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The EPATEE project

OBJECTIVE: creating favourable conditions for improving the number, quality/performance and effective use of ex-post impact evaluations of energy efficiency policies.

CONCEPT: improving key stakeholders’ evaluation practices can lead to a better understanding and knowledge of impacts and how policies work, and thereby to increasing effectiveness of policies.
Create the favourable conditions for ex-post impact evaluations

Building resources based on up-to-date knowledge and concrete experience feedback

Knowledge Base
(user-oriented database of references)

Guidance and support

Case studies
(about ex-post evaluations)

Creating the conditions for an effective use of these resources

Online toolbox
making resources easy to use

Experience sharing
targeted workshops, webinars, etc.

Dissemination
of results

Experience sharing
targeted workshops, webinars, etc.

Dissemination
of results
Stakeholder involvement

Previous experience sharing webinars about *How energy efficiency policy evaluation can produce benefits and add value to policy makers?*

Recordings available at: [https://epatee.eu/events-webinars](https://epatee.eu/events-webinars)
Comparing estimated and measured energy savings: why raising this topic?

Analysis of the 23 EPATEE case studies

Regular monitoring

Ex-post evaluations or studies
## Comparing different methods: examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of use or comparison of different methods</th>
<th>Cases where these examples are mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plausibility check of the overall results (comparison with trends in energy consumption, and/or comparison with previous periods)</td>
<td>Environmental support scheme (AT), EE programmes of Vienna (AT), Primes Energie (BE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of surveys and econometric analysis to assess additionality</td>
<td>EEO scheme (DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of different statistical methods</td>
<td>“Future investments” programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison of engineering calculations and billing data/analysis</strong></td>
<td>Better Energy Homes (IE), Renovation programmes (LT), Subsidy scheme for housing corporations (NL), Supplier Obligation (UK), Warm Front (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of monitoring of energy efficiency indicators (top-down approach) and monitoring based on engineering estimates at project level</td>
<td>Multi-year agreement (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of standardised laboratory tests and field measurements</td>
<td>Purchase tax on new cars (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of different methods to normalised energy consumption for weather conditions</td>
<td>WAP (US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking for more references: EPATEE Knowledge Base

Search by Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>None selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>None selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Type of policy instrument</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Geographical scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advanced Search**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation type</th>
<th>Objective of evaluation</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Calculation method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline / counterfactual</th>
<th>Savings data presentation</th>
<th>Normalisation factors</th>
<th>Other impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost data</th>
<th>Uncertainty analysis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None selected</td>
<td>None selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details about the type of methods
What’s next?

➢ Two other examples to be presented today during this webinar!

➢ Topical case study about *Comparing estimated and measured energy savings* \(\rightarrow\) to be published early 2019

➢ A second webinar on this topic in the first quarter of 2019

STAY TUNED!
Thank you for your attention!
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Ex post evaluation of energy efficiency programs: Case study of Czech Green Investment Scheme

Michaela Valentová  | Jiří Karásek  | Jaroslav Knápek

A significant amount of financing has been available for improvements in energy efficiency in buildings in recent years. However, careful evaluation of the real impacts of the programs is still inadequate. The paper provides an insight into the relationship between the expected outcomes and the actual results of an energy efficiency program. It does so on a case example of one of the most significant energy efficiency and renewable energy sources programs in Central Europe, the Green Savings Programme. In total, 206 measures were inspected in 124 projects of the program. The analysis of the inspections showed that there is a significant difference between the expected, verified CO₂ emission reduction and ex post, real attained reduction (25% on average). The reasons are partly methodical, but most can be attributed to the behavioral factors of occupants in the respective buildings. The results therefore clearly show the need to tackle the relationship between the calculated (expected) energy savings (and related CO₂ emission reduction) and the real savings which are highly influenced by building users. Ex post evaluations should be done, among other things, to provide a more accurate picture regarding the member states’ energy efficiency improvement obligations. Furthermore, such evaluation also provides an essential input for further optimisation of the future energy efficiency support programs.

This article is categorized under:
   Energy Efficiency > Economics and Policy
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Motivation

To evaluate the real outcomes of the energy efficiency and RES programmes

To bring insight into the relation between expected and real emission savings.

Reasons behind the differences

Based on ex post on-site inspections carried out within the programme as a prerequisite by the buyers of AAUs.
Green Savings Programme overview

Ran in 2009 – 2012, administered by the State Environmental Fund

Total allocation CZK 20.29 billion

- Insulation, low-energy building construction, RES
- CO2 reduction of 800,000 tons per year
- In total, 73,994 applications paid by the end of 2014.

Shares

Subsidy area

- Insulation
- Low energy houses
- Biomass boilers
- Solar collectors
- Heat pumps

Green Savings Programme overview

Greening ratios for individual subsidy areas.

Inspections

206 measures inspected in 124 objects in all 14 regions of the Czech Republic

Focus on combinations of measures

On-site personal visits by 2-3 inspectors
On site, the process of inspection went as follows:

Controlling of the project documents

Determination of the real energy consumption before and after implementation of the measures

Compliance check of the implemented measures to the project documentation, photo documentation
## Protocol of the on-site inspection

### Identification of applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification No of application</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of applicant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type if building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of EE measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Administration part of inspection

Findings related to the administrative part of the project or related to the contractor.

### 2. Physical part of inspection

Findings related to the physical part of inspection:

### Description of the figures included as an annex of the protocol:

### 3. Results of inspection

Overall evaluation:

Results of analysis; energy consumption evaluation of heating hot water preparation after implementation measures in case of energy invoices available:

### Signature of head of inspection group

Energy expert signature

Applicant signature
Inspections, cont.

• Evaluation of the data
  – Quantitative
    the real ex-ante and ex-post energy consumption compared with the calculated energy and CO$_2$ emission savings from the project documentation.
  – Qualitative
    Semi-structured interviews with the applicants about the process, initial expectations, duration of construction works, and overall satisfaction explanations to the differences in real and expected savings
Sample

Single-family, new 24%

Multi-family, brickwork 13%

Multi-family, panel 13%

Single-family 50%

Total insulation 13%

Solar collectors 29%

Heat Pumps 13%

Biomass boilers 17%

Low energy houses 7%

Partial insulation 21%
Results

Difference between expected and real CO₂ emission savings

Real savings > expected savings

Real savings < expected savings
Share of inspected objects with higher real than expected CO₂ emission reduction
Factors influencing the difference between expected and real outcomes

Methodical factors
Unavailability of invoices or low level of detail of the invoice
Wrong categorization of heat sources
Additional heat source (fireplace)
Factors influencing the difference between expected and real outcomes

Behavioural factors
Usage of homes (temperature, heated area, life changes)
Number of occupants
Results, cont.

Further aspects discovered during the inspections

Overall satisfaction with the implementation of the measures (suppliers)

Quality and experience with low energy houses construction

Benefits: lower bills, higher comfort

Principal-agent problem

Additionality of the measures
Lessons learnt

**Ex post evaluation** should be a **common part** of the energy efficiency programme

- To avoid deception
- To provide data for learning

**Behavioural factors** play significant role in achieving the energy savings

**Discrepancy** between the reporting (Art. 7) and the national energy balance accounts
THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION.
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Why this study is important

• We need to know more about the extent to which retrofit schemes actually work.
  o To what extent do they change domestic energy use, reduce fuel poverty, reduce carbon emissions?
  o To what extent are outcomes affected by performance gaps and rebound effects?
  o How do they impact on lower, middle and upper income households?
  o What is the direct cost-benefit case, what are the broader indirect benefits?
• There are few large scale, ex post evaluations of the actual impacts of retrofit schemes.
The KWZ Scheme (1)

- One of the largest retrofit schemes completed in the UK to date.
- Ran from 2007 to 2010 with a budget of £21m
- Initiated by Kirklees Council, managed Yorkshire Energy Services (not for profit) with insulation installed by the private sector.
- Offered free energy assessments and surveys and, where technically feasible, free loft and cavity wall insulation to all households in the area.
- Of the 176,000 households in the area, 134,000 had a preliminary (doorstep) assessment, 111,000 of which went on to have a fuller survey and 51,000 households had measures installed.
- A total of 64,000 measures were installed, including insulation in 43,000 lofts and 21,000 cavity walls.
The KWZ Scheme (2)

• 30% participation rate was secured through sustained marketing and repeated household visits from a trusted provider that placed great emphasis on customer care and the quality of installations.

• It also relied on the provision of insulation measures at no cost with steps (such as assisted loft clearances) taken to limit disruption in participating households.

• KWZ makes a good case study for a large-number, *ex post* analysis because of the its scale, geographical and temporal concentration the data on KWZ activity that was collected by the local authority.
Our Approach

• Data set 1 – on 176,000 households (inc. size, age, type) and insulation measures pre and post KWZ.
• Data set 2 – on household energy at MLSOA level (inc. domestic gas, economy 7, electricity usage) for 58 MLSOAs
• Corrected for changes in numbers of meters and weather
• We predict energy savings from KWZ insulation using two models
  • CERT (RdSAP) model used up to 2012
  • BRE model developed for Committee on Climate Change
• We examine correlations between actual reductions in energy demand and predicted impacts of different levels of KWZ activity to separate background trends from KWZ impacts.
Correlating Actual and Predicted Impacts

More energy savings

More insulation

Predicted Impacts (Model 1)

‘background’ – non KWZ reduction (2007-2011)
Correlating Actual and Predicted Impacts After Adjusting for Background Trends

More energy savings

More insulation
Impacts Across Income Groups

Fig. 3. Average 2011 fuel bills and energy savings for lower, middle and upper income areas.
Key Findings (1)

• BRE model assumes that 44% of the full technical energy saving potential of insulation would be realized in practice.

• Results suggest 76% of potential is actually realized in practice, with 53% of the technical potential realized in the lowest income areas, but 85-93% in the middle and highest income areas.

• CERT model assumes that 50% of the full technical energy saving potential of insulation would be realized in practice.

• Results suggest 62% is actually realized in practice, with 49% of the technical energy savings potential secured in the lowest income areas, but 70-71% in middle and higher income areas.
Key Findings (2)

- Losses due to performance gaps and rebound effects are roughly as predicted in lower income areas but are lower than predicted in middle and upper income areas.

- Poorer households split the benefit between improved quality of life and monetary savings. This addresses fuel poverty. Middle and upper income households save more energy and benefit most monetarily.
Key Findings (3)

• In aggregate, we identify a reduction of 4.2% in 2007 levels of household demand for energy for space and water heating that can be attributed to KWZ and a further 12.3% that is independent of KWZ.

• For participating households, this amounts to an average per household KWZ reduction in energy use of 2,655 kWh over the 2007-2011 period due to KWZ, compared to 2177kWh reductions from background trends.
Key Findings (4)

- For its initial investment of £21m, KWZ has generated reductions in energy bills totaling £6.2m a year at 2011 energy prices.

- This is equivalent to an average annual saving of £125 per year at 2011 energy prices for each participating household, which represents a saving on the total average household energy bill of 10.6%.

- In 2011, Kirklees commissioned studies which estimated the non energy related local economic impact at £39m and the health benefits at £3.9m over 5 years.