

SOCIAL DIALOGUE TO SUPPORT ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN SOCIAL HOUSING

**OUTLINE MODEL REFURBISHMENT PROCESSES
EXPERIENCE AND CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ISEES PROJECT**

December 2007

Prepared under the ISEES project



A project realised with support from the European Commission



About ISEES

“ISEES – Improving the Social Dialogue for Energy Efficient Social Housing” is a project funded under the “Intelligent Energy for Europe Programme” sponsored by the European Commission. It runs from January 2006 until December 2007 and aims to increase the rate of energy related refurbishment of social housing by applying innovative approaches of a *social dialogue*, and merging technical solutions with socio-economic tools.

The dialogue is targeted at involving all stakeholders – tenants/owners of dwellings, housing associations, municipalities and energy service providers – into the refurbishment process, develop efficient and feasible models of user participation and implement exemplary participation processes in a renovation project.

Model buildings have been identified in the 5 participating countries, namely Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Slovak Republic and the United Kingdom. During the heating season 2006/07, energy behaviour of tenants has been continuously measured. Using this measured data the participants in the each country have attempted to advocate the development of a model refurbishment process, with respect to the engagement and inclusion of all stakeholders in the process, in the hope that the refurbishment will provide additional value to all than would have otherwise been the case.

The results of pilot social dialogue activities are reported in this report alongside conclusions drawn from the activities undertaken.

The scope of social dialogue

ISEES considered the social dialogue in respect of the following activities associated to social housing:

- Maximising the benefits of the building refurbishment
- Improvement of communal district heating services
- Reduction of in the householder energy use (and improvement of thermal comfort conditions) through modifying “user behaviour”

1 Review Social Dialogue theory

The earlier reported “Country specific guidelines for a social dialogue” discusses the nature of social dialogue in the context of building refurbishment, improvement of communal district heating services and reduction of householder energy use through modifying “user behaviour”. In a social dialogue in this context can be summarised as follows:

1.1 Social Dialogue stakeholders

The following groups are relevant stakeholders for a social dialogue.

- Occupants (tenants/owners)

To start a social dialogue the willingness of the residents to engage in such a process is essential. Usually at least a part of the residents shows interest in the topics. The issues of the social dialogue have to match the needs and information level of the residents to be successful. Usually the most difficult part is to find the space and time that all potentially interested residents can be involved. However, it has to be respected, if residents refuse to participate.

- Housing associations / housing companies

Housing associations or housing management companies are often the main actors to start a social dialogue. Thus, their readiness to involve residents is important. In case of a refurbishment usually the property management and the technical apartment (responsible for planning and execution of construction work) are involved.

- Local authorities

Depending on the respective regulatory framework conditions local authorities will be involved in different stages of the refurbishment process and should be included in the social dialogue activities. In case of refurbishment of municipality owned buildings the competent agency can also be the main actor of a social dialogue.

- District heating companies

District heating companies may play a major role in a refurbishment process, in case of reconstruction of heating system and should be included in the social dialogue. Besides refurbishment activities, district heating companies are well advised to start a social dialogue with residents to improve their customer relationship (e.g. service offering, customer information), at least in some of the participating countries.

- Sponsoring institutions

The financial means are a major issue regarding refurbishment and often depends on available subsidies and sponsoring. Thus it might make sense to include sponsoring institutions early in the process.

- Building enterprises

In case of a refurbishment building enterprises play a crucial role during the social dialogue. With the beginning of the construction phase the social dialogue is not finished. Residents often communicate directly with the building enterprises during the implementation phase. Important is that the building enterprise has a professional attitude and takes requests seriously.

- Surroundings

In case of a refurbishment, the surroundings have to be considered as well, as disturbances for the neighbouring residents have to be minimised. To inform them about the on-going process might be useful to ensure a smooth implementation.

1.2 Different levels of cooperation

There is no „ideal“ participation process. It is not necessary to involve occupants in all phases of a dialogue or participation process, but it is possible to offer methods for participation for all phases and levels. Elements and methods for a dialogue are often overlapping and can be used for different purpose. These elements and methods must be in accordance with the occupants, the „style“ of the care-takers, the building and the components of the participation process. The challenge for the person in charge of a social dialogue process it to select the appropriate methods.

Basic guidelines for a social dialogue are:

The residents must be able to gain all relevant information.

All residents, who are interested, must be able to participate in the process.

At the beginning it has to be decided how to deal with the results of the social dialogue.

The residents have to be taken seriously in expressing their needs and proposals.

A social dialogue must not be misused to manipulate or to enforce respective interests.

Cooperation can start at different levels and can be differentiated according to the levels of information, consultation, co-design and co-decision. A comprehensive social dialogue can compromise all four levels. Information about the refurbishment is the basis for all further collaboration activities.

1.2.1 Information

Information is the basis for each form of participation. It is a one way-communication (e.g. housing association informs residents). Information can be provided about planned procedures, realised votes, opinions, facts etc. This kind of communication limits the possibilities of feedback, but it is possible for residents to ask for more information. Examples are:

- Personal letters
- Circular letters
- Invitations
- Protocols of resident meetings
- Notice in staircases

- Internal journals
- Information brochures
- E-mails
- Information on websites

1.2.2 Consultation

Consultation is a two-way-communication and assumes direct contact between e.g. residents and representatives of housing association, district heating company, and municipality. Here, a dialogue between the involved persons takes place.

Examples are:

- Personal conversation
- Surveys (personal, written, by phone)
- Interviews
- Information meeting
- Inspection
- Excursion

1.2.3 Co-design

Co-design means active participation of occupants. They have the possibility to deal with certain questions concerning the process and if suitable develop concrete ideas and solutions. In this scenario occupants are viewed as experts for their flats. Open remains the question, in which way results and expectations of the co-design process are considered in the concrete planning.

A disadvantage of this method is that residents who are less committed are segregated, as usually a manageable and stable group of persons are established for co-designing.

Examples are:

- Small groups
- Round tables
- Workshops
- Focus groups
- Future conference

1.2.4 Co-decision

Co-decision means that occupants take responsibility and bring in their competences and experiences. On the one hand, surveys or votes (e.g. to fulfil legal rules) are important, on the other hand there is the possibility to decide between alternatives. Collective co-decision compromises issues regarding the whole building, whereas individual co-decision focus on changes in the own flat (e.g. change of windows).

Examples are:

- Surveys
- Voting
- Assignment of services

1.3 Potential Social Dialogue Actions

There are a wide range of the possible social dialogue actions that could be pursued. The following list represents most of the key opportunities for the types of projects considered within the ISEES project, i.e. building refurbishment, advising on domestic energy consumption and improving district heating services.

Information Dissemination (one-way)

- Information leaflet
- Energy saving tip of the month
- Newspaper / Broadcast media
- Energy exhibition display

Two-way communication / participation / co-decision

- Series of workshops
- Contact by internet
- Surveys (questionnaires, personal interviews, phone interviews)
- Focus group with residents
- Competition for ideas
- Introducing the issue of refurbishment during owner meetings
- Establish an advisory board with owners
- Checklist for residents
- Inspection of the building
- Residents workshop
- Workshop with municipality, property management, district heating company
- Moderated tenants meetings
- Consultation surgeries with district heating / property management
- Energy saving team
- Training sessions on user behaviour
- Rental of energy measuring tools

These are described in further detail in Appendix 1, which also briefly identifies the relative advantages and disadvantages of each. The selection of social dialogue actions will occur as part of a communication / participation strategy. It is anticipated any process would included a series of actions which are determined by a) the objectives of the overall process, b) the stage of communication / participation reached, c) the resource constraints that exist (money, people, time), and, d) the specific nature of the existing (or future) relationships between the parties/stakeholders and the communication sensitivities between them.

2 Social Dialogue Actions undertaken under ISEES project

Within each of the member states with demonstration / “model” buildings involved in the ISEES project (BG, LT, UK, SK, CZ) a series of **core social dialogue actions** were undertaken in response to delivering the main objectives of the project:

- identifying and monitoring model buildings,
- reviewing the status quo with key stakeholders (building owners/housing associations, tenants, district heating operators and municipalities), and,

- reviewing challenges and opportunities for stakeholders if they were to engage in social dialogue.

In addition, each member state partners undertook to carry out a series of **pilot social dialogue actions** designed to support the process of resolving the principal objectives identified for each “model building” (such as reducing domestic energy demand, refurbishment of accommodation or improving district heating systems). The nature of the challenges and opportunities identified, the nature of stakeholders involved and the nature of the constraints that existed was very different in each case and required a variety of responses.

Table 2.1 summarises the key social dialogue actions undertaken in each member state.

	LT	CZ	BG	SK	UK
Core SD actions					
1	Issue ISEES information leaflet				
2	Tenant attitude surveys				
3	Issue user manuals to tenants				
4	Discussion sessions with tenants and tenant groups				
5	Review meetings with DH operators / Housing Association / Municipalities				
6	Distribution of SD guides to district heating operators and Housing Associations				
Pilot SD Actions					
1	Information Sharing event for professional Stakeholders	Information Sharing event tenants, DH operator and housing association	Information sharing event (tenants, DH operator and billing company)	Information sharing event (tenants, DH operator and building owner)	No further SD actions possible*
2	1st Information Sharing event for tenants / housing association	Conference presentation – professional audience (utilities and DH operators)	Conference presentation – Energy Forum 2007	2nd Information sharing event (tenants, DH operator and building owner)	
3	2nd Information Sharing event for tenants / housing association	Information sharing event – tenants, HA and municipality	Workshop on refurbishment of multi-family dwellings		

Table 2.1 Key social dialogue actions undertaken by member state partner

(*Note) In the UK it was not possible to complete meaningful SD pilot actions since during the course of the ISEES project, the owners of the model buildings (municipality) and the Housing Management company developed a plan for major refurbishment which would resolve the key challenges identified in the building by tenants and other stakeholders. By way the biggest challenge for the building (and the associated energy consumption / thermal comfort) was the very poor thermal standard of the building fabric – the lack of wall insulation very poor single

pane glazing with ineffective window frames. In addition, the owners have an established approach to tenant engagement, which is considered 'good practice' and therefore did not require additional facilitation from the ISEES partners.

Further detail of each of the pilot actions undertaken is included in Appendix 2. This gives a description of the actions and discusses their impact/benefit.

3 Conclusions drawn from Social Dialogue Actions undertaken

As can be seen from the records of the social dialogue actions undertaken, the ISEES project has dealt with a wide range of parameters when implementing social dialogue in the context of improving energy services. There is great variety across member states with respect to the how energy is provided, the arrangements for housing management and cultural attitudes to energy use (and energy efficiency). There are even very basic differences in the understanding of the fundamental terms used, such as "social housing" which refers to managed housing for lower income tenants in the UK, and as mixed-tenure, high-density accommodation in the other members states within the project. In addition, the model building and the associated pilot actions are designed for different purposes. They are either tackling tenant energy consumption through user behaviour, building refurbishment or improving district heating services.

This large number of parameters makes it difficult to draw out specific conclusions regarding the impact of social dialogue and how to design better social dialogue processes. However, there are a number of concrete lessons that can be taken for the ISEES project:

3.1 Social dialogue needs tenant motivation and organisation

Social dialogue is often informal, sporadic and unorganised. However, for it to be successful, i.e. to achieve the original aims, it needs to be both planned and effectively resourced (time, people and money).

The actors in the dialogue process need to be motivated to effectively take part since it requires information to be shared between the parties, and, as we move towards co-design the parties need to be prepared to negotiate and compromise. In many cases in the ISEES pilot actions it is clear that parties involved were not significantly motivated to part of the process. Key reasons identified for this were:

Tenants

- Limited specific interest in energy as a single issue. Whilst tenants are partially interested in 'energy' it is not a major household concern, or rather there are many other more important concerns. Also energy is associated to a number of other primary issues such as concerns over thermal comfort, reliability of heating systems and better living environment, making it difficult to bring a specific focus on reducing energy consumption.
- Common perceptions that tenants are unable to significantly influence DH companies or building owners/Housing Associations

Housing Associations / Building Owners / DH companies

- Housing Associations may not exist (Bulgaria) or have no authority to influence energy related issues
- Concerns over commercial confidentiality, which may lead to attempts to avoid meaningful dialogue to avoid quarries over financial issues
- Existing business models / investment constraints limiting the opportunity to meet the requests of tenants even though this may provide better service (better services may have capital and overhead implications)

3.2 Social dialogue needs to be developed that is appropriately for the purpose and stakeholders

Wherever social dialogue is being considered it is important to develop a clear set of objectives, to consider the needs of the various stakeholders and the constraints to dialogue. As the ISEES project clearly demonstrates that are a significant range of parameters to consider. This means that it is impossible to have a few generic social dialogue responses. The social dialogue process needs to be specifically designed to each situation and then a flexible approach needs to be taken to ensure the process adapts to the outcomes of each stage.

The process of design and implementation should take the following steps:

- Review objectives (expected outcomes and timescales)
- Gain understanding of parties and their motivation for dialogue and the constraints they may impose, e.g. a DH company may not wish tenants to be involved in co-decision on their investment plans
- Review constraints (time, money, people)
- Develop programme of SD actions
- Initiate process
- Review outcomes
- Refine SD process

3.3 Depth of Social Dialogue significantly influences the perception of risk

The depth of the Social Dialogue process will significantly influence how the stakeholders will feel about the process. Most stakeholders will happily accept simple information about a process or project, but as we move from basic information provision, through the information-consultation-co-design-co-decision continuum, then stakeholders will perceive greater risk in the process and will be more cautious about taking part.

The risk to stakeholders does rise as participants agree to increase their co-dependency but often the perception of this risk will be greater than reality, particularly where participants have limited experience of co-dependency, as was typically the case in the scenarios considered under ISEES. This lack of experience is an important factor and often will require an

experienced third party to facilitate the consultation process – this may be a communications/advocacy organisation or an expert partner (as is in the case of the ISEES project partners).

In addition, it is common for partners not to balance the risk posed with the potential rewards available. For the tenants the reward is generally intuitive: the expectation would be that they would reduce energy costs, have improved energy services and/or a better living environment. For the DH Company, building owner or municipality rewards are less obvious, but may include:

- A greater understand of issues associated to the their service and improvements that could be made
- Improved customer satisfaction
- Increase in customer base.
- Better investment decisions (building refurbishment)
- Greater support from tenants for other initiatives and increased participation leading to better relations overall

Taking a coherent view of the risks and rewards and considering the long-term impact of effective social dialogue would suggest that it would add value to all participants.

3.4 There are significant constraints to SD

In addition to the motivational and risk perception constraints discussed above, it was clear in all member states, that there are significant practical constraints to effective social dialogue. Principal of these is the availability of time, which in itself is linked to the motivation of participants. Essentially, social dialogue is not seen as a normal activity when considering the refurbishment of buildings, reducing domestic energy consumption (except through one-way communications and improving district heating). As such it presents an extra burden: to complete a questionnaire, to meet with tenants, to create information leaflets, to organise workshops, and so on.

This is exacerbated with the need for financial resources to support social dialogue actions. Whilst costs are generally not high, some resources are required, which generally means that tenants, on their own, are unlikely to organise social dialogue actions, and that input from other stakeholders is necessary.

3.5 Social dialogue needs to be accountable and transparent

For social dialogue to be effective it is important that it is organised such that the partners are accountable for the process and for the outcomes that may occur. This requires the process to be transparent. One of the constraints for the ISEES project was that project partners attempted to establish pilot social dialogue actions to influence tenant behaviour, to facilitate the improvement of building standards and the improvement of district heating services. By definition the ISEES partners were not responsible for the model buildings, the services provided nor the welfare of tenants and this lack of accountability made it difficult to establish

legitimate social dialogue processes. This leads to the conclusion that outside parties can only effectively **facilitate and support** the social dialogue process. It ostensibly needs to be “owned” by key stakeholders in the process or it fail.

3.6 User behaviour can be influenced by good information exchange

The ISEES project has shown that it is possible to influence tenants' behaviour with respect to the energy consumption through direct two-way social dialogue. During ISEES tenants or representatives of tenants were interviewed, where given advice on how to reduce energy consumption (through user manuals and other means) and actual consumption was monitored. This lead to a good understanding by ISEES partners of how tenants use energy, what was good practice, what was bad and enter into a useful dialogue with tenants. Whilst it has not been impossible within the ISEES project timescales to evaluate energy savings achieved it is anticipated that these will be significant as many tenants reported that they would change their behaviour.

APPENDIX A – POTENTIAL SOCIAL DIALOGUE ACTIONS

Information dissemination (one way)

Method	Description	Participants	Advantages	Disadvantages
Information leaflet	A simple form of communication to provide simple information and referral to other sources / project contacts	Property management/district heating company provide for residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low cost - Significant reach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May not be reach many - No feedback possible
Energy saving tip of the month	<p>Simple, practical and positive information distributed through existing media route. For the property management or the district heating company this could be a method of keeping regularly in touch and could help build a positive image.</p> <p>Recommendations could be general and varied in line with season (e.g. turn down thermostats in the summer) or based on specific issues, e.g. ventilated for short periods only.</p> <p>Could be e-mail, published on an information board in a communal area, included in bills and / or other typical communication.</p>	Property management/district heating company provide for residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keeps in touch regularly with residents - Unobtrusive method of communication - Low effort to produce - positive communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information may not be noticed - No feedback or questions are possible
Newspaper / Broadcast media	Opportunity to make a general feature of energy related issues: e.g. 'How to save money in the home', comparison of one flat to another, plans for energy efficiency improvements.	Municipality, Housing Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - significant reach - promotes overall project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - costly? - time-consuming - difficult to organise - limited feedback
Energy exhibition	The aim would be to inform users about energy and energy saving. Although it is dependant on whether such	Housing Association/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attracts attention - Involves users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - can be expensive

display	an exhibition exists and can be rented. Often NGOs which work with schools have appropriate material. The display could be placed in the entrance hall together with an information point where a representative of the housing association is available to issue advice and discuss relevant issues with residents.	residents	- Positive image for housing association	- prone to damage - impact reduced over time - limited feedback
---------	--	-----------	--	---

Two-way consultation methods

Method	Description	Participants	Advantages	Disadvantages
Series of workshops	A starting point for a social dialogue between energy providers and residents could be a workshop/meeting to discuss possibilities for improvement and to gather key issues from the residents' perspective. These issues should be discussed in follow-up meetings, where improvements should be presented.	Residents and district heating companies	- Face-to-face contact - Generation of new ideas - Immediate feedback possible - fosters relationships and helps build trust	- Not all residents would be included - strong personalities can dominate
Contact by internet	Increasingly an important channel local information and communication. Utilities, housing association and municipalities have the chance to install an interactive forum on their websites to discuss future services with their customers. However, limited access to the internet by some residents may mean that the information is needs to be provided in alternative formats.	All parties and residents	- Independent - Cost-effective - reasonable reach	- Only residents with internet access can participate
Surveys (questionnaires, personal interviews, phone interviews)	Ideas for innovative services can be collected via surveys or in personal or phone interviews. Guidelines for questions: - short and comprehensible - no double negation - provide suitable categories of answers - avoid controversial concepts - avoid multidimensional questions - avoid indirect questions	All parties and residents	- Possibility to reach many residents - Structured instrument - Good data basis - closed will lead to more open views	- Preparation is time-consuming - High human-resource allocation - Expert knowledge to develop and evaluate questionnaires is required

	- avoid leading questions			
Focus group with residents	A focus group offers the opportunity to discuss issues in more detail. Usually six to twelve persons participate in a focus group. The focus group should be moderated by a person designated by the group. The different perspectives of residents regarding the services of energy service providers can be focused and discussed in a short meeting lasting no more than 2 hours. The participants interact during the discussion process, which makes it possible to gain new perspectives and ideas. Result of a focus group is a pattern of opinions.	Residents, property management, district heating company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Small group makes a discussion more fruitful - Provides good possibilities for reflection - Facilitation helps to avoid domination by strong personalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good preparation is required - Moderation is necessary - Only the opinion of selected residents is considered
Competition for ideas	<p>The aim of the competition would be to involve users more actively in the project. They are asked to develop ideas as to how energy can be saved for the whole building or for single apartments. This may lead to unorthodox solutions and ideas. Ideas gained by this method maybe more readily accepted by the residents than those provided by third party, external contributors.</p> <p>The entry forms could also include some set questions around appropriate energy behaviour before giving the opportunity for entrants to write down their own ideas.</p> <p>The energy saving ideas would be evaluated separately and can be implemented in the monthly energy tip.</p> <p>Those who participated in the second part might also be interested to join an energy saving team.</p>	Residents, energy utility company and housing association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attracts attention - Positive image building for energy utility/housing association - Involves users 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ideas might be creative, but not useful - Cost-intensive - Often low level of participation

Introducing the issue of refurbishment during owner meetings	The aim would be to inform and discuss general issues of the building. Such meetings are handled differently in various buildings. Sometimes they take place on a regular and formal basis, sometimes only a group of residents meet in an informal way. If possible, existing meetings should be used to introduce the topic of refurbishment/social dialogue. Otherwise such a meeting can be introduced by or in cooperation with the property management. Good preparation is essential for a successful meeting. It may be necessary to moderate the discussion, depending on the number of participants.	Owners and property managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents can be reached directly - Good opportunity for communication and exchange of ideas - Feedback is possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good preparation necessary (structure, content, venue, time) - Big gathering makes discussion difficult - Single opinions sometimes dominate
Establish an advisory board with owners	To start a refurbishment process the owners have to agree on the proposed measures. Not all owners will be interested in the issue or have the relevant know-how to make decisions. Therefore it makes sense to establish an advisory board with selected residents who represent different interests and groups. This advisory board also represents the interest of the remaining residents towards the property management. Their task should be to develop ideas for refurbishment.	Owners and property managers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents can be reached directly - Good opportunity for communication and exchange of ideas - Feedback is possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time-consuming - Requires organisation - Single opinions can dominate - Legitimacy of self-appointed representatives?
Checklist for residents	To involve further residents, the advisory board could distribute check lists in the building to collect ideas and requests.	Residents, residents advisory board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents become experts on their building - Results are collected on the spot - Cheap to carry out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advisory board may need training to handle checklists - Support is required - Results may not be valid
Inspection of the building	An inspection of the building with people responsible for the refurbishment and interested residents can be useful	Residents, property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct contact with residents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Time consuming

	to learn about the desires and needs of the residents.	managers	- Two-way discussions allows for clarity	
--	--	----------	--	--

Residents workshop	The aim of a workshop would be to allow people to meet and try to find creative solutions for problems. Representatives of municipalities, district heating companies and the property management should be invited. A neutral moderator may help to establish the necessary creative and communicative atmosphere. S/he should ensure discussions are short and realistic and that critical participants do not inhibit creative and unorthodox contributions of others. The workshop should involve no more than 15 people, and should last a maximum of half a day. It should consist of three phases: criticism, imagination and realisation. The day should enable participants to develop scenarios and discuss their potential for implementation.	Representatives of municipalities, district heating companies, property management, residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Makes creative solutions possible - Weak points of the current situation can be highlighted - Different perspectives are considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents with creative potential are favoured - External moderation is necessary - Results might not be easy to implement
Workshop with municipality, property management, district heating company	To introduce the issue of social dialogue during a refurbishment process a workshop with representatives of the municipality, the property management and district heating companies (if feasible) should be organised to present the results of SD analysis specific energy issues and discuss their perspectives and expectations of a social dialogue. Such a workshop gives the opportunity to convince the relevant stakeholders of the benefits of a social dialogue.	Representatives of municipality, property management, district heating company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Involvement of all relevant stakeholders - Direct feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good preparation required - External moderator is needed
Moderated tenants meetings	Once the decision for a refurbishment is taken, a meeting with tenants and a moderator is required. During this meeting the residents are informed about the refurbishment programme and have the opportunity to ask questions and discuss issues.	Residents of rented properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct contact with residents - Good instrument for communication and exchange - Direct feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good preparation is required (structure, contents, venue, time) - Big gathering impedes discussion

				- Single opinions sometimes dominate
Consultation surgeries with district heating / property management	Residents' dissatisfaction with the property management and district heating can often be due to difficulties with getting in touch with the person in charge. Regular, fixed consultation hours (e.g. once per quarter) could help to improve communications.	District heating companies, property management and residents/owners	- Direct and regular contact with residents - Contact person on site	- Fixed dates are necessary - Only some residents may use this service
Energy saving team	Any people particularly interested in the topic of energy saving could be invited to form an "energy saving task force" within the respective building. Together with the property management or a consultant from an energy agency they develop new ideas for energy saving in the building and communicate the ideas to the other residents and implement them. Regular, informal meetings of this team help to keep the topic on the agenda.	Residents, property managers, energy consultant	- Residents become experts on the topic - Ongoing contact between property management and residents - Participation of residents may help build their confidence in the property managers	- May be difficult to hold up interest
Training sessions on user behaviour	An easy way of reaching residents is to make use of existing meetings. The issue of user behaviour could be put on the agenda of already existing resident meetings. During the meetings, different options how to improve user behaviour can be discussed and demonstrated.		- Residents can be reached directly - Feedback is possible	- Not all residents can be reached
Rental of energy	For any apartments not involved in the refurbishment, some feedback on energy consumption might be		- Easy to implement for the	

measuring tools	interesting. The housing association could provide measurement tools which can be attached to electrical equipment for the tenants. The households could be informed via a mail out about this service and what benefits it may give them. Help and advice for use of the measuring tool may be required.		housing association - Positive image for housing association	
-----------------	---	--	---	--

APPENDIX B – PILOT SOCIAL DIALOGUE ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN

LITHUANIA

Social dialogue pilot action record	
Country:	Lithuania
Location:	< record location for social dialogue > Lithuanian District Heating Association (LDHA)
Why?	< record the purpose for the social dialogue >
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inform on user behaviour in model building with individual regulation in old house Inform on tenants motivation to start refurbishment Inform on renovation possibilities with the view to measured consumption Encourage DH companies to promote user behaviour Encourage DH companies to promote energy efficiency measures in apartments and residential houses Forum for debate
Who?	< record the organisations / groups who have some role or influence in the dialogue planned > Lithuanian District Heating Association, District heating companies, Housing Associations, Consumers rights protection institutions, Municipalities
Pilot Action name:	Information sharing event
What?	<p>< xxxxxx what the action will be – it may be a single action or a process (a series of actions). Specifically record a) who will be involved, b) the nature of the event, e.g. what sort of dialogue are you encouraging and how are you planning to influence this in terms of the arrangements for the events and the running of the event, c) what the actions of the key groups involved will be?, d) what resources will be prepared, e) in what environment the action is planned to happen ></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informational presentation – a big one on single topic – at monthly forum of DH companies, members of LDHA as well as invited guests, like housing associations, consumers rights protection institutions on the topics: “How we can save on heating through regulation and rational behaviour” and “How we can improve energy efficiency of our house using state support schemes” Additional information through handouts of presentations and info brochures for DH companies No costs, as LDHA arranges such monthly forums itself Nature of the dialogue: a) presentation of expert information to DH companies, b) listening and recording energy supplier’s opinion for presenting later to tenants, c) opportunity for suppliers (DHs/HAs) to be involved tenant issues.
When?	November, 2007

Expectations of action:	
	< record a) the benefits you anticipate from the action for each of the partners, b) the risks that you foresee, i.e. the potential negative impact that, c) whether this is an action that is likely to be successful and repeated again by some of the groups identified above >
Anticipated benefits?	Feed back for involved parties
Risks foreseen?	Might be too formal and with low discussion
Will it be repeated?	If interested in other topics as only 0,5 hour presentation is possible
Review of action:	
	< AFTER COMPLETION OF THE ACTION comment of whether the expectations of the action were realized and additional notes AND provide confirmation of what evidence that action has occurred will be available >
Summary of the event / action	<p>< Indicate how the event / action was organised, how it was delivered, by whom and what the sequence of actions involved etc. ></p> <p>General seminar on renovation issues with LEI presentation on measurements, which gives insight on social dialogue and possible ideas concerning promotion of buildings renovation. There was interest in the results of measurements, which show significant need for insulation/renovation of the building.</p>
Benefits of action	<p>< Indicate the benefits that were achieved, and identify whether the risks identified were realised or how they were mitigated ></p> <p>Information for District Heating Association, which are very strongly promoting renovation of residential buildings and implementation of energy efficiency measures inside buildings.</p>
Will it be repeated?	?
Additional notes?	
Evidence for event	< Confirm what evidence is available to confirm that the event has happened (for the EU Commission). Attach examples of material that were used for the event, e.g. invitations, documents, records, handouts etc. >

LITHUANIA

Social dialogue pilot action record	
Country:	Lithuania
Location:	< record location for social dialogue > Kaunas, Café "Silaityų Karoema"
Why?	< record the purpose for the social dialogue > <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Help tenants energy savings• Encourage user behaviour• Encourage energy efficiency measures• Inform on renovation possibilities• Forum for debate
Who?	< record the organisations / groups who have some role or influence in the dialogue planned > Tenants, Housing Association
Pilot Action name:	Information sharing event
What?	< record what the action will be – it may be a single action or a process (a series of actions). Specifically record a) who will be involved, b) the nature of the event, e.g. what sort of dialogue are you encouraging and how are you planning to influence this in terms of the arrangements for the events and the running of the event, c) what the actions of the key groups involved will be?, d) what resources will be prepared, e) in what environment the action is planned to happen > <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Information evening for possibly bigger group of tenants – with 2 topics: "How we can save on heating through regulation and rational behaviour" and "How we can improve energy efficiency of our house using state support schemes"• Additional information through handouts of presentations and User Manual• Costs for snacks and refreshments• Nature of the dialogue: a) presentation of expert information to tenants, b) listening and recording tenant concerns, c) opportunity for suppliers (DHs/HAs) to respond to tenant issues.
When?	October, 2007

Expectations of action:	
	< record a) the benefits you anticipate from the action for each of the partners, b) the risks that you foresee, i.e. the potential negative impact that, c) whether this is an action that is likely to be successful and repeated again by some of the groups identified above >
Anticipated benefits?	Feedback for involved parties
Risks foreseen?	Low attendance – there is spring seminar experience
Will it be repeated?	If requested
Review of action:	
	< AFTER COMPLETION OF THE ACTION comment of whether the expectations of the action were realized and additional notes AND provide confirmation of what evidence that action has occurred will be available >
Summary of the event / action	< Indicate how the event / action was organised, how it was delivered, by whom and what the sequences of actions involved etc. > Very few tenants attended the meeting, just 2 people from model building and some others living in the vicinity as the event was public. The interest was mainly in the results of measurements, however tenants came to the conclusion that regulation in every room is not a good idea for Lithuanian apartments with vertical heat supply system.
Benefits of action	< Indicate the benefits that were achieved, and identify whether the risks identified were realized or how they were mitigated > Some information for tenants was provided, though low interest
Will it be repeated?	If requested
Additional notes?	
Evidence for event	< Confirm what evidence is available to confirm that the event has happened (for the EU Commission). Attach examples of material that were used for the event, e.g. invitations, documents, records, handouts etc. >

Social dialogue pilot action record	
Country:	Lithuania
Location:	< record location for social dialogue > Model building
Why?	< record the purpose for the social dialogue > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help tenants energy savings • Encourage user behaviour • Encourage energy efficiency measures • Inform on renovation possibilities
Who?	< record the organisations / groups who have some role or influence in the dialogue planned > Tenants, Housing Association
Pilot Action name:	Information sharing event
What?	< record what the action will be – it may be a single action or a process (a series of actions). Specifically record a) who will be involved, b) the nature of the event, e.g. what sort of dialogue are you encouraging and how are you planning to influence this in terms of the arrangements for the events and the running of the event, c) what the actions of the key groups involved will be, d) what resources will be prepared, e) in what environment the action is planned to happen > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of summarised project data for tenants in printed version with “Guidelines for Social Dialogue” • Nature of the dialogue - presentation of expert information to tenants
When?	December, 2007

Expectations of action:	
	< record a) the benefits you anticipate from the action for each of the partners, b) the risks that you foresee, i.e. the potential negative impact that, c) whether this is an action that is likely to be successful and repeated again by some of the groups identified above >
Anticipated benefits?	Feedback for tenants with ideas for further steps
Risks foreseen?	Possibility to throw away data without reading
Will it be repeated?	If more relevant data will be produced or required from tenants
Review of action:	
	< AFTER COMPLETION OF THE ACTION comment of whether the expectations of the actions were realized and additional notes AND provide confirmation of what evidence that action has occurred will be available >
Summary of the event / action	< Indicate how the event / action was organised, how it was delivered, by whom and what the sequences of actions involved etc. > Handouts for tenants were disseminated among all tenants of model building. The coloured brochure was supplied to all post boxes.
Benefits of action	< Indicate the benefits that were achieved, and identify whether the risks identified were realised or how they were mitigated >
Will it be repeated?	
Additional notes?	
Evidence for event	< Confirm what evidence is available to confirm that the event has happened (for the EU Commission). Attach examples of material that were used for the event, e.g. invitation s, documents, records, handouts etc. >

CZECH REPUBLIC



Social dialogue pilot action record	
Country:	Czech Republic
Location:	< record location for social dialogue > Restaurant Jalta, Petrohradská 3113, Kladno
Why?	< record the purpose for the social dialogue >
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help tenants energy savings • Encourage user behavior • Preliminary results of measurement in model flats • Strategies of DH company and housing management company • Are there any problems with house management and/or heat supply? • Forum for debate
Who?	< record the organisations / groups who have some role or influence in the dialogue planned > Tenants, Municipality, housing management company, DH company
Pilot Action name:	Information sharing event
What?	< record what the action will be – it may be a single action or a process (a series of actions). Specifically record a) who will be involved, b) the nature of the event, e.g. what sort of dialogue are you encouraging and how are you planning to influence this in terms of the arrangements for the events and the running of the event, c) what the actions of the key groups involved will be? , d) what resources will be prepared, e) in what environment the action is planned to happen > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information evening for small group of tenants – with the theme of “Possibilities of Energy Saving in Households” • Rent of room in a restaurant • Nature of the dialogue: a) dissemination of expert information to tenants, b) listening and recording tenant concerns, c) opportunity for decision makers / suppliers (DHs/HAs) to respond to tenant issues.
When?	16 th January, 2007
Expectations of action:	< record a) the benefits you anticipate from the action for each of the partners, b) the risks that you foresee, i.e. the potential negative impact that, c) whether this is an action that is likely to be successful and repeated again by some of the groups identified above >
Anticipated benefits?	Possibility to learn more about possibilities of energy saving and to share their ideas and complaints with responsible decision makers. Feedback for DH company and housing management company
Risks foreseen?	Low attendance

Will it be repeated?	Maybe after the completion of measurement. The probability of higher attendance is very low.
Review of action:	< AFTER COMPLETION OF THE ACTION comment of whether the expectations of the action were realized and additional notes AND provide confirmation of what evidence that action has occurred will be available >
Summary of the event / action	< Indicate how the event / action was organised, how it was delivered, by whom and what the sequences of actions involved etc. > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invitations with questionnaires and information leaflets were distributed to all households. Also invitation posters were post on entrance door and elevators' doors. We offered free drink to anyone coming with filled in questionnaire • Despite this the attendance was very low (6 tenants, director of DH company, director of Housing management company and 2 people from CP)
Benefits of action	< Indicate the benefits that were achieved, and identify whether the risks identified were reduced or how they were mitigated > Despite very low number of participants (6) it was a good start of social dialogue, because a director of house managing company and DH company came and presented the strategy of both companies in relation to energy saving and other investment in houses. People took their opportunity, asked many questions and we had a very fruitful discussion. We also presented preliminary results of the project and energy saving opportunities. The meeting took about 1,5 hour and took place in a nearby restaurant. The first direct result of the meeting is that housing management company will distribute the project leaflets to all municipal houses.
Will it be repeated?	Maybe after the completion of measurement. The probability of higher attendance is very low.
Additional notes?	
Evidence for event	< Confirm what evidence is available to confirm that the event has happened (for the EU Commission). Attach examples of material that were used for the event, e.g. invitation, documents, records, handouts etc. > Photos, bill for payment of the room rent, filled in questionnaires

CZECH REPUBLIC

Social dialogue pilot action record	
Country:	Czech Republic
Location:	< record location for social dialogue > Hradec Kralove, District Heating Days 2007
Why?	< record the purpose for the social dialogue > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dissemination of preliminary project results Getting other DH companies or municipalities involved and interested in the process of social dialogue
Who?	< record the organisations / groups who have some role or influence in the dialogue planned > DH companies, utilities, municipalities
Pilot Action name:	Project presentation – Cogeneration Days Hradec Kralove 2007
What?	< record what the action will be – it may be a single action or a process (a series of actions). Specifically record a) who will be involved, b) the nature of the event, e.g. what sort of dialogue are you encouraging and how are you planning to influence this in terms of the arrangements for the events and the running of the event, c) what the actions of the key groups involved will be, d) what resources will be prepared, e) in what environment the action is planned to happen > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation at the conference (20 minutes)
When?	26 April, 2007
Expectations of action:	
Anticipated benefits?	< record at the least do you anticipate from the action for each of the partners, b) the risks that you foresee, i.e. the potential negative impact that, c) whether this is an action that is likely to be successful and repeated again by some of the group's identified actors > Increase of publicity of the project Dissemination of project results
Risks foreseen?	No risk foreseen
Will it be repeated?	No

Review of action:	< AFTER COMPLETION OF THE ACTION comment on whether the expectations of the actions were realized and additional notes AND provide confirmation of what evidence that action has occurred will be available >
Summary of the event / action	< Indicate how the event / action was organized, how it was delivered, by whom and what the sequences of actions involved etc. > Presentation of the information about project and preliminary project results About 50 People participated
Benefits of action	< Indicate the benefits that were achieved, and identify whether the risks identified were realized or how they were mitigated >
Will it be repeated?	NO
Additional notes?	NO
Evidence for event	< Confirm what evidence is available to confirm that the event has happened (for the EU Commission). Attach examples of material that were used for the event, e.g. invitation, documents, records, handouts etc. > Presentation in annex



CZECH REPUBLIC

Social dialogue pilot action record									
Country:	Czech Republic								
Location:	< record location for social dialogue > ISEES model buildings, Kladno								
Why?	< record the purpose for the social dialogue > • Dissemination of the project results and energy saving recommendation, user manual, Manual v DH companies, discussion about further project								
Who?	< record the organisations / groups who have some role or influence in the dialogue planned > Individual meetings with volunteers Director of SBF (Housing management company) Director of TEPO (DH Company) Professional committee for marketing and Public Relations – Association for District Heating								
Pilot Action name:	Dissemination of measurement and other project results								
What?	< record what the action will be – it may be a single action or a process (a series of actions). Specifically record a) who will be involved, b) the nature of the event, e.g. what sort of dialogue are you encouraging and how are you planning to influence this in terms of the arrangements for the events and the running of the event, c) what the actions of the key groups involved will be, d) what resources will be prepared, e) in what environment the action is planned to happen > <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual meetings with volunteers Meeting with Mr. Munzar, director of SBF (Housing management company) Meeting with Mr. Samek, director of TEPO (DH Company) 								
When?	<table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>15.2.2007</td> <td>Professional committee for marketing and Public Relations – Association for District Heating</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9.11.07</td> <td>meeting with tenants</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21.11.07</td> <td>Meeting with director of TEPO (DH Company)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.12.07</td> <td>Meeting with director of SBF (Housing Management Company)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	15.2.2007	Professional committee for marketing and Public Relations – Association for District Heating	9.11.07	meeting with tenants	21.11.07	Meeting with director of TEPO (DH Company)	4.12.07	Meeting with director of SBF (Housing Management Company)
15.2.2007	Professional committee for marketing and Public Relations – Association for District Heating								
9.11.07	meeting with tenants								
21.11.07	Meeting with director of TEPO (DH Company)								
4.12.07	Meeting with director of SBF (Housing Management Company)								
Expectations of action:	< record a) the benefits you anticipate from the action for each of the partners, b) the risks that you foresee, i.e. the potential negative impact that, c) whether this is an action that is likely to be successful and repeated again by some of the groups identified above >								
Anticipated benefits?	Getting information for supply side analysis Feedback for involved parties, recommendation for energy saving measures reconstruction of the model buildings Obtaining information about activities planned by municipality								

Risks foreseen?	Lack of interest of tenants, unwillingness of DH companies to participate in analysis
Will it be repeated?	Yes
Review of action:	< AFTER COMPLETION OF THE ACTION comment on whether the expectations of the action were realized and additional notes AND provide confirmation of what evidence that action has occurred will be available >
Summary of the event / action	< Indicate how the event / action was organized, how it was delivered, by whom and what the sequence of actions involved etc. > DH companies were interested in information and project results, but are not willing to provide any information that is considered to be a business secret. Finally we got some questionnaires from them. Tenants were often surprised with the results of measurement, because they realized that their flats are heated to higher temperature than they expected. They were interested in recommendation for energy saving, but there was a strong pressure on municipality management for window replacement. Municipality management (Lord Mayor was informed by Mr. Munzar, director of SBF a Council Member and Mr. Samek, Director of TEPO and Council member) was very interested in project results and User Manual. The wished to distribute the manual to all the households in Kladno as a part of realization Territorial Energy Concept activities. They held a press conference on 9 th January, 2008 to present the municipal activities in this field (press release is in annex)
Benefits of action	< Indicate the benefits that were achieved, and identify whether the risks identified were mitigated or how they were mitigated > Discussion about the renovation of the building, namely the windows replacement, will be subject of municipal budget discussion. We can say that project results motivated the city management also to further fundraising. Currently the housing management company started negotiation with monument preservation office about the possibilities of replacement of wooden window frames by plastic ones. The costs of replacement will be calculated and should be negotiated in the framework of 2008 budget preparation. Municipality is looking for possibilities of fundraising and subsidies for the state budget and EU funds. Information for supply side analysis
Will it be repeated?	Yes, we would like to organize a meeting with Kladno city council members in February 2008 that should be focused on energy saving and project results presentation and discussion about further reconstructions of the model building.
Additional notes?	NO
Evidence for event	< Confirm what evidence is available to confirm that the event has happened (for the EU Commission). Attach examples of material that were used for the event, e.g. invitations, documents, records, handouts etc. >
	Report in Czech press release Article in reporter of District Heating Association

Social dialogue pilot action record

Country: Bulgaria

Location:

ISEES model buildings, Mladost

Why?

- Presentation of the results of the project
- Give tenants advices for improving behaviour
- Give tenants advices regarding energy efficient lighting and appliances
- Discussion on the billing and the costs of district heating

Who?

Tenants, Sofia DH company, DH billing company

Pilot Action name:

Information sharing event

What?

- Information evening for small group of tenants – with the theme of “your behaviour and your energy consumption”
- Send invitation with questionnaire.
- Nature of the dialogue: a) dissemination of expert information to tenants, b) listening and recording tenant concerns, c) opportunity for DH company and DH billing company to respond to tenant issues.
- A local cafeteria

When?

After the heating season – April-May

Expectations of action:

Anticipated benefits?

Better understanding of the influence of user behaviour on energy consumption
Better understanding of heat energy bills
Better understanding of tenants concerns

Risks foreseen?

Low attendance
Difficult contact with Sofia DH company

Will it be repeated?

It depends on the interest of tenants and the willingness of Sofia DH company and DH billing companies

Review of action:

Summary of the event / action

The event was organised on 18 May 2007. Invitations, questionnaires and Info Letters were mailed to the 72 apartments of the 3 selected buildings. DH and billing companies were contacted through e-mails. The event was organised in a small pizzeria close to the model buildings from 18.00. 11 tenants attended the event. There were three presentations. Two of them from Sofia Energy Centre and one from Techem.

The presentations covered the following topics:

- Results of the ISEES project – how your behaviour influences your heat energy bills;
 - How to save energy keeping the same comfort;
 - What represent the figures in your heat energy bill;
- The presentations were followed by a discussion. The main concerns of the tenants regarding the heat energy consumptions were:
- What is the real percentage of “common heat consumption” (losses from pipes, heating of staircase and common permises, etc.)
 - Could be the metering of heat energy more accurate?
 - Is it possible to install heating sub-station in each building for a more accurate metering (curently the 3 buildings are connected to one sub-station where the whole heat energy is metered)?

Evelina Stoykova from Sofia Energy Centre and Valentin Tsenov from Techem answered to the questions.

Materials on energy saving in dwellings were distributed to participants. The event finished at 19.30.

Benefits of action

For the tenants :

A better understanding of the influence of user behaviour on heat energy consumption.

Better understanding of bills for heat energy

For the heat energy suppliers:

Better understanding of the problems that arise in big multi-family dwelling buildings

Probably no.

Will it be repeated?

Additional notes?

There is a big suspicion between users and suppliers of heat energy because of the inaccurate billing, the lack of information and inefficient regulations (it is difficult to prove theft of heat energy from people that reconnect radiators without advertisement, it is difficult to calculate the real percentage of “common heat consumption” as it depends on too much factors- how many radiators are disconnected, insulation of pipes, general condition of the heating system, etc.)

Evidence for event



Attached : presentations and invitation letter.

Social dialogue pilot action record

Country: Bulgaria

Location: Varna, house of scientists "Jolio-Curie"

Why? < record the purpose for the social dialogue >

- Presentation of the results of the project and provoke a discussion between experts from all fields of energy sector on problems of district heating

Who?

- Universities,
- Ministries and state agencies;
- Electrical transmission and distribution companies;
- District heating companies;
- Energy agencies;
- Local authorities and representatives from municipalities;
- Gas distribution company;
- Private companies.

Pilot Action name: Information sharing event

What? Presentation of the results of ISEES project (single action) in the frame of the biggest annual energy forum in Bulgaria.

When? 13-16 June 2007

Expectations of action:

Anticipated benefits? Possible solutions for improvement of the quality of DH supply and technical solutions for more accurate metering of the heat energy consumption

Risks foreseen? Lack of interest

Will it be repeated? No

Review of action:

Summary of the event / action

- The Energy Forum is an international annual event organised by:
- The scientific-technical union of power engineers in Bulgaria;
 - The Ministry of Economy and Energy;
 - The Energy Efficiency Agency;
 - Natsionalna Elektrieska Kompania EAD (the National Electric Company);
 - The Federation of scientific-technical unions in Bulgaria;
 - The Technical University of Sofia.

The Forum was attended by 350 participants, including 50 experts from other countries (Austria, Czech Republic, Italy, Germany, Poland, and Russia). The participants are from all spheres of the energy sector, as well as from the main institutions.

The paper "Improving the Social Dialogue for Energy Efficient Social Housing – ISEES project" was presented in the frame of the third session "Energy Efficiency" that was held on 15 June 2007.

The presentation was followed by a discussion on the results of the project, mainly on the results of measurements. In the discussion took part representatives from district heating companies and professionals from the energy sector that are also users of heat energy supplied by district heating. The following main topics were discussed:

- **Metering of heat energy consumption:** currently the heat consumption is metered through heat meter fixed at the inlet pipe of the heating system after the substation and heat cost allocators fixed on radiators. Experts expressed doubts regarding the accuracy of this measurement, as the temperature of the outgoing water from the heating system of the building is not measured. Following this it is possible to report a higher consumption than the real one. They suggested that to a second heat meter fixed on the outgoing pipe of the substation would give a more accurate measurement.
- **Billing system:** currently the billing of heat consumption is based on the data from the heat meter and the heat cost allocators. The total heat energy consumption metered from the heat meter is divided in proportion to the data from the heat cost allocators. 15% of the whole heat energy consumption is calculated for the "heating installation" – heat emanated by the vertical pipes that are passing through the flats. These 15% reflect approximately the real heat energy consumption of the common pipes when all radiators are used. Problems occur when there are disconnected radiators. More are the disconnected radiators; more is the heat exchange between heated and non-heated flats. There are cases when the energy consumption of a radiator, in a building with more than 25% of disconnected users, is higher than its total capacity. Experts stressed on the importance of the elaboration of a new methodology for calculation of heat consumption. This methodology should take into account the number of disconnected radiators, the place and length of vertical pipes (in some flats there are incoming pipes, in other outgoing pipes – their temperature is quite different).
- **User behaviour:** different aspects of the user behaviour were discussed:
- **Reasons for disconnection:** the main reason for disconnection from the district heating system is the low income of people. Families

BULGARIA

- of retrainees and other vulnerable groups cannot afford the price of heat energy supplied by district heating. Another reason for disconnection is the billing system. People are not aware for what they give money. In buildings with high rate of disconnected radiators or empty flats, users of district heating pay very high bills, even when they try to make some savings (reducing temperature in rooms, turn off the radiators at night, etc.).
- Temperatures in premises: the results of the measurements in five selected flats were very interesting for the audience. This aspect of the heat energy consumption was not taken into account till now. Experts agreed that a dialogue between experts from the building sector, district heating and billing companies would be very useful. They suggested that district heating companies should organise awareness rising programmes for users.

Benefits of action

< Indicate the benefits that were achieved, and identify whether the risks identified were realised or how they were mitigated >

For suppliers of DH:

- Suggestions for technical improvement of metering of heat energy consumption
- Suggestions for improvement of regulations
- Suggestions for better management

Will it be repeated?

no.

Additional notes?

Evidence for event



Social dialogue pilot action record

Country: Bulgaria

Location: Sofia, meeting room No 1, hotel Rila

Why? Workshop on refurbishment of multi-family dwelling buildings. The aim of the event is to inform the target group on the possibilities for energy saving at building refurbishment and at improvement of user behaviour.

Who?

- Tenants,
- District heating companies;
- DH billing companies;
- Energy agencies;
- Local authorities and representatives from municipalities;
- Experts from building sector.

Pilot Action name: Information sharing event

What? Single event for tenants and experts from energy and building sector.

When? 20 December 2007

Expectations of action:

Anticipated benefits? Improve the dialogue on problems related to energy consumption and building refurbishment.

Risks foreseen? Experts from municipalities, DH companies and DH billing companies are available day-time. Tenants are available in the evening. Lack of interest especially from DH companies and municipalities

Will it be repeated? No

Review of action:

Summary of the event / action

The workshop was organised by Sofia Energy Centre and the "Institute for Environmental Strategies". Invitations were sent by e-mail to municipalities, DH companies, DH billing companies, building companies. Tenants were reached by phone or through Info Letters. The event was organised in hotel Rila, Sofia. The agenda included 2 sessions. First session is devoted to user behaviour, possibilities for improvement of DH and energy advice for tenants. The second session is devoted to the organisation and financing of refurbishment of multi-family dwelling buildings. 24 people attended the event.

- 10 tenants of flats;
- 1 expert from DH billing company;
- 3 experts from municipalities;
- 3 experts from building sector;
- 6 experts from energy agencies.

The presentations were followed by a discussion on the following main topics:

- Metering and billing of heat energy consumption
- Organisational problems towards building refurbishment – it is very difficult, nearly impossible, to get the approval of all owners of flats as required by the current legislation.
- Financial problems – in the same building live people with different incomes, some owners cannot afford the price of the refurbishment and the banks would not approve loan because of their low incomes.
- User behaviour – tenants show big interest in the results of the project, especially in the possibility to reach substantial energy savings only with a change of their behaviour.

Benefits of action

For tenants:

- Awareness raising on possibilities to implement energy saving measures in their home;
- Awareness raising on current programs for refurbishment of multi-family dwelling buildings.

For DH companies:

- Awareness rising on possibilities for improvement quality of services

For experts from building sector:

- Information on the market for building refurbishment and technical solutions

Will it be repeated?

no.



Presentations
Invitation letter

Social dialogue pilot action record

Country:	Slovakia
Location:	Model Building – Bratislava, Hálova 19
Why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss the idea of heat consumption measurement in the type of panel building Promote the possibilities of saving thermal energy and thus family budget Inform on user behaviour in model building with individual regulation in old house – introduction of digital, remote monitoring of model building to tenants Inform on tenants motivation to start refurbishment Introduce DH provider and inform on energy efficiency actions taken at the supply side Discussion
Who?	Petržalka Housing Cooperative – energy department, District heating company, ISEES PM, Inhabitants of social houses in the neighbourhood.

Pilot Action name: Information sharing event

What?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informational presentation – distributed among participants in printed version on ISEES measurement results. Presentation was used as an “ice breaker” for the discussion afterwards. Secondly the short introduction about action on supply side was given. Main topic of the DH presentation was “how much heat and hot water cost us now and in 10 years time...” Unique action which brought people from DH company to the very end users, which does not happen normally.
-------	--

When? October, 2007

Expectations of action:

Anticipated benefits?	Feedback for involved parties
Risks foreseen?	Number of participants. The group of opinions may vary dramatically affecting the final feeling of the whole action.
Will it be repeated?	In line with housing management regular meetings with occupants of social housing. A 15 minute start of the meeting can be

Review of action:

Summary of the event / action	Social dialogue event – meeting in this form (directly at the model building) has shown quite high efficiency due to higher number of participants than any other action considered. Planned with the housing management company and them being involved in the event encouraged participants to be involved in the discussion and also led to a higher number of participants.
Benefits of action	<p>Direct information transfer from DH company to the end users – decision makers whether stay connected/disconnect from DH network. People receiving information on actual EE measures on the supply side.</p> <p>Positive information on possible cost saving related to the user behaviour (not only technical measures, which are rather costly are necessary to save family budget)</p>
Will it be repeated?	Upon request of the housing management company, in case of important decision making situation regarding measurement of consumption, heat source and refurbishment actions planned in specific building.
Additional notes?	
Evidence for event	Housing management company records.

Social dialogue pilot action record

Country: Slovakia

Location: Model Building – Banská Bystrica, Oreburská 3

Why?

- Discuss the idea of heat consumption measurement in the type of panel building
- Promote the possibilities of saving thermal energy and thus family budget
- Inform on user behaviour in model building with individual regulation in old house – introduction of digital, remote monitoring of model building to tenants
- Inform on tenants motivation to start refurbishment
- Introduce DH provider and inform on energy efficiency actions taken at the supply side
- Discussion

Who? Realbyt – housing management company, District heating company STEFE SK, ISEES PM, Inhabitants of social houses in the neighbourhood o of Oreburská street. 20 participants in total.

Pilot Action name: Information sharing event

What?

- Informational presentation – distributed among participants in printed version on ISEES measurement results. Presentation was used as an “ice breaker” for the discussion afterwards.
- Secondly the short introduction about action on supply side was given. Main topic of the DH presentation was “how much heat and hot water cost us now and in 10 years time...”
- Unique action which brought people from DH company to the very end users, which does not happen normally.

When? November, 2007

Expectations of action:

Anticipated benefits? Feedback for involved parties, decreased number of complaints towards housing management company regarding heating.

Risks foreseen? Number of participants. The group of opinions may vary dramatically effecting the final feeling of the whole action. Too much information in a short time is contraproductive.

Will it be repeated?

Based on experience from Bratislava building, other actions of this type may be repeated preferably in line with housing management regular meetings with occupants of social housing. At the beginning the topic of regular meeting can be dedicated to SD means, longer meeting time causes less effect of the proposed actions, as well as decreasing number of people involved in SD.

Positive experience from Banska Bystrica resulted in willingness of DH provider to present idea of ISEES at a bigger event organised by STEFE SK in next months

Review of action:

Summary of the event / action

Social dialogue event – meeting in this form (directly at the model building) has shown quite high efficiency in attendance. Higher number of participants than by any other action considered was reached by official involvement of housing management company and also other than ISEES related topics on the programme. In cooperation with housing management company and taking part at the occupant meeting with given schedule participants were also more prepared for the discussion and also higher number of participants arrived.

Benefits of action

Barrier between DH provider Direct information transfer from DH company to the end users – decision makers whether stay connected/disconnect from DH network. People receiving information on actual EE measures on the supply side.

Positive information on possible cost saving related to the user behaviour (not only technical measures, which are rather costly are necessary to save family budget)

Dialogues among people who do not know each other very well started and may continue in the future which is very important mainly when taking important decisions in the house.

Will it be repeated?

Up on request of the housing management company, in case of important decision making situation regarding measurement of consumption, heat source and refurbishment actions planned in specific building.

Additional notes?

Evidence for event

Housing management company records

**Imprint:**

This report has been prepared in the course of the ISEES project, partly funded by the European Commission

**Author:**

Robert Clark, ESD Ltd, UK

December 2007

www.isees.info