

Evaluation and Monitoring for the EU Directive on Energy End-Use Efficiency and Energy Services

Report: Workshop carried out in Portugal

Authors

Aníbal de Almeida, Paula Fonseca, Tiago Fernandes

ISR-University of Coimbra

15 January 2008

evaluate
energy savings ^{EU}

coordinated by



Wuppertal Institute
for Climate, Environment
and Energy

supported by

Intelligent Energy  Europe

EVENT DESCRIPTION: EMEEES – Portuguese Workshop**(1) Title:**

“Directiva dos Serviços de Energia” – Energy Services Directive

No pictures available

(2) Date & location: 11 January 2008

Directorate General of Energy
Direcção Geral de Energia e Geologia
Av. 5 de Outubro, nº 87
1069-039 Lisboa

Telefone: (351) 217 922 700/217 922 800
Fax: (351) 217 939 540
energia@dgge.pt
www.dgge.pt

(3) Organiser:

ISR-University of Coimbra

(4) Number of Participants:

13 participants from Portugal. No participant from the neighboring country Spain. The invited people from the Spanish Government and the Spanish National Energy Agency excuse themselves for not being able to be present and they mention that they are aware of the work that has been carried out in EMEEES through the ODYSSEE Project group.

(5) Short description:

The workshop was carried out in the Directorate General of Energy premises, in Lisbon and lasted for more than 3 hours. The Director General of Energy, Dr. Miguel Barreto, hosted the workshop and was present most of the time.

The most important Electric Utilities were present, as well as one gas company, the National Energy Agency and staff from Energy Efficiency Division of the Directorate General of Energy. There was an active and productive discussion about the EMEEES work that is being carried out, and people was most interested to know if this work on

EMEEES will be the basis for the future methodologies to be issued by the EC and to be followed by each Member State in the future. We replied that yes, the EC is being informed about the developments on the methodologies, and they even take part in the discussions and in the project meetings. The Commission Committee responsible for the implementation of the ESD is being informed about this project regularly.

The audience was most interested in WhCs mechanisms for promoting Energy Efficiency, in particular people from the utility, for whom it makes sense to have a market based instrument because in such a system, "low efficient users" have to pay to improve their efficiency, while in DSM plans, all people who need the service will pay the bill for improving energy efficiency of some parts. However people from the Government think it makes more sense to have another DSM Programme in Portugal in the future. Information about the recent Plans of Energy Efficiency Promotion follows below:

Plan of Energy Efficiency Promotion (PPEC): Under the scope of the Decree law nº 97/2002, de 12 de April, the electricity regulator office ERSE, has launched in May 2006, Regulation Nº 8/2006, a call for DSM programmes: Portuguese Plan of Energy Efficiency Promotion. This plan attributes an incentive by the recuperation of the costs in DSM activities in the electricity tariffs. The utilities can yearly propose a DSM plan and a ranking of all the DSM measures proposed by the utilities, is made. The proposed measures in each activity sector with best position in the ranking, within the available budget in each sector, are approved and will be implemented. The first plan was entered into effect in 2007, and a second plan for 2008 one was recently approved by the regulator. Under this plan, EDP and other companies are finally implementing some large scale measures to improve energy efficiency.

All the participants are interested in following the developments within EMEEES, in particular the additional Top-Down and Bottom-Up methodologies under development.

(6) Objective & programme:

The objective of the workshop was to debate with the main stakeholders the need to promote energy efficiency and to raise awareness about the main steps for the Implementation of the Energy Services Directive, and to present the methodologies developed in the EMEEES project for monitoring and evaluation of energy efficiency programmes and measures.

Agenda:

14.30 Welcome

14:45 Introduction and project context :

The Energy Services Directive: objectives and scope

The EMEEES Project presentation

Terminology for working on monitoring methods

15:45 Development of bottom up evaluation methods

Examples (1): bottom up methods

16:45 Development of top down evaluation methods:

Examples (2): top down methods

17:30 Discussion

18:00 End of Workshop

(7) Results, follow-up:

Comment: Do not explicitly ask these questions, but report if there has been a debate about them, and what was debated.

(7.1) General questions

- Have there been any objections on our interpretation of the ESD target (i.e., only annual energy savings achieved and still „alive“ in 2016 (2010)?
- The suggestion of correcting for Autonomous Progress was not well accepted by all the participants. There was a general concern about the definition of the baselines and the consideration of Autonomous Progress in the possible adjustment of the baseline will be of critical importance.
- If yes, which kind of stakeholders objected?
- The stakeholder who did mention that autonomous savings should not be corrected was the Director General of Energy. In particular, for refrigerators, when replacing a refrigerator by a new one because of EE measures, the baseline should always be the old refrigerator.

(7.2) Bottom-up

- Was the 3-level approach accepted?
If not by all, which kind of stakeholders objected?

The 3 Levels of effort was well accepted by all participants, in particular by the electric utilities. One particular utility was in favour of using Level 3, because using default values may cause too conservative savings.

- Was the 4-steps approach accepted?
If not by all, which kind of stakeholders objected?
- Are there existing methods that we can use for refinement of our methods?
(Please do not explicitly ask for that!)
- Are there specific comments on the methods presented?

In relation to the VSD method, there was one comment related to the motors in which the VSD is going to be applied. We should know if the motor has already been

rewound or not, and how many times. Rewinding typically decreases motor efficiency by 1% up to 4%, depending on the methodology used for stripping the windings. In this case, the motor efficiency should be decreased by 1-4%.

There were no questions concerning the audits methodology.

The lighting methodology has raised the following question: What about if the lux quantity is also increased? If besides the improvement in energy efficiency of the systems, there is also an improvement in service quality? In some situations, specially in industry where the lighting levels are low (below recommended levels), this improvement may mean increasing the consumption.

Suggestion: Considering a coefficient to reduce the total savings achieved with the technological improvement?

- Particularly, are the EU default values proposed in the methods accepted?
- Care should be taken with the average EU default values proposed, which should be based in credible sources of information.
- Would the proposal be acceptable for the stakeholders present that only that part of early energy savings would be accepted that is due to *unitary* energy savings compared to the 2008 baseline for the end-use action targeted? Were there any differences between stakeholders?
- What were the positions by which type of stakeholders on:
 - the proposed principles for the choice of baselines,
 - the correction or not for free riders,

In many cases we should consider that there is a free ridership for small VSDs, as they are used for other reasons (process control) rather than energy savings. They will always be used, independently of the existence of incentive programmes.

- the correction or not for direct rebound effects?

(7.3) Top-down

- Is the regression analysis approach accepted?
If not by all, which kind of stakeholders objected?
- For the electricity end-use in the tertiary sector, the chosen indicator (kWh/employee) was not well accepted. We should use instead kWh/m³ (or kWh/m²). A potential difficulty is the lack of building data.

- Is the proposal to correct for market price effects accepted?
If not by all, which kind of stakeholders objected?
- Is the proposal to correct for autonomous progress accepted?
If not by all, which kind of stakeholders objected?
- Those belonging to government were not in favour of considering the correction for autonomous progress.
- What were the positions by which type of stakeholders on:
 - The time up to which to calculate the trend (1995 or just before major energy efficiency policy on the subject analysed was enacted?),
 - the choice of the trend (MS individual or „3 slowest“ MS?),

Individual MS is preferred choice.

 - the choice of price elasticities (MS individual or EU average or pooled?),

Individual Member States.

 - the correction or not for direct rebound effects?

(7.4) Questionnaire

Please tick one option

(1) What is the expected effect of the ESD and its implementation in Portugal to additional energy savings compared to the trend?

N° of Answers

- 0 no additional savings
- 2 few additional savings
- 7 9% savings
- 0 more than 9%

(2) What is the expected effort for measuring and verificate end-use energy savings?

N° of Answers

- 1 low
- 8 medium
- 0 high

(3) What is the expectation about the exactness of methods used?

N° of Answers

- 1 low
- 6 medium

2 high

(4) Desirability of high level of comparability and homogenisation of methods used

N° of Answers

0 low

2 medium

7 high relevance

(8) List of Participants:

Participant	Company
Alexandre Fernandes	ADENE – National Energy Agency
Álvaro Gomes	University of Coimbra / INESC
Aníbal de Almeida	University of Coimbra
Carlos Pimparel	Directorate General of Energy (DGEG)
Cristina Cardoso	Directorate General of Energy
J. Vitorino Reis	EDP-Gás
José Carrilho	Union Fenosa
Miguel Águas	IBERDROLA
Miguel Barreto	Directorate General of Energy
Patrão Reto	REN
Paula Fonseca	ISR-Universidade de Coimbra
Pedro Paes	EDP
Tiago Fernandes	ISR-Universidade de Coimbra