 2014 version of the Public Procurement Directive contains a clause that widens the tender award criteria to include life cycle thinking (Art. 67). Under the new wording, contracting authorities "shall" base the award of public contracts on the most economically advantageous tender which is defined on the basis of the price or cost, "using a cost-effectiveness approach, such as life-cycle costing".

8. Article 7: Energy efficiency obligation schemes

8.1. Emerging evidence suggests that most of the measures introduced under Article 7 have long lifetimes (20-30 years) and will continue have an impact beyond 2020. Do you share this view?

Yes.

This is to be understood as a weak "yes". The picture varies substantially from one country to another. Most measures implemented under the energy efficiency obligations should have a longer lifetime. Some alternative measures have shorter lifetimes. Investments in energy efficient buildings can be expected to deliver savings for 15 to 50 years. Certain industrial efficiency measures have shorter lifetimes due to short investment cycles.

The sunset clause should be removed to provide a longer term prospective to all stakeholders.

8.2. What is your view on the potential benefits (listed) of energy efficiency obligation schemes?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Lower energy bills for consumers			Lower bills are the consequence of any energy efficiency measure. Transaction costs for EEO might neutralise a part of the benefits and the focus of EEO on low-hanging fruits may limit savings and cause lock-in effects.	
Better awareness of energy efficiency potential by consumers			This is over-simplified. EEO tend to realise long-hanging fruits. Consumers are not necessarily made aware of full cost-effective savings potentials.	

Better relationship between energy suppliers, distributors and customers		This may be achieved provided customers feel they are well advised about saving potentials and proposed measures.		
Lower energy generation (and transmission) costs for the utilities		If EEO lead to lower peak demand, the efficiency of generation and transmission capacities can be increased.		
Improved business and administrative environment for up-coming innovative energy services	There is certainly room for innovative services.			
Aggregation of small-scale investments (pooling / bundling)		EEO can encourage the development of standardised solutions for energy efficiency which can be used with a pool of consumers, such as energy efficiency measures in multi-owner apartment blocks.		
Development of new financing models – e.g. energy performance contracting		This is a possibility but not a guaranteed outcome.		
Stimulation of energy efficient renovation of buildings			Ricardo AEA (2015) estimates that 48% of the savings from art. 7 stem from buildings. However, these are mostly shallow measures. EEO must stimulate the (staged) deep renovation of the building stock.	
Increased competitiveness in the energy markets			Competitiveness compared to what?	

8.3. Are you aware of any developments in the energy services markets that have benefited particular actors (e.g. service providers, suppliers, distributors, etc.) in Member States having an obligation to define the obligated parties under the energy efficiency obligation scheme?

No.

8.4. If you think that some requirements of Annex V need more precise guidance please list those requirements and specify briefly what further information you think would be useful.

No answer.

8.5. The current framework of Article 7 is set until 2020, linked to the energy efficiency target for 2020, which will expire at the end of 2020. In your view, should the Article 7 obligations continue beyond 2020 in view of the new energy efficiency target for 2030?

Yes.

The reasons for keeping the article and removing the sunset clause include the following:

- Despite its complexity, the article contributes to the 2020 goal. It will also play its part in achieving the 2030 energy efficiency target and ensure proper progress beyond 2030.
- Removing the framework would again trigger changes in regulations and add to the "stop-and-go" issue.
- Maintaining the framework would encourage the creation of long-term measures and schemes to deliver savings, building on experience of creating successful and effective schemes and provide increased certainty for investors. If the article 7 was not extended, many schemes and measures would not continue beyond 2020, which would be a waste of the efforts to date.
- A longer outlook would also encourage the inclusion of measures which deliver savings over longer lifetimes.

If yes, what factors should be considered for the future Article 7 (please select up to 5 options from the list, and explain your reply if possible):

- The possibility to choose between the energy efficiency obligations scheme and/or alternative measures should be retained.
- The exemptions under paragraph 2 should be retained but the level and number of exemptions should be reviewed.
- Currently, the minimum requirement only delivers 0.8% final energy savings, well below the 1.5% target. Flexibilities that allow Member States to exclude the energy used in the transport sector from the baseline applied to the calculation of the target and use of exemptions, such as allowing phasing of savings and counting savings from before 2014 should be removed. They are now obsolete, as measures will have been introduced and do not need a transition period, and savings before 2014 should have been included in the scheme to 2020.

8.6. Do you think that the scope of eligible measures allowed under Article 7 should be clarified?

Yes.

If yes, please explain your answer further:

- The scope of eligible measures should only be end-use energy savings (as it is at the moment)

Please explain your answer:

The scope of eligible measures should be limited to end-use energy savings following the trias energetica. Therefore, measures resulting in increased generation of renewable energy should be seen as complimentary and additional. However, measures should support the implementation of energy efficiency elsewhere in the supply chain (via Article 14 and 15), which help to reach the indicative national energy efficiency targets set under Article 3.

8.7. Would there be benefits in greater harmonisation of some of the requirements of Article 7 to allow more consistent implementation across Member States?

Provision of art. 7/Annex V	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Calculation methods	Better guidance would be helpful.			
Materiality	Better guidance would be helpful.			
Additionality	Better guidance would be helpful.			
Lifetimes	Better guidance would be helpful.			

Price demand elasticities for taxation measures in real terms	Better guidance would be helpful.			
Indicative list of eligible energy saving measures		Appropriate measures may differ between Member States. Hence, the list should not be prescriptive, but simply list eligible measures which Member States can choose from.		
Monitoring and verification procedures	Better guidance would be helpful.			
Reporting	Better guidance would be helpful.			

8.8. What role should the EU play in assisting the Member States in the implementation of Article 7?

The implementation of policies and measures should be closely monitored and enforced by the Commission. This will also help the Commission to better understand where clearer guidance to Member States is required. The Commission should assess national targets to ensure that the 2030 target will be achieved, and, if progress is not sufficient, propose additional measures.

An EU level dialogue with stakeholders should also be established to aid the development and implementation of policies.

8.9. Please state which best practice examples could be promoted across the EU and how?

Recommendations are included in the recent report by the Coalition for Energy Savings on the implementation of article 7 which can be found here (pages 25 and 26): http://energycoalition.eu/sites/default/files/20150316_Coalition-for-Energy-Savings_Updated_Art.7_report.pdf

8.10. Would it be appropriate and useful to design a system where some types of energy savings achieved in one Member State would count towards obligations carried out either by governments or by economic operators in another country, just as the option to cooperate on greenhouse gas emissions reductions already exists?

No. This would be the wrong approach. It should only be discussed when a country has demonstrated that the cost-effective potential for energy savings is fully tapped. No Member State is close to achieving this anytime soon. It is the (indicative) national energy efficiency target that triggers action. Such exchange mechanisms would impede ambition.

8.11. Would it be appropriate and useful to design a system where energy efficiency obligations would also include elements aiming at gradually increasing the minimum share of renewable energy applicable to energy suppliers and distributors?

No. EEO schemes on suppliers and distributors must be focused on improving energy efficiency with a clear focus on end-use applications. Measures to increase the share of renewable energy are complimentary and additional. Furthermore, increased energy efficiency automatically increases the RES share in the total energy mix.

8.12. Could the option of establishing an EU wide 'white certificate' trading scheme be considered for post 2020?

- Strongly disagree

This is not a correct approach at this point in time. The option should only be considered when a country has demonstrated that its cost-effective savings potential is fully tapped. No Member State is close to achieving this anytime soon.

It would cause serious acceptance problems if energy consumers in one country would finance energy efficiency measures in another (without having any say).

Furthermore, the obligated actors would continue to harvest the low-hanging fruits across Europe thus creating significant lock-in effects. The corrective measures that would have to follow might lead to higher overall costs.

Brussels, 28th January 2016

Abbreviations used in this reply are the following:

Art.: article

CEN: European Committee on Standardisation

EED: Energy Efficiency Directive

EEO: Energy efficiency obligations

EPBD: Energy Performance of Buildings Directive

ETS: Emission trading scheme

GHG: Greenhouse gas