



Minutes NEES Partner Meeting Thursday 15th to Saturday 17th November 2012

Thursday 15th - Pre-Meeting at the City Hotel, Derry

Present: Christopher Parker (Desk Officer NPP), Alma Galleher, Finola (Clar ICH), Derek Bond, Elaine Ramsey, Stuart Thomson (U of Ulster), Thomas Olofsson (U of Umea), Kevin McCartney, Jose Ospina (CCAIE) Rohinton Emmanuel, Craig Thomson (GCU)

Christopher explained his concerns with respect to progress. He stated that the delay in submitting Progress and Financial Reports 1 and 2 was unacceptable, as it meant that the NPP had no way of knowing what progress there had been on the project to date. He has received drafts of both reports, but without the audit information they cannot be considered evidence of progress. Also, he had a number of concerns with the draft progress reports, especially with the lack of detailed reporting of all Partner's activities during each period, and the lack of detailed responses to the progress on agreed indicators.

He stated that unless Reports 1 and 2 were received by 31.12.11, he would report the Project to the Monitoring Committee as being in non-compliance of its contract with NPP.

Jose has previously explained that Report No. 1 is held up due to a minor query by the Southern and eastern Regional Assembly auditor that has delayed the UCC 1st level audit, thereby holding up the entire report. UCC would immediately move to unblock this delay. As far as the 2nd Report, 1st level reports for the 2nd reporting period have been received from GCU, Clar ICH, U of Ulster and U of Umea only. They are still due from UCC, ARTEK, NCE and SKDP. These 1st level audits must be finalised ASAP or we cannot make the 2nd Report.

Partners agreed that we would do everything possible to meet this deadline. The 3rd Report is due at NPP by **01.02.13**. This means that 1st level audits must be with UCC at the latest by **15.01.13**, so Partners should be submitting their accounts for 1st level audit now.

Friday 16th - Slieve Donart Hotel and Spa

Present: Alma Gallaher, Finola (Clar ICH), Rohinton Emmanuel, Craig Thomson (GCU), Derek Bond, Elaine Ramsey, Stuart Thomson, Norry McBride, Tom Woolley (U of Ulster) Colm Cryan, Mort (NCE and Thiel 1), Jing Qu (ARTEK) Kevin McCartney, Jose Ospina (CCAIE) **Apologies:** Thomas Fitzgerald (SKDP)

The meeting was chaired by Kevin McCartney (UCC)

WP1 – Formation of the Partnership, management of the Project, mentoring & evaluation of the project, audit. (CCAIE to lead)

Jose made a PPP presentation (attached) which covered what has been discussed with Christopher Parker. In addition, Jose pointed out



- a) There has been significant underspend during periods 1 and 2, and this was a worry to NPP, as this is the last period and they do not have time re-allocate budgets
- b) There has been significant under-reporting of Match Funding, we should be reporting 40% of all ; expenditure as Match Funding, and the level is much less

He suggested:

- 1) Review of the 2 draft Reports (1 and 2) is needed in order to try to add more detailed Partner activity information and more accurate indicators. A form for Partners to provide detailed indicators for each period has been circulated. Umea and SKDP have provided more detailed indicator information. In future, Jose would provide an excel sheet to facilitate return of this information.
- 2) Partners that are not co-ordinating WP's are asked to co-coordinate with Partners where WP's are starting. Specifically, NCE is asked to support SKDP in co-ordination of WP5 and Clar ICH to support ARTEK in WP6.
- 3) All WP's (especially WP4 (Exchange), WP5 (Pilot Projects) and WP6 (Training and Support) need to kick in NOW, and show significant activity and expenditure to make up for under spending.

WP 4 Transferability (U of Ulster to lead)

Stuart began with a PPP where he explained that U of Ulster was submitting a paper to the UK enquiry on energy efficiency in housing, and was asking for Partner contributions. GCU and ARTEK had contributed to date, but they were looking for input from other Partners.

Norry (?) the made a presentation regarding the research and support that U of Ulster would give to Best Practices as part of the NEES Project. They would apply a feasibility study that they had developed previously from use with their SME's, which would look at whether the operations were financially sustainable. They would examine all parameters, and develop a prototype template for NEES enterprises. This module would be developed by Christmas for circulation to partners for agreement. After tis U of Ulster would visit individual enterprises and apply the model.

This model once developed could be applied by other enterprise development bodies to establish the feasibility of other SME's.

WP 2 - Mapping resources (including models for behavioural influences & design approaches), and demand for natural energy efficiency and sustainability (NEES) in the partner regions (GCU to lead)

Rohinton presented a PPP (to be circulated).

He explained progress on the development of the NEES criteria, the 1st Call for best Practices, the setting up of the expert Panel and the selection of 6 best practices. He explained how a 2nd call had been launched, which was due to end on the 1st of February. It was hoped that a number of new Best practice proposals would be submitted, which could ten be evaluated by the Expert Panel, either remotely or/and with a meeting, in March. According to the number and geographic spread of submissions, we could decide whether a 3rd or even 4th Call would be needed.



It was clear that adjustments were still needed to the criteria. For example, it was unreasonable to expect that energy efficiency should be the primary objective of best practices; some would have other primary objectives (e.g. water treatment, construction, etc.) The 2nd call was being promoted primarily in Scotland, but there was nothing to stop other areas from securing submissions from appropriate bodies.

There was some discussion of the NEES posters that had been exhibited at the NPP. It was noted that a draft version had been uploaded for a while on the web site. This was not good as could lead to confusion and complaints. Draft material in future should only be uploaded on private section of site. Tom felt that all posters should have a disclaimer. This was agreed. Also that the NEES and the NPP logo should be on the poster.

It was important also to have a consistent version of the summary evaluations to put on the site with each best practice. Rohinton agreed to do a revised format for summary evaluation, and we would ask Experts to review the summaries on this basis.

WP3 – Benchmarking Best Practices (U of Umea to lead)

Thomas presented a PPP that explained progress on this WP (which overlapped with WP2) the web site was the primary instrument for hosting the Calls and promoting Best Practices. We would finalise the posters and summary evaluations to put on each BP web site entry.

Study Visit Hemp Crete House

A study visit was held, to Tom and Rachel's hemp Crete house in Downpatrick, and also their home which has been retrofitted with hemp Crete. A very good video illustrating the hemp Crete process was also shown.

Saturday 17th

WP 5 – Pilot Projects (NCE to lead)

The PPP prepared by SKDP was presented by Colm of NCE in Thomas' absence. It seems that demonstration projects have not been identified in many cases because partners were waiting for best practices to be identified. Partners also feel that the number and scope of best practices is very limited to date, to allow demonstration projects. However, a number issue arose from the survey, namely

- Partners themselves have few proposals for Pilot Projects that they have reported
- The Best Practices have a number of projects that they have carried out that can be used as Pilot Projects
- There was some question as to what the « services » demonstration projects could be (e.g a training course for Mud and wood ?)
- We need to be clear as to what we are proposing to do in relation to each demonstration project
- We need to define the objective of the demonstration projects

It was clear that Pilot (Demonstration) Project should include selected Best Practices.



Colm felt that we should have some consistency in what we testing in Pilot Projects. There are environmental indicators in the project in terms of CO2 footprint, reduction of waste and reduction of water use, as well as a number of social (e.g. fuel poverty, social inclusion) and economic, (e.g. jobs and investment). We must presumably aim at “testing” these benefits in the different pilots.

Colm would prepare a questionnaire for Partners (and possibly BP's) in consultation with SKDP in order to get more details about Pilot Projects.

It was recommended that ARTEK should get their Pilot Project insulation material supplier and installer, although Danish, to apply as best practices.

NCE would “co-ordinate” the pilot project WP%

WP 6 - Support and Training (ARTEK to lead)

Jing presented a PPP that explained how this WOP would be developed. She suggested a timetable, which included surveying for training needs, developing the modules, implementing them in the Training Meeting in Greenland (scheduled for August 2013) and disseminating them, on line and in the regions.

After some discussion, it was decided to forgo the “survey of training needs”. Partners felt that we (the Partners) can best define what sort of training is needed, and we know what our material is, the BP experiences. What is needed is to define the background, rationale and context of proposing this as an alternative approach, and then draw from the BP's themselves.

A more direct consultation with Partners would be held, on the basis of a revised survey drawn up by ARTEK in discussion with Clar. This would be sent out for completion by January 2013.

Support would be carried out under WP3 (Business Support) and through the web site. Clar ICH would “co-ordinate” the Support and Training WP6.

WP7 – Dissemination (U of Umea to lead)

Thomas presented this PPP. He went through the various dissemination instruments that the project has developed to date, including:

- Web site
- Press releases
- Posters
- Brochure
- Launch and Scottish event
- NPP exhibition

Some were still to be developed:

- E-newsletter – this would be used from now on. Umea would edit.
- Articles for inclusion should be sent to Thomas and Geza.



Clar ICH was producing a printed newsletter, and UCC producing an electronic newsheet.

Public events were expected in Sweden, Greenland, Northern Ireland and West of Ireland.

A public event would be held in Calremoriss in late March 2013. Combined with an Irish Partner's meeting.

The final project conference would be early in 2014 in Brussels.

Agreed that Umea should present a written Dissemination Strategy, for circulation and discussion, prior to the next Partner's meeting. This would include attendance at external events and events outside the region.

The NEES Network proposal would be developed as part of this WP, and would be focused primarily on the final Conference. In the meantime, we would work at development of what this Network should be, in future meeting, as part of WP7.

Additional conclusions and actions (CCAIE to lead)

1 – We would send copy of advice given by 1st level control to U of Ulster on Experts being simultaneously Associate Partners to Christopher (as he has suggested that all Experts should cease being Associates)

2- We would take steps to address concerns flagged up by U of Ulster legal department.

3- UCC to produce a PPP for presentation of the Project (for all to use)

4 – The 3rd Irish Partners meeting would be in Claremorris in mid to late March (doodle to be sent out)

5 – 5th Irish Partner's meeting would be in Greenland in August (Doodle to be sent out)

6 – 6th and Final conference to be held in Brussels in Feb-march 2014 (doodle to be set out)

The meeting ended at 1 PM

Jose Ospina
Project Manager
NEES Project