



ODYSSEE-MURE Fit4-55 (2022-2025)
Monitoring the Energy Efficiency Pillar for Climate Neutrality

Second regional meeting, ODYSSEE-MURE, 25-26 September 2024, Rome

Successful Measures Tool

Barbara Schlomann, Fraunhofer ISI

Handling of the Successful Measures Tool - Step 1: Selection of the measures for the assessment

Guideline for the measure selection

The assessment is limited to a **maximum of 5 measures per sector** (including the cross-cutting sector), i.e. a maximal 25 policy measures can be evaluated per country.

Selection criteria:

- Only high and medium impact measures, i.e. leave out low impact measures.
- Measures with some experience, i.e. implemented at least around 1-2 years ago.
- Focus on ongoing measures and not too old measures (starting after around 2010).
- Representation of several measure types.

Note: If these criteria reduce the number of remaining measures too much, they can be watered down; in the end, the selection of measures is based on your own “expert feeling”.

Evaluation criteria for successful measures: 6 “high-priority” criteria (score from 1 to 5)

Group 1: High priority criteria		
1) High impact / high number of applicants	Amount of energy savings achieved by the measure / amount of energy saving activities which are addressed and carried out by the measure	Link to MURE descriptors "Impact evaluation" and "Semi-quantitative impact": High impact measure = score 5 or 4 Medium impact measure = score 3 Low impact measure = score 2 or 1
2) Cost efficiency for the implementor / necessary administrative support	Relation of energy savings achieved and necessary costs for the implementor / amount of administrative support necessary to implement a measure, i.e. extent of the administrative barrier to implement a measure	Score 5 = very cost-effective Score 4 = relatively cost-effective Score 3 = neutral, balanced relation Score 2 = less cost-effective Score 1 = not cost-effective at all
3) Potential for market transformation and for promotion of energy service market	Suitability of the measure to enhance the market transformation to energy-efficient product/systems and to strengthening the market for energy efficiency and energy services (e.g. in the form of new actor or new business models)	Score 5 = very high potential Score 4 = high potential Score 3 = medium potential Score 2 = low potential Score 1 = very low potential
4) Suitability to overcome barriers for energy efficiency	This criterion refers to the fact that in reality various barriers prevent private households and companies from realizing even a profitable energy-saving potential. Usually, the following main types of barriers are distinguished: information and knowledge deficits; capital constraints both including external and internal funds; risk and uncertainties, often leading to very short pay-back times for an EE investment; or split incentives when the costs and benefits of an EE investment decision fall on different actors.	Score 5 = very suitable to overcome barriers Score 4 = suitable to overcome barriers Score 3 = neutral Score 2 = not suitable to overcome barriers Score 1 = fully unsuitable to overcome barriers
5) Ease and stability of re-financing (only relevant for financial measures)	This criterion examines the extent to which the instruments differ in terms of their funding; one focus is on the aspect of budget-independence of the funding. It must only be evaluated for financial measures.	Score 5 = very high stability Score 4 = high stability Score 3 = medium stability Score 2 = low stability Score 1 = very low stability
6) Persistency of the savings induced by the measure	How lasting is the impact of the measure in terms of time; usually, behavioural measures are less persistent or the persistency is less ensured as for measures inducing investments	Score 5 = very persistent / long-lasting Score 4 = persistent / lasting Score 3 = medium persistent / lasting Score 2 = low persistency / short-lasting Score 1 = very low persistency / very short-lasting

Evaluation criteria for successful measures: 6 “low-priority” criteria (score from 1 to 5)

Group 2: Low priority criteria		
7) Transferability between countries	The following questions are addressed by this criterion: Can the measure be easily transferred to another country? Makes such a transfer sense? Is it possible that the measure may not work in the same way in another political context?	Score 5 = very suitable for transfer Score 4 = suitable for transfer Score 3 = neutral Score 2 = not suitable for transfer Score 1 = fully unsuitable for transfer
8) Link other measures / policy packages	In general two or more measures interact when addressing the same targeted end use. Typical interaction, for example, is between the implementation of an EU Directive and the corresponding incentivizing (financial, fiscal, etc.) measures. Please note that this criterion refers to a sub-heading in the detailed measure description, where information on interaction should be given, too (see new guidelines Chapter 4.3).	Link to sub-heading "Interaction of measures" in the detailed measure description Score 5 = very high degree of interaction Score 4 = high degree of interaction Score 3 = medium degree of interaction Score 2 = low degree of interaction Score 1 = no interaction at all
9) Some experience with measure	Experience means that the measure is already implemented for some time (refers to MURE descriptor "starting year"). And also that a measure evaluation or at least some information on impact, acceptance etc. is available.	Link to MURE descriptors "Starting year" and "Impact evaluation" Score 5 = very much experience Score 4 = much experience Score 3 = some experience Score 2 = not much experience Score 1 = no experience at all
10) Avoidance of negative side-effects	Side-effect are defined here as measure impacts which are not directly linked to the energy savings induced and the costs of the measure. Negative side-effects are e.g.: -Distributional effects as e.g. an "unfair" burdening of the measure costs or relatively high burden for low-income households -Direct rebound effects, i.e. negligent handling of energy due to cost saving induced by the measure (e.g. more lighting, higher room temperature) - Indirect rebound effects due to economic interrelations.	Score 5 = Very high avoidance of negative side-effects Score 4 = High avoidance of negative side-effects Score 3 = Medium avoidance of negative side-effects Score 2 = Low avoidance of negative side-effects Score 1 = Very low avoidance of negative side-effects
11) Support of positive side-effects	Positive side-effects or co-benefits of a measure are e.g.: -Higher economic growth, improved competitiveness and productivity -Creation of new jobs, improved work environment - Improvement of energy security, health etc.	Score 5 = Very high support of positive side-effects Score 4 = High support of positive side-effects Score 3 = Medium support of positive side-effects Score 2 = Low support of positive side-effects Score 1 = Very low support of positive side-effects
12) Ease of acceptance by relevant stakeholders	The following questions are addressed by this criterion: Will the measure be easily accepted by the relevant stakeholders or is a strong opposition to be expected (e.g. by industry, consumer associations, renters etc.)?	Score 5 = Very high degree of acceptance Score 4 = High degree of acceptance Score 3 = Medium degree of acceptance Score 2 = Low degree of acceptance Score 1 = Very low degree of acceptance / strong opposition

Handling of the assessment in the MURE online screen

Mure ≡ Successful Measures Search

MAIN NAVIGATION

- > Lists
- > Measures
- > Facilities
- > **Successful measures**
- > Score management
- > Assessment tool
- > Users
- > Quality
- > Api documentation

General cross-cutting **Household** Industry Services Transport

Code	Country	Name	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	Average Score
HOU-AT0402	Austria	Austrian Federal Government's Renovation Initiative	5	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	5	4.0
HOU-AT0403	Austria	klimaaktiv Buildings - Building Standard	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3.3
HOU-AT0408	Austria	Minimum thermal standards for buildings	5	4	3	2	1	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3.3

Note:

C1 – C12 are the 12 evaluation criteria. A short explanation is given when you click on the field.

For EU Member States:

- The last update of the Tool was done in the previous ODYSSEE-MURE project.
- We suggest a light update of the measure assessment, if you see that some of the selected measures are outdated.
- The best time for this would be during the processing of the quality control results.

For Contracting Parties of the Energy Community:

- As the Tool has not yet been used for these countries, it does not need to be completed for the first time in the current project.
- If individual countries are still interested in trying out the tool for their country, they are welcome to do so. The TC will check whether it is ready for use for the EnCs and make it usable otherwise.



Thank you for your attention!

Barbara Schlomann, Fraunhofer ISI
barbara.schlomann@isi.fraunhofer.de