

CA ESD Interview Questions

2nd Plenary Meeting Interview Questions for Member States

Country: FRANCE

Name: CHEYROU Laurence and TRAUCHESSEC Elodie

Organisation: Ministry of environment / ADEME

Role in ESD implementation: Definition, implementation and evaluation of EE measures, writing of the NEEAP

Q1. How long have you been with the Concerted Action?

Since Lisbon meeting (for Laurence), since Warsaw meeting (for Elodie). Representatives of the ADEME and of the Ministry have been involved in the Concerted Action since its beginning.

Q2. Has the CA ESD improved your working relationships with other participating countries?

Yes

How have you otherwise benefited from the network, exchange of information and experience within the CA-ESD?

Mail exchange with participants on dedicated subjects.
Involvement in CT4 has led us to learn a lot about ESCOs and energy services (through the analyses of other MS answers).

Q3. Can you give us any concrete examples (e.g. policy measure, methodology, organisation) of best or good practices that you have learned about through the CA ESD and have taken on board, in some way, whilst developing national policies?

For example, discussions in Lisbon about writing the 2nd NEEAP have been really helpful, and have helped us, among other benefits, to better see how to organize us in order to calculate the achievement of the ESD 2010 target.

Q4. Has the CA supported your work in generating awareness for energy efficiency and the ESD with national policy makers and other stakeholders?

Yes

If yes, how?

For example, discussions about evaluating energy savings have helped us a lot to better understand the benefits and limits of the different evaluation methods, and to be much aware of that in the perspective of the EE directive negotiations.

Q5. What has been the most useful CA ESD product/output for you? (PMs, WG Reports, website, Forum,

1

Published date: 14th March 2012

Newsletter, National Summary Reports, public documents, other)

PM and WG reports are for us the heart of the CA ESD

Q6. Do you attend other Concerted Action meetings – CA RES or CA EPBD?

No

Q7. What is your national dissemination strategy when it comes to CA ESD material and the outcomes of the Plenary Meetings?

Dissemination through the French CA ESD Team: ministry (office for energy savings), ADEME, Armines

To how many people, and to whom, do you send the final reports and other outputs of the CA ESD?

About 10 people in the ministry and 3 in Armines. Main outputs are also disseminated among the members of the ADEME Climate Service (about 10 people) and to each service/engineer working on one of the CA ESD Core Theme topics.

What methods do you use (meetings, email, presentations, etc)?

Mainly through emails, call-conferences (before and after each PM)

Are you aware of the NCP toolkit on the website?

Yes

Q8. What is your feedback regarding the new in-depth topic and sessions? How was your experience in trying to identify your expert(s) to attend these sessions?

The concept of in-depth sessions is very interesting.
It's quite difficult to motivate experts outside dedicated experts in Ademe, Armines and ministry, but at the end we have managed to find the right expert for the public procurement in-depth session

Q9. Do you have any other remarks, comments or feedback you would like to give us on specific or general elements of the CA ESD?

The CA ESD is a very precious time of exchange about EE issues. It helps very much to develop a common culture about these issues between MS, and to learn from each other.
It could be very valuable to focus on best practices / measures now described in the 2nd NEEAP, to exchange more in depth about the implementation of EE measures.

Overall, the content of the WG reports and sessions is very interesting. However some sessions remained at a too general level, facing some difficulties in entering into concrete aspects and examples. Therefore, their interest in terms of experience sharing is much lower.

This has happened for sessions relying only on questionnaires, and not giving enough space for examples (both, in the report and during the session).

And the risk is higher when the topic of the session is not enough specified, leading to confusions among the participants in terms of scope, definitions, etc.

That's why we would suggest to limit the use of questionnaires to very well specified topics, and to include the

detailed description of at least two or three concrete examples in the first version of each WG report (the ones sent before the plenary meeting).

This would ensure the level and interest of discussions during the sessions.

Concerning discussions, some topics are only revealed during the parallel session, which may be disturbing as representatives are not experts on all subjects. We suggest that Working groups provide participants with questions to debate/elements to think about a while before the Plenary Meetings so that answers and questions can be prepared.

As suggestion for the next plenary meeting in October in Cyprus, it could be very useful to have a presentation by the teams of JRC and Energy Efficiency Watch about their review of the NEEAPS. This could lead to very fruitful discussions between the participants of the CA ESD about the methodologies that have been used, the trends that can be observed and so on.