



Provincia di Cremona

EIE/07/064/SMART

**Strategies to promote small scale hydro electricity production in Europe
Second Meeting - 30th September and 1st October 2008**

Report

List of participants

Representatives from all the organizations that take part in the project attended the meeting. The following persons have participated in the discussions:

Marinko Maradin (Karlovac County)
 Zvonimir Guzovic (University of Zagreb)
 Branimir Matijasevic (University of Zagreb)
 Vesna Kolega (North-west Croatia Regional Energy Agency)
 Marco Antoniazzi (Provincia di Cremona)
 Sabrina Cassi (Provincia di Cremona)
 Giuseppina Maffini (Provincia di Cremona)
 Garofalo Elisabetta (CESI RICERCA)
 Peviani Maximo (CESI RICERCA)
 Julio Alterach (CESI RICERCA)
 Lilly Christoforidou (Regional Secretariat of Athens)
 Matthaios Prosopapis (Greek Ministry of Economic and Finance)
 Ole Gunnar Dhlhaug (NTNU)
 Horst Lunzer (Energieagentur)

Venue and participants

The meeting took place at Hotel Europa in Karlovac, Croatia.

The Karlovac County, which arranged the meeting as host partner with the collaboration of University of Zagreb, was represented by Marinko Maradin.

On the 30th September, at 9.30 a.m., Marinko Maradin opened the meeting: after welcoming the project partners, he mentioned the initiatives foreseen for the two-days meeting in the field of SMART project.

The list of all the participants and their contact details are enclosed in a separate attachment.

Topics of the meeting

WP2: handbook's topics discussion;
 WP3: cd-rom's index and deliverable's deadlines definition;
 WP4: presentation of the pilot areas for every region;
 Management: First Progress Report presentation;

WP2 - handbook's topics discussion

The University of Zagreb, as WP2's leader, noticed the stage of the contributions concerning the handbook (WP2):

| Partner | Chapter 1 (3 Pgs.) | Chapter 2 (3 Pgs.) | | Chapter 3 (9 Pgs.) |
|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| Province of Cremona | 5 Pgs. | Italy | Portugal | Spain |
| CESI RICERCA | | (14 Pgs.) | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------|
| Faculty of Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Univ. Zg. | 6 Pgs. | Croatia (6 Pgs.) | Serbia (6 Pgs.) | Bosnia & Herzegovina (5 Pgs.) | 13 Pgs. |
| Karlovac Regional Authority | | | | | |
| Norwegian University of Science and Technology | 4 Pgs. | Norway (3 Pgs.) | | | 9 Pgs. |
| Regional Secretariat of Attica | 9 Pgs. | Greece (6 Pgs.) | Bulgaria | Romania | 14 Pgs. |
| Energieagentur Waldviertel | 4 Pgs. | Austria (2 Pgs.) | Germany | Poland | 10 Pgs. |
| IN PROGRESS | YES | | | | |

Cesi Ricerca Spa, Regional Secretariat of Attica, Energieagentur Waldviertel said they will send as soon as possible the chapters still in progress (non later than 15 December 2008). Mr. Guzovic, leader of Work Package 2, as regards the coordination of work and the planning of the deadlines relating to WP2, said:

- he will start to analyze the first three chapters from each partner when every contribution missing will be sent;
- after this, he will study the weak and strong points of the different normative, with the help of all partners by mail, and will send its comments as soon as possible;
- the contribution from each partners on the first three chapters are much different and over the foreseen pages, so it need to decide how many pages to subdivide from every partner.

Mr. Antoniazzi suggest at maximum 150 pages for the handbook and 30 pages for every nation (five nation: Italy, Greece, Croatia, Austria and Norway): all partners agree with Antoniazzi.

Every partner started to present a summary of its first three chapters and to show which can be considered weak and strong points (the works are downloadable from the official website).

All partners agree to point out chapter n. 4 on the environmental effects of SHP, that are already described in different parts of the first three chapters, because institutional normative is directly linked to environmental normative, therefore it will be dedicated sub-charters inside Chapter 2 or 3. All partners agree to the following new updated official index:

“Introduction – Motivation, objective and content of the handbook

Chapter 1 – Inalienable principles regarding the right to use water in the in different EU countries;

Chapter 2: Analysis of the normative in different EU countries (including general overview of the situation of SHP implementation):

- a) Italy
- b) Croatia (FSB + Karlovac);
- c) Greece (RSA);
- d) Norway (NTNU);
- e) Austria (EAW4);
- f) Portugal and Spain: CESI RICERCA;
- g) Serbia and Bosnia: Karlovac County;
- h) Bulgaria and Romania: RSA;
- i) Germany and Poland: EAW4.

Chapter 3 - Analysis of enviromental and administrative procedures in the different Partners countries about S.H.P.:

- a) Introduction (legal S.H.P. definition, delegated and concerned Authorities);
- b) procedures and application technical documents to submit (technical, economic and environmental sections of the laws);
- c) Timing of procedures (from application to license granting);

- d) Costs (taxes, procedure fees, other compensation costs);
- e) Evaluation criteria (for all procedures);
- f) Procedures to connect the plants to the Grid;

Chapter 4: Critical review

- a) Weak and strong points of the different regulations regarding the points of chapter 4;
- b) Water conflicts;

Chapter 5: Strategies to improve existing regulations”

WP3 - cd-rom’s index and deliverable’s deadlines definition

The NTNU (Mr. Ole Gunnar), as WP3’s leader, noticed a delay in the definition of cd-rom’s index and in the WP3’s deadlines and first to suggest a strategy ask to every each partner to show its contribution.

Every partner started to present a summary of its contribution in the cd-rom (the works are downloadable from the official website). After this, Mr. Gunnar suggest these following cd-rom index:

“*CD-ROM INDEX:*

3.1 - Introduction of the purpose of the chapter

NTNU

3.2 - Policies, best practice and methodologies known from every public partner:

Cremona, RSA, Austria, Karlovac;

3.3 - Tools for a technical and economical evaluation of SHP already used from every scientific partner:

NTNU, CESI RICERCA, FSB, University of Zagreb, Austria, Greece;

3.4 - Financial analysis including subsidies:

NTNU, CESI RICERCA, FSB, University of Zagreb;”

All partners agree to Gunnar, after this, Mr. Gunnar suggest these following deadlines:

“*WP3’s DEADLINES*

Feedback on proposed strategy and list of contents on the CD-room 01.10.08

Every partner describes what features the tool needs to include with respect to each partners range of application 01.11.08

List of tools and descriptions of the tools and Input data that is needed for the tools: 15.12.08

First draft of the friendly tool with documentation 15.12.08

Assessment of the possibility to implement private & public joint investment regulations 15.03.09

Operating version of the friendly tool 15.06.09

First draft of the Report with the recommodations concerning the implementation of private and public joint investment regulation 15.06.09

Final version of the report 15.11.09

Investor Database of potential sites 15.11.09”

All partners agree to Gunnar.

WP4: Testing of methodologies and tools in pilot regions and promoting strategies learned from pilot regions

The CESI RICERCA (Mr. M. Peviani), as WP4’s leader, has reviewed the tasks and deliverables of the WP4 and the respective deadlines. In continuation, each country partner has briefly presented the selected pilot region for the testing of methodologies an tools, in particular:

- Northern Cremona Province in Cremona County - Italy (CESI RICERCA and CREMONA)
- Dobra Korana river basin in Karlovac County - Croatia (KAZUP and FSBUZ)
- Municipality of Holtalen in Trondheim County – Norway (NTNU)
- Asopos river in Attica Region – Greece (RSA)
- Ybbs, Kamp or Thaya river in Thaya County – Austria (EAW4)

The WP leader have presented the strategies for the development of the activities and proposed the following deadlines, that were accepted by all partners:

1 - Definitive selection of pilot regions in each country, sending to the WP leader a brief description of the area (with map showing the river system, political division, population data, morphology description, surface, altitude, general comments, etc.), about 3 – 5 pages (31.10.2008)

2 – Start data collection of pilot areas (01.01.09)

- 3 – Ending digital maps (31.03.09)
- 4 – Work in progress to be discussed in the Milan meeting (15.06.09)
- 5 – Ending pilot applications (15.01.10)
- 6 – Ending reporting of WP4 (15.05.10)
- 7 – Final deliverables (15.07.10)

Next Meetings

Province of Cremona reminds Karlovac County and University of Zagreb have to arrange a national workshop until the end of November about the local and national problems to implement SHP (almost 50 participants, dissemination on media, photos).

Further 3 project meetings are planned and all partners are required to participate. The provisional dates and venues are:

- by the 15th June 2009 in Milan, arranged by Cesi Ricerca spa:

- by the 15th February 2010 in Trondheim, arranged by NTNU;
- by the 15th September 2010 in Athens, arranged by RSA.

Province of Cremona reminds all partners that after every each next meeting, the leader of the meeting will have to organize also a national workshop about local and national problems to implement SHP.

About that workshops, Cesi Ricerca is evaluating the possibility to postpone the national workshop for the second half of the next year in order to have more outcomes from the pilot regions to present to the stakeholders.

Managing the project

Province of Cremona reminds all partners that, under Art. I.6 of the Grant Agreement – EIE/07/064/SI2.466791, the documents listed below must be delivered to the European Commission within the following deadlines:

“Progress Technical Report” relating to the period from the first to the ninth month (**15th January 2008 and 15th October 2008**), which must be submitted by the **14th November 2008** and which will be prepared by the Province of Cremona with the essential help of the other partners. In order to draw up each “Technical Report” each partner will have to fill in a template file, within a set period of time, which will be sent to the Province of Cremona in due time. Basically, the Technical Report describes the progress made and the documents produced during the reference period. The template files can already be downloaded from the website: http://ec.europa.eu/energy/intelligent/implementation/reporting_en.htm

After the first technical Report:

An **“Interim Technical Report”** and an **“Interim Financial Report”** relating to the period from the first and the twentieth month (**15th January 2008 and 15th September 2009**), which must be submitted by the **15th October 2009** and which will be prepared by the Province of Cremona with the essential help of the other partners;

A **“Progress Technical Report”** relating to the period from the **15th September 2009 and the 15th June 2010**, which must be submitted by the **15th July 2010** and which will be prepared by the Province of Cremona with the essential help of the other partners;

A **“Final Technical Report”** and a **“Final Financial Report”** relating to the whole period from the first to the thirty-sixth month of the project (**from the 15th January 2008 to the 15th January 2011**), which must be submitted by the **15th March 2011** and which will be prepared by the Province of Cremona with the essential help of the other partners.

Financial aspects

The European Commission allocates financial support to the Province of Cremona, the project coordinator, which, in turns, distributes it to its partners within 30 days of receipt. The payments expected from the European Commission are as follows:

- **30% of expected costs as an expense advance by the 29th February 2008 (DONE!!!);**
- 40% of expected costs, only once the previous 30% has been fully used and in any case after the presentation of the “Interim Technical Report” and the “Interim Financial Report”.
- the balance of about 30% of expected costs, only following the approval of the “Final Technical Report” and the “Final Financial Report”.