



**CONCERTED ACTION
ENERGY EFFICIENCY
DIRECTIVE**

Inventory of central government buildings

Executive Summary

WGR 2.1

**Core theme 2: Public Sector - public buildings and public purchasing
Working Group Report 2.1**

**Anna Salama, ENEA, Italy
Tadeusz Skoczkowski, KAPE, Poland
Zbigniew Szpak, KAPE, Poland**

Date: 4 April 2013

The new Energy Efficiency Directive (EED) - like the Energy Services Directive before it - states explicitly that public bodies at national, regional and local level should fulfil an exemplary role as regards energy efficiency. This demand for exemplary efforts from the public sector falls into two main categories: the exemplary role of public bodies' buildings (article 5) and purchasing by public bodies (article 6).

Article 5 of the EED permits two approaches, the "default" and the "alternative", and various flexibility mechanisms. The approach chosen by each Member States (MS) will determine their way of meeting their target, but both approaches should lead to an equivalent improvement in the energy performance of buildings.

The following conclusions were drawn from a survey of Member States and discussions at a CA EED meeting in March 2013:

1. Knowledge and experience of art. 5 are being steadily accumulated but at this stage are not sufficient to secure smooth and secure implementation in the majority of MS.
2. Inventory creation is a complex and costly task best carried out by central government. The process of art. 5 implementation should therefore be initiated, governed and monitored by central governments.
3. The MS reported few needs for clarification of the requirements of article 5.
4. The process of preparing the inventory of central government buildings is different across the MS. A few countries are well advanced, but a few are still in the conceptual phase of preparation.
5. The possible exemptions laid out in art. 5(2) were generally seen as second-order priorities, but should not automatically be seen as insignificant to the EED energy efficiency targets (art.3).
6. Relatively few countries have decided whether to choose the "default" or the "alternative" approach. The reasons provided for choosing a particular approach are varied and country-specific. Further work is required to identify more objective, cost-benefit based criteria.
7. For the "alternative" approach, establishment of the central government building inventory is not obligatory but is strongly recommended.

Subsequent discussions among CA EED participants led to the following recommendations:

1. MS should continue to develop their individual approaches in order to optimise how they will reach the renovation objectives set in art. 5.
2. The following topics seem to be worth for further discussions:
 - a. "precise definition of the scope of the obligation in art. 5"
 - b. "consider the building as a whole"
 - c. "the optimal number of buildings renovated yearly in the programs launched by the government"
 - d. "setting the level of ambitions in renovation to meet the balance between costs and profits"
 - e. "stable long-term funding for renovation"
 - f. "deep renovations and behavioural change"
 - g. "actions to address the lack of reliable data"
 - h. "how to prioritise the renovation of buildings with the poorest energy performance, where cost-effective and technically feasible"
 - i. "multiple occupancy"
3. The exemptions in art. 5(2) should be carefully examined at national level and presented to relevant bodies, e.g. military forces, architecture or historical heritage supervision authorities or religious societies.

They should be presented as a win-win-opportunity enabling energy cost reduction. Training on possible, applicable energy saving measures is recommended.

4. Assessment of the cost-effectiveness of renovating public buildings should include broader social and environmental considerations. The assessment of costs and benefits should be communicated to across society to explain to citizens the reasons why government is spending public resources on its own building stock.
5. As cost-effectiveness of approach seems to be the most important criterion when choosing between the "default" and the "alternative" approach, further elaboration of the issue is needed at the EU level as well as within each MS. MS should take into account national resources, experience and conditions.
6. Where possible, existing building stock databases, public or private, should be used as bases for the inventory required by art.5. Some good examples of such databases were reported by some countries.
7. The art. 5 inventory should serve other purposes and therefore its scope should be enriched by providing additional data, i.e. reduction of CO₂ emissions, energy intensity of the building measured in terms of one occupant or visitor. The idea of providing energy intensity and energy saving potential rather than floor area in m² was supported. Linking with energy audit databases seems to be realistic and helpful. A Geographical Information System (GIS) was suggested as an example of a flexible and appropriate instrument.
8. The work undertaken by central government should be promoted and communicated effectively to regional and local governments at the earliest possible stage to stimulate action at these levels. The use of a local energy agency is essential for effective and low-cost diffusion of information from central to local level.
9. Based on their experience of renovating public buildings, MS should encourage municipalities and other public bodies to adopt integrated and sustainable energy efficiency plans with clear objectives, to involve citizens in their development and implementation and to adequately inform them about their content and progress in achieving objectives. The Covenant of Mayors is an example of a good framework for this.
10. Methods for estimating savings potential under the "alternative" approach and for calculating savings stemming from measures other than renovations should be further elaborated as they play an essential role in the "alternative" approach.
11. The MS in which the EED and the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (EPBD) are implemented separately or with only loose connections should consider closer co-operation as the potential for synergy effects is large and, in some MS, remains untapped. The idea of establishing a joint Working Group of Concerted Actions EPBD-EED-RES is a step in the right direction.
12. As the renovation obligations set in art. 5 require substantial and stable long-term funding, secure adequate financial resources are of primary importance for MS governments EED implementation should be carried out in close coordination with art. 4 implementation (national buildings renovation strategies and plans). The provisions of art. 20 of the EED should be considered¹.

Good practice examples reported by the MS included:

- The Czech Republic: producing an inventory of central government buildings.
- Poland: an effective scheme for financing public building restoration; competitive criteria for project selection, transparent procedures; strict rules of monitoring of results.
- Sweden: the concept "Totalprojekt" and experience of implementing measures.

¹ Article 20 Energy Efficiency National Fund, Financing and Technical Support, p. 5. Member States may allow for the obligations set out in Article 5(1) to be fulfilled by annual contributions to the Energy Efficiency National Fund of an amount equal to the investments.

**For more information please email
tskocz@itc.pw.edu.pl**

Legal Disclaimer

The sole responsibility for the content of this report lies with the authors. It does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Union or the Member States. Neither EACI nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

The Concerted Action for the Energy Efficiency Directive (CA EED) was launched by Intelligent Energy Europe (IEE) in spring 2013 to provide a structured framework for the exchange of information between the 29 Member States during their implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED).

For further information please visit www.eed-ca.eu or contact the CA EED Coordinator Lucinda Maclagan at lucinda.maclagan@agentschapnl.nl



Co-funded by
the Intelligent Energy Europe Programme
of the European Union