

Rapporteur Report

Group B - Realising Business Opportunities and Regulatory Needs Stefan Scheuer

Topics

- Group Composition
- Summary of Presentations
- Summary of Interventions
- Group Discussion Highlights
- Areas of Agreement
- Areas of Disagreement
- Areas for Further Policy Research
- Conclusions

Group Composition

- Total number: 19
- 6 Energy Providers: SE, EDF, Vattenfall, DK, FI energy, DE
- 3 Government: UK, DE, US
- 4 Regulators: SE, IR, PT, UK
- 0 Consumer advocates:
- 2 Energy efficiency industry: Insulation, Smart meters
- 4 Academics and NGO: Coalition, Lund, DE

Summary of Presentations

- Ms Liikanen (CEER retail market functioning task force)
 - Impact on national regulators' competencies (customer interest, competition of retail market, network tariffs, implement programs)
 - Welcome EED, but
 - concerns about distortion of competition due to role of DSOs in demand response measures foreseen
 - Need flexibilities
 - Need new competencies for regulators
 - Pre-requisite for services is
 - Understanding, trust of customers, no conflicting tariffs
 - Further work: benchmarking on data management in smart metering, price comparison tools, further work on smart grid/meters with DG Sanco

Summary of Presentations

• Mr Bowie (Rockwool)

- EED:
 - Less flexibility in obligation schemes
 - Ensure high quality of measures
 - Regulators and authorities to be gate keepers
 - Concerns over
 - Lack of clarity in EED proposal, i.e. cumulative targets
 - short-term views, i.e. sunset clause for art 6
 - early actions
- Viable EE market needs
 - Financing facility needed to mainstream funding
 - Long-term renovation roadmap and deep renovation
 - Need public sector to kick-start the process
- Supplier obligations are a pragmatic way forward
 - can promote competition (i.e. loyalty),
 - need complementary measures to tackle perceived risks and better understand consumers
- Business opportunities into the broader context of saving the planet and financial crisis

Summary of Interventions

- SE energy provider
 - EED one-size does not fit all, need reasonable amount of flexibility, reduce admin burden
 - Obligations not suitable for SE market, not cost-effective, provocative / not legitimate to take money from customer A to pay for customer B
 - Already successful in SE to address market failures, ESCOs are growing now in SE
 - Objective is low carbon
- DK energy provider
 - EED proposal needed because not on track to deliver objectives
 - Obligation in DK works, delivers 50% of savings, to go beyond low hanging fruits you need long-term customer relation
 - It is fair, obligated party does not decide who gets the money
 - EE is more than GHG emissions
- PT regulator
 - PT obligation scheme was a democratic process, it is providing a greater benefit for society
 - Need to find the right agents to deliver measures (tendering process, including consumer orgs, broadcasting stations, etc..) to avoid distortion – barrier to new market entrance
- IEA
 - Supplier obligation is a proxy for obligation on customers
 - In some US parts provider is not part of the EE delivery

Group Discussion Highlights

- Market distortion and interaction with the liberalisation agenda
- Fairness of financing schemes
- Is it economic? Too long pay back time?
 - Need to look at life cycle and co-benefits (like societal benefits)
- Binding targets to replace obligations?
 - Increase flexibility
 - But there is a lack of viable programs in some countries
 - Is there a convergence of programs and measures?

Areas of Agreement

- Little info on business opportunities, but efficiency business is growing
- Customer is the central and difficult actor
 - Customer needs are central for success
 - Public bodies have to show leadership
- Need to address transport

Areas of Disagreement

- Mandatory or voluntary obligations schemes?
- Added value of EU common approach?
- Is EE primarily to reduce GHG emissions or to improve economy?

Areas for Further Policy Research

Conclusions and Next Steps