



Covenant Territorial Coordinators, Supporters and joint SECAPs

Technical training on the Covenant of Mayors

JRC training for IUC contractors and FPI Programme managers







Regions and Provinces may join as Covenant Territorial Coordinators

- Support and coordination to **promote accession** to the CoM among municipalities in their territory
- Strategic guidance, financial and technical support to Covenant signatories
- Technical and strategic assistance to those municipalities lacking the necessary resources to prepare a SE(C)AP

Financial support and opportunities for municipalities to develop and implement their SE(C)AP





Further activities of CTC:

Development of emissions' inventory and/or **SEAPs**

- Adaptation of the methodology for preparing the SEAPs, by taking into account the **national or** regional context
- Training of local managers who will look after their SEAPs

Liaising with JRC and CoMO on behalf of the signatories



Some figures on CoM signatories' size



Shares of CoM signatories and population as a function of the size of the urban centre (up to 4 September 2016: 6201 signatories, 213 million inh.)



Achievements and Projections" (JRC, 2016)



Involvement of CTCs by country





Three countries show the highest share of signatories under a CTC:

- Spain
- Belgium
- Italy
- Local authorities up to 50k inhabitants generally require support from government bodies at higher territorial levels







No. SEAPs over no. of municipalities by region (NUTS2)





Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS)

- Aim: To provide a breakdown of the economic territory of the European Union into territorial units for the production of regional statistics and for targeting political interventions at a regional level
- a) The NUTS classification includes three hierarchical levels
- b) NUTS favours administrative units already existing in the Member States
- c) The NUTS Regulation lays down minimum and maximum thresholds for the population size of the Regions
- d) The NUTS are complemented at the lower level by loca administrative units (LAU)

for Climate & Energy



Districts and municipalities constitute a more detailed level than NUTS 3. These are called 'Local Administrative Units' (LAUs)

Two levels (LAU 1 and LAU 2)

Not all the Member States use the level of LAU 1; LAU 2 regions are defined for the whole EU

e.g. Germany

NUTS 1	NUTS 2	NUTS 3	LAU 1 (1)	LAU 2	
Lander (16)	Regierungsbezirke (38)	Kreise, kreisfreie Stadte (402)	Verwaltungs- gemeinschaft en (1374)	Gemeinden (11238)	j



A common feature to the three countries

LAU 1 level is missing in the administrative structure of BE, ES, IT.

	NUTS 1		NUTS 2		NUTS 3		LAU	J 1	LAU 2	
BE	Gewesten / Regions	3	Provincies / Provinces	1 1	Arrondissemen ten / Arrondissemen ts	44	-	-	Gemeenten / Communes	589
ES	Agrupacion de comunidade s Autonomas	7	Comunidad es Autónomas, Ciudades Autónomas	1 9	Provincias, Consejos insulares y Cabildos	59	-	-	Municipios	8117
IT	Gruppi di regioni	5	Regioni	2 1	Provincie	11 0	-	-	Comuni	8071
					Joint Research Centre				Cove for C	nant of Ma imate & Er

High administrative fragmentation (IT, ES)

 \checkmark

Many local authorities <10 000 inh.

European Commission



Case studies



СТС	CoM-related activities
Province of Barcelona (ES)	 200 signatories, 189 submitted SEAPs Technical support on inventories calculation and SEAP elaboration Financial support via ELENA technical assistance: 190 feasibility studies for energy efficiency in buildings, public lighting, renewable energies and legal studies (122.5 million euros of investments) Coordination of low cost actions: "Euronet 50/50" project on energy savings in school buildings
Province of Limburg (BE)	 44 signatories: 11 signatories <10 000 inhabitants 31 signatories from 10 000 to 50 000 inhabitants Scientific study to define the concept of climate neutrality Technical support in data collection for inventories and for actions' impact estimations "ESCOLIMBURG2020" project: partnership between the Province, an energy grid operator and a consultant. Aim: making the municipal and provincial buildings more energy-efficient and integrating renewable energy sources
Regione Abruzzo (IT)	 305 signatories: 278 signatories <10 000 inhabitants Support for the SEAP elaboration from 2007-2013 European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Operational Programme 20.7 million euros from ERDF for implementing one action in each municipality: high demonstrative effect Partner of the project "Alterenergy" for municipalities <10 000 inhabitants. Aim: improving their capacity to plan and manage integrated actions of energy saving and the production of energy from renewable sources







Some considerations and findings

- In IT and ES, CTCs support small towns (<10k inhabitants) in CoM-related activities. In BE, CTCs support also medium-sized local authorities (up to 50k inhabitants)
- The experience of ES, BE, IT shows that up to 50 000 inhabitants, local authorities generally require support from government bodies at higher territorial levels
- Many CoM signatories below 50k inhabitants have not yet submitted a SEAP, sometimes even being suspended





SEAPs developed by CTCs often have common characteristics...

BEIs are established and based on common data sources and approach

Common key areas of action

The estimates on forecasted energy savings related to the actions are calculated in a consistent way

SEAP documents are structured in a very similar way





...sometimes direct communication with small municipalities is not easy

The feedback report sent by the JRC is sometimes not received by the municipality

The language used in the report is not always understood by the recipient



The CTC ensures the correct transmission of any communication to the municipality and liaises directly with JRC/CoMO





The CTC-grouped approach for SEAP evaluation

Advantages of the approach:

- Better knowledge of the national/local conditions (CTC)
- Faster and more detailed analysis (JRC)
- Easier identification of any criticalities for the methodology adapted (JRC)
- Detailed feedback received in shorter time (CTC)
- Subsequent easier solution, applicable to future SEAPs under preparation (CTC)







How the grouped approach analysis works



- For the municipalities >50000 people the SEAP will be analysed on a one to one basis by JRC.
- CTCs will group their SEAPs based on the following population's thresholds:

10001÷50000

3001÷10000

<3000

...but they will also take into account other characteristics, such as:

- geographical and territorial conditions
- existence of industrial, agricultural, protected green areas etc...

For each group, the CTC identifies and communicates a representative plan to JRC.







How the grouped approach analysis works



The CTC provides JRC with a detailed description of the methodology adopted to develop the SEAPs:

- Description of the regional context.
- Identification of the local data sources (energy consumption and energy production).
- Approach used for BEI elaboration.
- Description of the strategic measures and key actions to be implemented in order to achieve the target.
- Description of how the CTC will support and coordinate the signatories.





How the grouped approach analysis works



- JRC analyses in details the methodology and the representative SEAPs and provides the feedback report to CTC
- Based on the outcome of the analysis performed on the methodology and the representative SEAP, JRC will accept/reject all the related SEAPs







How the grouped approach analysis works

Follow-up: JRC/CTC

- CTC will distribute and follow-up the feedback on the representative SEAP and the methodology to all the SEAPs it coordinates
- Subsequently, JRC may organize a follow-up meeting (preferably in Video Conference) with some of the CTCs' representatives to discuss the issues raised in the feedback report and the solutions identified by the Coordinator





Climate change has to be mitigated at **different levels of** governance

Small and medium sized local authorities need **support from other bodies** such as regions and provinces **acting as CTCs**

CTCs can help to create **economies of scale** in SEAP development and reporting activities

The European Commission should adopt **strategies to reach** and foster an active participation of an **increasing number of CTCs**

The governance model Signatory-CTC is expected to be successful in countries with an **administrative structure** similar to that of Italy and Spain







Future studies could:

- 1. Investigate **other possible circumstances** that have favoured this model:
 - **national policies** on sustainable energy
 - level of decentralization of competences on energy issues

2. Examine the role of CTCs in **SEAP implementation**:

- have regional authorities succeeded in executing energy efficiency or renewable energy projects in municipalities?
- have they created economies of scale on SEAP implementation?









First considerations...

- ⁸ Respecting the CoM requirements is often challenging for signatories (e.g. sending the plan within the deadline)
- [©]For small municipalities, planning sufficient actions to reach the minimum target may be challenging

Output Adjoining municipalities may wish to implement collective actions ©Sometimes good opportunities for effective actions may be found beyond the municipal boundaries (e.g. supra-municipal public transport) [©]Possibility to create economies of scale (e.g. joint public procurement) **Covenant of Mayors** 22



for Climate & Energy



The SE(C)AP: standard, joint Opt. 1 e Opt.2

	Standard SE(C)AP	Joint SE(C)AP Option 1	Joint SE(C)AP Option 2
Emission reduction target	Individual	Individual	Shared
BEI/RVA development	Individual	Individual	Shared
SE(C)AP development	Individual	Shared	Shared
SE(C)AP approval	The Municipal Council approves the plan	Each Municipal Council approves the joint plan	Each Municipal Council approves the joint plan
SE(C)AP submission	Individual template	Individual template	Shared template



23



Joint SE(C)APs: Pros and cons



Option 1

Greater visibility for each municipality

Greater autonomy compared to other members of the group

- 😕 Less flexibility for the achievement of the individual target
- Over the second seco calculation and SE(C)AP preparation
- 😕 Greater effort for monitoring and reporting

Option 2

Greater flexibility for the achievement of the shared target

Economies of scale in SE(C)AP preparation and implementation

Less resources needed for data collection and BEI calculation

- Bigger coordination effort with $(\ddot{})$ other municipalities
- 😕 Less visibility to individual municipalities



for Climate & Energy



