

**Natural Energy Efficiency and Sustainability (NEES) Project  
Northern Periphery Programme (NPP)**

**MINUTES**

**NEES Project Meeting 2**

27 – 28 October 2011

**Venue:**

**Easterbrook House, Critchon Campus, Dumfries, Dumfries & Galloway, Scotland**

**Thursday, 27<sup>th</sup> October 2011**

**Attendees:**

Jose Ospina (JP)	NEES project co-ordinator
Rohinton Emmanuel (RE)	Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU)
Craig Thomson (CT)	GCU
Keith Baker (KB)	GCU
Thomas Olofsson (TO)	University of Umea (Umea)
Walter Unterrainer (WU)	Umea
Derek Bond (DB)	University of Ulster (Ulster)
Elaine Ramsey (ER)	Ulster
Janne Dragsted (JD)	Arteck
Michael Prenty (MP)	Clar ICH
John O'Leary (JO'L)	NEC
Thomas Fitzgerald (TF)	South Kerry Development Partnership (SKDP)
Frank Boyle (FB)	Irvine Housing Association Ltd (IHA)
Roger Curtis (RC)	Historic Scotland (HS)

**1.00 PM - Registration and lunch reception**

Meeting began with a light lunch, and informal discussions as the attendees arrived.

**2:00 PM – Presentations by Scottish Associate Partners**

Historic Scotland- Roger Curtis (Head of Research) introduced himself and the role of Historic Scotland in the conservation of buildings. He presented a series of slides related to work which they have been doing on housing in the Scottish context and specifically in relation to Victorian tenement buildings in Glasgow, and the Garden Boothy at Dumfries House in Cumnock, Ayrshire. RC outlined the focus in the UK with regards to construction skills being around new builds, and argued that as we recognise the significance of existing buildings, funding streams need

**Responsible**

to follow skills development in this context. The concept of sustainable upgrade was introduced, with a light and careful touch being often the best way to improve amongst other things the energy efficiency of historic buildings. RC outlined examples where hemp/ lime have been used and should be considered. The concept of external bounding was raised and clay boarding particularly being of relevance. RC observed that many historic buildings have an emphasis on conservation in relation to the frontage of the building, but are open to external insulation if deemed appropriate in many cases.

WG made a valid point about climate zones, and that for some of the measures being carried out in the Scottish context would simply be inappropriate in Sweden and what he described as Alpine environments due to the difference in the climate with the example of internal insulation being identified. This helped to provide focus to the need contextualise solutions for climate zones in both the criteria and materials selected.

Irvine Housing Association Ltd- Frank Boyle (Development Manager) introduced his role within a housing association which operates within the NEES area of Dumfries and Galloway. Although based in Ayrshire (outwith the region) they have a substantial housing stock within the region and an office in Dumfries. FB outlined that the organisation have recently been merged with the Riverside Group which is one of the UK's biggest housing associations. This has real implications for the way that Irvine HA will procure their materials as they will become part of an organisation with a larger and more developed supply chain. This issue highlighted the importance of procurement of materials for the NEES project.

FB outlined a new development in Ayrshire called Tarryholme where as part of this two semi detached demonstration properties are being developed with a focus on superseding the energy performance standards and at the same time focusing on the need to develop a healthy building. A priority on increasing energy efficiency for new build housing has the potential for implications on Indoor Air Quality and the impact this has on the health of those living in the buildings. FB discussed this project, and helped the NEES team consider the challenge of providing affordable housing which responds to the needs of the people and aligns with energy performance standards. During questions, the team discussed the issue of local suppliers and what constitutes a local material supplier.

**Action-** CT/FB to send JO Tarryholme housing report

**CT/FB**

## Work Package 2 Determining products, processes, services, opportunities and barriers

<p>Rohinton Emmanuel (of Glasgow Caledonain) provided a presentation outlining the progress that had been made in WP2. To remind attendees, he started with an overview of the project and how the terms outlined in the proposal needed to be used to guide the development of the survey of products, processes, services as part of this workpackage. RE provided a reminder of the NEES regions. From this he presented the development of headline indicators and the rational which had been developed by GCU for their development. RE reported that the criteria had been developed based on a mix of existing research at GCU and observations from the Scottish expert group which meet in September. The criteria had aimed to strick a balance between too many indicators and to few with the expert group stressing to the researchers that it had to be straight forward for companies to input data.</p>	<p><b>Responsible</b></p>
<p><b>1 Presentation of criteria and findings of discussion</b></p> <p><b><i>Definition of product, process and services</i></b></p> <p>The team discussed the implications of what should be interepted as a product, process or a service in the critiera.</p> <p>JO raised the issue that the Secetariate had raised the issue that not only natural mateials should be considered but also renewal/ recycable and and he had stated that this should be reflected in the criteria.</p> <p>JO raised the issue of energy efficient products and to which interpetation should be taken</p> <p>The team discussed whether the interpetation of this was 1) products for energy efficiency or 2) products which display energy efficiency in their lifecycle.</p> <p>A view was taken that these should be products that were for energy efficiency, but that in our criteria we need to assess whether they display energy efficiency in their lifecycle.</p> <p>JO argued that in his view, a focus on products would be more effective given the challange of reviewing a service (i.e. architect's service for energy efficiency using natural products) as there was a difficultly in assessing it.</p> <p>WU discussed the dynamics of systems used in design, which may not be a specific product but when components come together through design form an important part of energy efficiency in buildings.</p>	

Decision was taken to focus on products and systems primarily, and to then to map those who provide advice and guidance through the survey, and then any services around the product or system.

Products were defined as potentially aligning to labelling system; and a system was defined as natural system.

### ***Definition of natural***

The discussion moved to discuss Natural and given the Secetariate's focus, a deicision was taken to reflect Natural products that are Renewable/ Recycable. Products which relied on materials which were recycled from already processed materials could also be considered i.e. glass.

The issue of what is local presented the team with some challenges with regards to 1) what was local to the bioregion and 2) what was local to the NEES region.

A challenge existed as to whether to include only products which originated from the Bioregion or whether they would include organisations who were based in the Bioregion as solely a supplier (i.e. products brought into region) or whether organisations which were based outwith the NPP region but serviced it (i.e. in context of Dumfires, from Carlisle 34 miles away but not part of region).

DB observed that in other NPP projects they had used an understanding that you could consider people who worked in the NPP region, but were based in the EU.

This would allow the focus to be on the activity in the Region, as opposed to it being sourced from the region.

RC wondered if it was wise for NEES to generate a list of words to define what was meant by these terms in the context of the project. Given the specific remit of the project it was felt valuable to be prescise about how NEES was approaching these terms as they could have other conertations.

The need in the survey for a Disclaimer was discussed to relate to data protection issues, for those who are involved in the survey. This would ensure legal responsibility for the claims in the survey lies with the product developer and not NEES.

Partners agreed that a product was defined as something that is sold or traded

The type of product was also raised as to whether it was valuable to provide catogries from which products could be compared. The challenge

of comparing apples and pears was discussed, as some products will always have a poor rating in comparison to others and that it would be unfair and not relevant to compare them directly as they serve very different functions. NaturePlus was suggested and a decision taken to follow its classification.

Some of the other issues raised in relation to other criteria

Lifecycle cut off was discussed and lifecycle was seen as an important issue by the team. Challenge however exists around how to ask about this in the survey as many will simply not know or have run an LCA on the product. A question in the survey to ask whether they were aware of the lifecycle performance of their product, if so what was it?

From the feedback from GCU expert group and the wider NEES team, two important issues emerged which needed to be picked up in the survey, but more importantly explored in detail in the pilot project.

- 1) Life cycle
- 2) Lambda value

Vapour resistance was also discussed.

The issue of lifecycle could be addressed through transport and by processes stages.

### ***Sustainable criteria***

A decision was taken that a higher level questionnaire survey should be conducted encompassing whether the product meets the Energy Efficiency and Natural aspects. This would qualify the product for a second stage questionnaire (main) which would relate to its sustainability and be based on the criteria presented. The question “is the product sustainable” is seen as the basis for benchmarking the products, and by having a two stage process the 1st questionnaire can eliminate those which don't pass the basic criteria of the NEES project.

TO presented to the team the early work which was being undertaken from Umea. This related to the Website development and how it was aiming to support the survey in WP2, but also the general development of the project website.

### **Related Actions for criteria development**

**Action-** decision was taken to consider and discuss the implications of

GCU

<p>Secretariate recommendations for renewal and recycable.</p> <p><b>Action-</b> GCU to continue to evolve criteria in response to comments</p> <p><b>Action-</b> to develop a glossary of terms, especially to support the survey</p> <p><b>Action-</b> to use NaturePlus classifications for product types, and get the survey to align with this. This will aid comparison and allow products to be viewed in context.</p> <p><b>Action-</b> decision taken to replace use of 'traditional' with 'culturally acceptable' in all project material - global edit needed - suggested question for members is 'Please provide an example of this PPT applied to a historic building'</p>	<p><b>GCU</b></p> <p><b>GCU/ Umea</b></p> <p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p><b>2 Discussion around workplan for WP2</b></p> <p>Feb 2012 some data should be available to begin to consider within the database</p> <p>Partners were encouraged to consider their marketing to secure a sufficient sample. Different countries will require different solutions with some like Scotland relying on established networks and others favouring advertising through industry publications in Ireland. Need for the website to be up and running with at least the 1st stage questionnaire ready for population in time for this marketing to begin.</p> <p>The website was to be developed to allow a user to firstly be presented with stage 1 questionnaire, and then stage 2 following the completion and satisfaction stage 1. A time lag was presented as a possibility between these. Stage 2 survey will be developed for population in 1 month, and then reviewed every 6 months to ensure its effectiveness</p> <p>The team discussed the implications of aligning the development of the presented criteria with the development of the website and database.</p> <p>JO observed that partners should be meeting with their expert groups in the next few weeks to review the criteria and consider contextualiation for their context (language, climate, culture etc) and to consider the approach to data collection.</p> <p><b>Related Actions for development of WP2</b></p> <p>The following decisions were taken with respect to the nature, protocols and logistics of the WP2 Survey of PPTs</p>	

<p>1. The survey will be conducted in 2 stages</p>	
<p>a. 'Pre-qualification' survey – This stage will involve the collection of demographic data and whether the product qualifies under the 'Energy Efficiency' and 'Natural' criteria. Those that fail to meet this stage will be eliminated. Those that pass will be invited to go on to Stage 2</p>	<p><b>GCU</b></p>
<p>b. Full Survey - GCU team will present the modified criteria for the full survey, taking into account all the comments raised at the Second Project Meeting. This stage is open only to those products and processes that pass Stage 1.</p>	<p><b>GCU</b></p>
<p>2. All survey participants will be required to submit evidence for fulfilling legal requirements (and codes as applicable) indicating the suitability/applicability of their products</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p>3. Data protection requirements will be adhered to</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p>4. Contact Information Commissioners Office regarding any likely issues with data protection</p>	<p><b>KB</b></p>
<p>5. Partners will decide which product/process passes Stage 1; An expert panel convened by the NEES project will recommend the final list of products and processes that the NEES project will champion.</p>	<p><b>ALL</b></p>
<p>6. Expert group meetings held in each partner region, should consider criteria and consider contextualisation with the outcomes of this should be fed back to GCU</p>	<p><b>Umea</b></p>
<p>7. RE will re-send 'How to publicise NEES' doc to partners and associate partners</p>	<p><b>RE</b></p>

## Work Package 3 Benchmarking

TO began to outline ideas for WP3. The connection between WP2 and 3 had always been closely linked and to an extent difficult to untangle. However, after a good discussion the role of WP3 became a lot clearer.

### Discussion about direction of WP3

The team came to the position, that the selection of materials and the associated benchmarks around which this is developed would be decided upon by expert groups. The team discussed the challenge of developing quantifiable measures from the survey which were legitimate for comparison, and came to the conclusion that the outputs of the survey should be interpreted instead by a group of experts. They would understand the NEES criteria and then consider the products which had been identified as suitable for consideration for demonstration and recommend a set number to the NEES partners for each region. This decision would be based on the outcome of the survey, but also on their experience of working with these products within the regional context.

A need exists for members of the expert group to declare if they have a conflict of interest.

JO felt this would be similar to expert panel which was used for evaluation of renewable energy projects in another funded project and that the model used for this should be consulted.

How the expert group should meet was discussed, with implications for how many days and the costs for their time. The composition and payment issues were to be revisited in day 2 of the meeting.

It was suggested that it may be possible for permission to be granted from the Secretariat for the meeting to be held outside of the region. Copenhagen was suggested as a potential venue if it was easier.

DB suggested that a title which had been used in another project was a Business Advisory Group and this could be adopted in this context.

### Related Actions for WP3

**Action-** A selection criteria is required for members of the expert group. Two experts from each region were agreed upon as the number.

**Action-** A selection criteria was required for evaluation of the products (or a protocol)

Umea

Umea



## Website development

Attention turned back to the website and TO took the attendees through some of the early functionality.

### Discussion around the website development

It was suggested that promotional material, photographs etc should be placed on the website in addition to minutes of the meetings. Different areas for the website were discussed, with a partners area, members area and areas with free access permitted. Security would be through a password. The partners area should be able to store project documents, logo's which to use, minute meetings. The members area should include the second stage survey and details of events and the demonstrations, in addition to training materials etc.

Password for the site at the moment is the project name (NEES)

Websites - draft - [www.neesonline.netii.net](http://www.neesonline.netii.net) - final - [www.neesonline.org](http://www.neesonline.org)

The importance of the website as the window through which the project was viewed was stressed. Any language/ translation issues needed to be identified and developed by the relevant partner region.

### Related actions concerning website development

**Action-** A project summary should appear on the website

**JO/ Umea**

**Action-** website addition - 'Apply for Membership' button (linked to PQQ)

**Umea**

**Action-** clarification of terms used in website needs - Partners, Associate Partners, Members, Experts

**Umea**

**Action-** Develop and coordinate News section of website

**Umea**

**Action-** agree and coordinate templates for promotional material

**JO/ TO**

**Action-** circulate draft case study (as submitted to the EU) along with comments

**JO**

**Action-** send photos and case studies to JO and TO

**ALL**

**Action-** Join LinkedIn group 'European Project Communication'

**ALL**

**Action-** Umea / JO - commission NEES logo and circulate

**Umea/ JO**

**Action-** Press releases - need to get permission from the EU if partner organisations will not publish EU logos on standard press releases

**ALL**

<b>Meetings Schedule:</b>	
May 2012 - Umea;	<b>Umea</b>
Oct 2012 - Ulster;	<b>Ulster</b>
May 2013 - ? Greenland looks too difficult so suggestion of Copenhagen (with EU permission)	<b>Artek/JO</b>
<b>6:30 PM - End</b>	
<b>8:00 PM – Dinner at Aston Hotel</b>	

## **Friday, 28<sup>th</sup> October 2011**

**Attendees on 28th:** Jose Ospina (JO) (NEES project co-ordinator), Rohinton Emmanuel (RE), Craig Thomson (CT), Keith Baker (KB) (Glasgow Caledonian University), Thomas Olofsson (TO), Walter Unterrainer (WU) (University of Umea), Derek Bond (DB), Elaine Ramsey (ER) (University of Ulster), Janne Dragsted (JD) (Arteck), Michael Prenty (MP) (Clar ICH), John O'Leary (JO'L)(NEC), Thomas Fitzgerald (TF) (South Kerry Development Partnership), Kevin McCartney (KM) (University College Cork).

	<b>Responsible</b>
<p><b>9:00 AM – WP 1 Management and Co-ordination Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activity Reporting (from the Lead Partner Seminar)</li> </ul> <p>Jose explained the Reporting process. The schedule of 6-monthly reports was circulated, as well as the deadlines for submission of the overall report. The overall technical reporting responsibility was the Lead Partner's (Jose's). But this has to be based on individual reports from each partner, which must be produced as soon as possible after the end of the reporting period. A template for these has been developed by UCC and circulated. This has to be produced by each Partner on a 6-monthly basis after the end of each reporting period. The 1<sup>st</sup> report from all partners (with the exception of SKDP) was set at Nov. 14<sup>th</sup>. This report should be e-mail to Jose and may also be sent to each 1<sup>st</sup> level controller with the financial report (below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Financial Reporting (from the Lead Partner Seminar)</li> </ul> <p>Financial reporting will follows the same sequence, every 6 months. The Partner Statement of Expenditure has to be sent to each Partner's 1<sup>st</sup> level controller together with timesheets, invoices, and receipts. Exact requirements should be discussed by each partner directly with their 1<sup>st</sup> level auditor. The template for this report has been circulated. Each partner should check with 21<sup>st</sup> level controller as to specific requirements. Copy of this Statement of Expenditure should be sent to Jose with the Technical Report (above). The deadline is also 14<sup>th</sup> November. The 1<sup>st</sup> level auditor will audit the Statement and provide a FLC Certificate of Expenditure, which will validate eligible expenditure. A copy of the documentation received from the 1<sup>st</sup> level auditor should be sent to Jose no later than the end of the year. Jose<sup>4</sup> will use this to produce and overall project report and claim by Feb 2012 (this is the deadline). Payment t will not be made until this overall claim is approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eligibility Rules of Expenditure (from Lead Partner Seminar)</li> </ul> <p>A copy of the Common Eligibility rules has been circulated and was discussed. All Partners should familiarise themselves with the requirements of eligibility. There was particular concern about the issue of</p>	

“overheads, distributed proportionately” and the reported difficulty of claiming these. All partners were advised to discuss this with their 1<sup>st</sup> level auditor and ensure that whatever system they were using to account for overheads was acceptable to the auditor. Jose recommended that this be done before the 1<sup>st</sup> claim. It was noted that ARTEK has already asked for a budget amendment for this reason, which is pending approval.

- Information and Publicity Requirements (from Lead Partner Seminar)

Partners were asked to ensure they are meeting publicity and information requirements, as specified by the NPP guidance. The Web Site and any information produced must recognise the contribution of the NPP programme and bear the EU logo. We are also awaiting a NEES logo for future use.

- Proposed NEES Technical and Financial Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

There would be no additional requirement to the Partner Main Activity Report and the Partner Statement of Expenditure, on a 6-monthly basis. However, WP co-ordinators have an additional responsibility in reporting progress on each individual work package. In doing so they are asked to bear in mind and report against the specific indicators for each WP provided in the application.

In addition to this, each Partner was asked to complete the Products and Services Indicators and Results section of the Main Activity Report, as this would be reported in cumulative form against the indicators approved.

**FB**

## Work Packages 4 – 6 Progress

- WP 4 Transfer of Best Practice (U. of Ulster)

Derek explained that U of Ulster Business School was the Partner and had considerable experience of the enterprise side of NPP Projects. They have been partners in a number of other projects, including some involving renewable energy. Their main concern would be testing the viability of the best practice products and services and the enterprises providing them, but also to gauge their transferability. Jose suggested that this needed to also include the long-term sustainability of the NEES Network and the services it could provide.

- WP 5 Demonstration Projects (SKDP)

Thomas from SKDP explained that they had only just joined the

**Responsible**

**U of Ulster**

<p>Partnership, taking over from CTC that had just withdrawn. As such, he was not really familiar enough to report on that SKDP's proposals were for this area, but would hope to do so at future meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WP6 Support and Training (ARTEK)</li> </ul> <p>Janne (ARTEK) made a PPP presentation regarding ARTEK's proposals for training. This presentation will be circulated with these Minutes. The presentation centred on the sort of training module that ARTEK intended to develop on the basis of Best Practise, once this had been identified. ARTEK has programmed for a substantial training event in October of 2012. Jose pointed out that this WP needs to not only include training, but also what sort of support the NEES Network can provide to enterprises manufacturing products and delivering services. This would require greater liaison between U of Ulster (WP5) and Artek (WP6).</p>	<p><b>SKDP</b></p> <p><b>ARTEK/U of Ulster</b></p>
<p><b>Action Schedule</b></p> <p>NEES partner main activity reports – to be completed by all Partners and e-mail to Jose by 14.11.11. Possible sent on to 1<sup>st</sup> level auditor by Partners with Statement of Expenditure</p> <p>NEES Partner statements of expenditure to be sent to 1<sup>st</sup> level auditor, possible with Main Activity Report, as soon as possible after 14.11.11 together with required timesheets, receipts, invoices etc.</p> <p>Partners need to contact their 1<sup>st</sup> level auditors to clarify any eligibility issues in particular in respect to tendering and requirements for claiming overheads, especially “overheads – pro-proportionately apportioned”.</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> level control completed audits to be e-mailed to Jose (and sent in original to Dr. Kevin McCartney, Cork Centre for Architectural Education, 9/10 Copley Street, Cork) no later than end of 2011.</p> <p>Jose will submit full report and claim for 1<sup>st</sup> project period (01.05.11 top 30.09.11) no later than Feb 2012.</p> <p>Next claiming period will be exactly 6 months after, 01.10.11 to 30.03.12)</p> <p>Work Package co-ordinators are asked to continue developing the detailed work programme for each work package and to report on progress at the next Partners meeting, in Umea.</p> <p>All regional co-ordinators should be holding minuted meetings with</p>	<p><b>All partners</b></p> <p><b>All partenrs</b></p> <p><b>All partners</b></p> <p><b>Al partners</b></p> <p><b>JO</b></p> <p><b>All partners</b></p>

<p>associates partners in their areas to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Disseminate the NEES survey</li> <li>b) Nominate experts for Panel of Experts</li> <li>c) Propose and clarify local pilot projects, and</li> <li>d) generally co-ordinate local activities</li> </ul>	<p><b>UCC</b> <b>U of Umea</b> <b>U of Ulster</b> <b>SKDP</b> <b>ARTEK</b></p> <p><b>All regions</b></p>
<p><b>Meetings Schedule:</b></p> <p>May 2012 - Umea;</p> <p>Oct 2012 - Ulster;</p> <p>May 2013 - ? Greenland looks too difficult so suggestion of Copenhagen (with EU permission)</p>	<p><b>Umea</b> <b>Ulster</b> <b>Artek/JO</b></p>
<p><b>4:30 PM - End</b></p>	

Jose Ospina  
NEES Project Manager