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EE policy context in Georgia

- No energy law – e.g. fuel wood and coal not covered by energy legislation
- No state EE & RE agency – only 2 person department in Ministry of Energy
- Association Agreement with EU - mandates implementation of EU energy acquis, including directives on EE & RE
- EBRD projects – EEB started with MoEconomy & SD, NEEAP starting with MoEnergy,
- USAID - EC-LEDs with MoEnv.
- Covenant of Mayors–active development – voluntary
- EE policy analysis capacity at early development stage

Georgia might serve for benchmarking (policy vs no policy).
Energy and Climate Indicators of SC Countries

Source: EEC Georgia
Energy data collection and Use

Supply data – more transparent on electricity and gas
- **Electricity** – system operator - openly available on ESCO (balancing market) and ministry site
- Gas - supply GOGC/Gas transportation company can be available on demand
- Biomass second indigenous energy resource - official data on cuttings largely misleading
- Oil Products - all imported data hard to find – customs and financial controllers
- No common energy law in Georgia - Ministry of Energy – is the ministry of electricity and gas – oil product and wood fuel data not covered

Consumption data - hard to collect
- Electricity and gas distribution companies (different classification and level of openness) – no legal requirement for data supply
- GEOSTAT – first in 13 years energy balance of 2014 after (INOGATE)
- Donor projects – household surveys, commercial and industrial survey to start (USAID)

Users – Ministry of Energy, GNERC, NGOs, think-tanks and donor projects
Assessment of Market status and potential of EE technologies. Buildings, industry and transport.

Comparison to the IEA methods

• The assessment is fragmented between separate donor projects. methodology not unified or agreed upon

• Technology Needs Assessment (UNEP/RISO/WEG) – stakeholder consultations

• EBRD project on EE in buildings (VTT/WEG) uses building stock model,

• MARKAL Georgia, (USAID/Winrock/ Deloitte/WEG/Remissia).

• Transport – SEAPs, LEDS - (Winrock/Remissia) – penetration of the types of vehicles assessed. Fuel switching and public procurement – recommended measures

• Industry is most difficult - no access, no energy audit obligations
Prioritization of EE Technologies

Donor projects:
- MARKAL Georgia (USAID, IRG, WEG)
- Technology needs assessment TNA methodology (UNEP,RISO,WEG)
- EC LEDS (Based on MARKAL Georgia, USAID)

Technologies identified – Efficiency in buildings, Solar water heaters (NAMA), efficient wood stoves,

**Winter deficit urges for EE in electricity sector** – MoE – energy strategy

Technologies – Thermal PPs – switch to Combined Cycle – can save 0.2 bcm/a

efficient lighting – can save .5 TWH/a

Do the proposed technologies, and end uses of energy within the methodology align well with your priorities and are they realistic for your country?
EE policies, targets, measures, responsibilities

• Up to now there has been no special state policy in support of EE, therefore no special measures have been implemented
  • Draft laws on EE & RE as well as attempts to introduce the EE in construction code were unsuccessful
  • Minor EE policies can be found at municipal level – e.g. Batumi and Tbilisi municipalities
• Country does not have EE targets yet - 1st NEEAP just starting
• Responsibilities scattered – MoEnergy - (energy strategy); MoEconomy & SD (Building code); MoEnvironment&R (LEDS, INDC, NAMAs)
• No direct responsibility assigned to central or local government – except a statement that MoEnergy should promote efficiency in energy supply
• Block tariff in electricity can be partly considered as a no-cost EE measure
• Tariff Subsidies - major impediment for EE development (both gas and electricity)
Comment on methodology use for Georgia conditions

• A very good logical model designed for high level of development
  • Assumes high maturation of data collection, analysis and policy making system
  • Assumes long term vision and high motivation of policymakers for EE improvements and detailed information available
  • Enabling environment analysis part of technology selection(?)

• Comparison to TNA methodology:
  • Sector, subsector and technology selection-> market and barrier analysis-> technology action plan
  • Selection criteria – GHG reduction potential and national development priorities
  • Stakeholder consultation, compensates for imperfections and helps to build the data collection and analysis system

• Recommendation: try to compensate with stakeholder involvement wherever data cannot support the methodology
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