

CA ESD Interview Questions

3rd Plenary Meeting Interview Questions for Member States

Country: Slovakia

Name: Miroslav Marias with input from Jan Magyar and Pavel Starinsky

Organisation: Ministry of Economy of the Slovak Republic

Role in ESD implementation: Responsible for implementation of the Directive

Q1. How long have you been with the Concerted Action?

Since the third CA ESD I meeting (Riga)

Q2. Has the CA ESD improved your working relationships with other participating countries?

Yes

How have you otherwise benefited from the network, exchange of information and experience within the CA-ESD?

We have learned from other countries how they are implementing measures, and what Slovakia could do.

Q3. Can you give us any concrete examples (e.g. policy measure, methodology, organisation) of best or good practices that you have learned about through the CA ESD and have taken on board, in some way, whilst developing national policies?

The green public procurement in-depth session was useful to develop the Slovakian public procurement scheme and public procurement rules. Also the NEEAP template discussions in the 5th Plenary Meeting (CA ESD I in Brussels) were very useful.

Q4. Has the CA supported your work in generating awareness for energy efficiency and the ESD with national policy makers and other stakeholders?

Yes

If yes, how?

We have better awareness of how implementation happens in other countries.

In terms of generating awareness nationally, we have a list of people that we communicate with and we communicate CA ESD related issues.

Q5. What has been the most useful CA ESD product/output for you? (PMs, WG Reports, website, Forum, Newsletter, National Summary Reports, public documents, other)

1. Improved connections/networking with CA ESD members (at Plenary Meetings) which have been useful when negotiating on the ESD.

2. Working group reports are a really good way to improve knowledge (of the ESD) and are useful in explaining how measures are implemented in other countries.
3. Presentations and reports are useful to show to other people involved in energy efficiency at the national level.

Q6. Do you attend other Concerted Action meetings – CA RES or CA EPBD?

Yes – others from Slovakia do (Paval and Jan)

If yes, what do you think the CA ESD can learn from the other Concerted Actions and vice versa?

There are differences between the Concerted Actions. The CA ESD is more general and political, compared to the CA EPBD which is more technical.

Pavel participates CA RES. The WGs in CA RES are more clearly identified. Questionnaires are sent concerning WG's topic before each parallel session and each questionnaire is accompanied with a requirement for some short feedback on the structure and the level of detail of this questionnaire with following questions:

- This questionnaire is formulated in a comprehensible way
- The level of detail of the questions is too high
- This level of detail of the questions is not high enough
- Important aspects of the topic are missing.

These questions are evaluated with scale 1-5. This feedback can help to improve the questionnaires for the preparation for the next meetings.

Q7. What is your national dissemination strategy when it comes to CA ESD material and the outcomes of the Plenary Meetings?

We disseminate information within the ministry and with other energy efficiency stakeholders, and it is the same with other CAs.

To how many people, and to whom, do you send the final reports and other outputs of the CA ESD?

What methods do you use (meetings, email, presentations, etc.)?

We write a summary of the meeting and if there are specific topics of interest we'll also include more detailed information such as the WG reports.

Are you aware of the NCP toolkit on the website?

Yes.

Dissemination could be improved by giving more information about the reports that are available.

Q8. What is your feedback regarding the new in-depth topic and sessions? How was your experience in trying to identify your expert(s) to attend these sessions?

Very good, and it's very interesting to go into more detail. Clear problems were identified in the in-depth finance session.

The in-depth topic about better use of European financing sources (SCF, EIB) in combination with national schemes for energy efficiency is quite interesting, but there is a strong barrier. Usually it is not allowed to have a combination of two or more support schemes in order to avoid financing one project from two support schemes

both European and national. For that reason it is difficult to find the right combination of national and European support schemes, so that it is not violated rule of double funding

Q9. Do you have any other remarks, comments or feedback you would like to give us on specific or general elements of the CA ESD?

Q10. As we transition from CA ESD > EED we are keen to ensure that the needs and views of participating countries are taken into account (as much as is possible within the constraints of the contract). We would therefore welcome your views on:

a. Specific topics / Articles (of the Directive) that are a particular priority for your country from December 2013 – May 2014

Article 7 – we need to find out the options before implementation, so it would need to be tackled in March and/or October 2013 as after this it will be too late. Timing is the biggest problem as everything is very rushed, which is difficult with a reduced financial budget.

b. Any other suggestions you have for improvement?

It would be good to have one structure as the way CA EED is structured is different to the way the Commission guidance notes are structured.

The lack of questionnaires for each topic means there are missed opportunities for MS to demonstrate best practice – e.g. the in-depth finance sessions, Slovakia had some good examples that could have been shown.