



Co-funded by the Intelligent Energy Europe
Programme of the European Union

Project Title: Regional and Local public Authorities cooperating in sustainable energy planning through effective multi-level governance models

Acronym: COOPENERGY

Grant Agreement Number: IEE/12/703/

Deliverable	D2.4-Regional review report – NENET
Associated WP	WP2- Multi-Level Governance Models
Associated Task	Task 2.5
Date Delivered	1 July 2013
Prepared by	NENET
Dissemination Level	Public (PU)



Deliverable D2.4- Regional review report - NENET

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. COOPENERGY.....	2
3. Overall context in sustainable energy planning:.....	2
4. Main purpose:	3
5. Regional situation in energy planning:.....	4
5.1 General information:	4
➤ Energy planning responsibilities at regional level.....	4
➤ Regional SEAP and Covenant of Mayors:.....	5
5.2 Cooperation between national and regional levels:	5
5.3 Cooperation between regional and local levels:.....	6
6. Synthesis:.....	15
6.1 SWOT analysis:.....	15
6.2 Recommendations for collaborative sustainable energy planning:.....	17



Deliverable D2.4- Regional review report - NENET

1. Introduction

This document covers the deliverable D2.5 of the COOPENERGY project.

The deliverable is submitted either in English (5-10 pages in an electronic format) or in National language with a 2-3 page summary in English.

Each COOPENERGY regional partner is responsible for delivering this document for its own region.

2. COOPENERGY

The main goal of COOPENERGY is to foster the development of collaboration models in sustainable energy planning between the regional and local public authorities to lead the transition towards low carbon communities and regions.

COOPENERGY aims to mobilize eight (8) regional public authorities to work hand in hand with the local authorities and demonstrate their collaboration by developing Multi-Level Governance (MLG) models that support the creation of mutually beneficial Sustainable Energy Action Plans (SEAP) at regional and local levels and the development of joint actions in energy planning for the successful implementation of SEAPs.

In complement to cooperation in strategic regional energy planning, three (3) **themes of collaboration** were identified as key cross-cutting pillars for the successful definition and implementation of the MLG models. COOPENERGY will focus on these collaboration themes:

- **Financial instruments**
- **Modelling, planning and monitoring tools for decision making**
- **Awareness raising and stakeholder involvement instruments**

3. Overall context in sustainable energy planning

Achieving sustainable energy solutions often requires the development of a number of interrelated measures such as a change in land use, sharing of sustainable energy resources or development of new financial models. Therefore, successful implementation will require coherent and concerted energy planning to bring all the differing strands together at regional and municipality levels. This could include additional support for the development of:

- infrastructure planning at a spatial and network level (covering more than one public authority or region) such as renewable energy networks
- cross boundary renewable energy resource supply chains e.g. wood fuel biomass
- natural resource use planning and conflict management

- comprehensive monitoring of energy use and GHG emissions at regional and local levels to inform development of local SEAPs and business cases
- development of innovative financial mechanisms supporting local actions

Successful implementation is further complicated by the fact that regional SEAPs are often part of a wider plan or strategy involving a greater number of stakeholders, and a longer plan development time. It is therefore imperative at the outset to develop a firm multi-level governance basis for action.

4. Main purpose

Each regional partner will perform an **analysis of the situation in its region** with regards to the implementation of MLG models in **sustainable energy planning** and provide recommendations for further improvements to the planning processes.

It will:

- Analyse if the local and regional needs are addressed in the regional SEAP by interviewing the regional authority and a number of municipalities (at least 3 per region).
- Identify areas of potential conflict for each stakeholder and propose a mapping of inconsistencies.
- Identify the drivers to provide a comprehensive business case for the definition of ambitious regional SEAPs.
- Assess if the financial instruments are planned and approved.
- Provide recommendations for improving the regional SEAP in terms of methodology for its revision as well as priority areas.

The report of the review analysis will be discussed with the regional authorities and serve as basis for COOPENERGY activities.

5. Regional situation in energy planning

5.1 General information

Background: regional authorities in Sweden

County Council: A County Council, in Swedish Landstingsfullmäktige, is an elected assembly of a regional municipality. It is a political entity, and typically its main responsibilities lies within the public health care system.

County Administration Board: A County Administrative Board (Swedish: Länsstyrelsen) is a Swedish Government Agency in each of the Counties of Sweden, led by a Governor appointed by the Government for a term of six years. The main responsibilities of the County Administrative Board are to coordinate the development of the county in line with goals set in national politics.

➤ Energy planning responsibilities at regional level

Please indicate the areas of responsibilities of your regional government in relation with energy. Please indicate (YES/NO). If YES please describe.

- Public buildings (schools,..): Yes, County Councils have responsibility for own health care buildings. Schools are municipal responsibility.
- Public transport: Yes, County Council, in collaboration and joint ownership of the regional public transport company (bus transport) with municipalities.
- Energy network infrastructures (planning, operation,..): Yes, in terms of the overall regional planning for development. Beyond, the County Administration Boards is responsible to ensure that local planning documents are not in conflict with national interests and is coordinating various interests in planning processes. There is also supervision and an approval process according to building and environmental laws.
- Local energy production (planning, authorisation, operation,..): Local energy production can become part of the regional development planning. The County Administration Board is in case of bigger production plants responsible for authorisation/license of the plant.
- Energy and GHG monitoring: Yes, the County Administration Board is responsible for data follow-up regarding regional energy and climate strategy.
- Land use and spatial planning: County Administration Boards are giving advice on local planning and are working together with municipalities and other governmental agencies

with counselling towards municipalities. They are developing and publishing regional planning documents to support municipal planning. County Administrative Boards are also reviewing the municipal planning with regard to human health and safety, national interests, environmental quality, shoreline protection and issues which affect several municipalities in the county.

➤ **Regional SEAP and Covenant of Mayors**

What is the name of the “regional SEAP”?

“Klimat- och energistrategi för Norrbottens län” = “Climate and energy strategy for the County of Norrbotten” and the complementing “Åtgärdsprogram för klimat- och energiarbete i Norrbottens län” = “Action plan for climate and energy in the County of Norrbotten”

When was it established?

The strategy has been published in 2008. The first Action Plan has been revised in 2012 and a new for the period 2013-2015 has been published in 2013.

- Does it need to be revised, if yes when? There is no decision yet, when the strategy will be revised. The Action Plan has been revised in 2012. But there is a need and a will to complement the current strategy and action documents with more concrete and action oriented planning. A new revised Action Plan will be developed during 2013-2015.
- Are there any Covenant of Mayors coordinating structures in your region? Please describe. No, so far there are no CoM coordinating structures in the region.
- How many CoM signatories are present in your region? 2 of 14 municipalities have submitted their SEAP, 4 more are in the process of developing their SEAP and 3 are in the process of signing the CoM.

5.2 Cooperation between national and regional levels

To what extent are National public authorities involved, support or can influence energy planning activities at regional and local levels?

- Due to the fact, as the County Administration Boards are appointed by the government, the national level is directly involved in energy planning activities.
 - Specific “national interests” are defined for various areas, which limits possibilities for other interests to use these areas, e.g. if one area is of interest for the military, wind power establishment is strongly limited.

Are there any collaboration processes in place between the National and Regional levels that support the design and/or implementation of the regional and local SEAPs? This could include for instance setting up a regulatory framework supporting a joint definition process, a joint awareness raising campaign, a national level financial instrument supporting regional level investment. Please describe

- Norrbotten County has been appointed by the Government as “Green Pilot County” in 2010 which included development of processes, tools and methods for the design and implementation of the regional SEAP and giving support to local authorities in their climate work as well. The experiences are now spread to other counties. There has been funding for the strategic work from the government to the County Administration Boards, as well as an obligation to national authorities like the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning and the National Energy Agency to support the County in activities and actions.
- The National Energy Agency is funding the core activities and staff costs of the County Administration Board for the coordination of the regional energy and climate strategy.
- The National Swedish Transport Administration and the National Forest Agency are members of the steering group for the coordination of the energy and climate strategy activities.
- There is a governmental support scheme for strategic energy efficiency work in municipalities and County Councils. The County Administration Boards has a supporting role on the regional level, and is very well connected to a more comprehensive energy and climate work in most municipalities and the region.

5.3 Cooperation between regional and local levels

➤ Content of the regional SEAP

What are the 3 main sectors targeted by the “regional SEAP”? (e.g: building retrofitting, sustainable mobility,..)

- 1) Three main sector:
Sustainable Growths, Sustainable Community Planning, Sustainable Transport
- 2) Three prioritised renewable energy sources:
Wind power, Hydro power and Biomass

What is the level of recommendations/actions at regional level/joint actions between regional and local levels, proposed within the regional SEAP?

- The regional SEAP has been developed in a comprehensive participation process, and is linked to priorities in the regional development strategy. It is
 - a compilation of priorities and actions of regional stakeholders;
 - a basis document for prioritising actions and projects in the future;
 - a basis document for coordinating regional and local activities to reach the jointly agreed climate and energy targets, thereby contributing to the Swedish and the EU climate and energy targets.

Does the regional SEAP include an estimated budget for implementing the recommendations/actions?

No.

Does the regional SEAP provide recommendations or measures for addressing interrelated measures such as a change in land use, sharing of sustainable energy resources or development of new financial models?

- While developing the regional SEAP, 6 working groups have been established: Forestry and Agriculture, Transport and Infrastructure, Buildings, Industry, Municipalities and Tourism. Interrelated measures have been part of all working groups, here are some examples:
 1. Industry:
 - Developing joint strategies, tools and method to improve access to Green Technology Funding/Financing;
 - Coordination of companies who offer solutions within Green Technology and energy efficiency
 2. Forestry and Agriculture:
Collaborate and coordinate in terms of improving climate friendly transport systems for products;
 3. Municipalities:
 - improving collaboration in climate-friendly transport systems;
 - Building systems for procurement of renewable energy sources

3. All working groups: improve capacity building and knowledge base in own organizations to facilitate collaboration and interaction.

Does the regional SEAP provide recommendations for implementing joint sustainable energy planning tools between the regional and local levels (see COOPENERGY pillars)? If yes, please specify.

- 1) Capacity building and coordination forums: New forums for both meetings of stakeholders within the various sectors as well as cross-sectorial forums shall be established to discuss and energy- and climate issues concrete collaborations.
- 2) Regional collaboration for financing transition towards a low-carbon economy shall be improved.
- 3) A regional collaboration platform to mobilise private money and other funding for regional Green Technology companies and projects shall be established.
- 4) Coordination of activities to improve railroad network in Northern Sweden
- 5) Collaboration of regional actor to improve evaluation of activities and follow-up data access for energy and climate data.

➤ **Regional SEAP design and approval process**

What was the process followed for designing the “regional SEAP”?

- In 2006, regional stakeholders from the public sector, energy supplier, from the commercial and industry sector came together for a climate conference to discuss the need of a more coordinated approach towards the energy and climate challenge. Following this, a collaboration process between County Council, County Administration Board and the Association of Municipalities has been established. The private sector has been heard, too. This resulted in the energy and climate strategy for Norrbotten County. This was also a required result due to a duty commissioned by the Swedish Government to the County Administration Board in 2008. The Action Programme has been developed in 2009 in a comprehensive participatory approach with the relevant sector and actors in the county.

How was the regional public authority represented and involved?

How were the local public authorities represented and involved?

- Through the Association of Municipalities
- Through commenting the documents each
- As part of the initial conference

***Were other regional stakeholders represented and involved during the design process?
See above.***

What were the different phases followed for designing the “regional SEAP”? How long did it take? See above

Was the National level involved? See above.

What was the process followed for approving the “regional SEAP”?

Who approved the regional SEAP within the regional authority?

- The so-called “Regional Partnership” has approved the regional SEAP. This is a formalised coordination committee between municipalities, County Council, County Administration Board and further authorities (e.g. employment office, Sami Council) and organisations (e.g. University, Association of Enterprises). The Counsellor is leading the work.

Did any local public authority representatives approve the regional SEAP?

- Not formally as this is not foreseen, but local authorities have been parts of the developing process of the regional SEAP.

Did any other regional stakeholders approve the regional SEAP? If yes, please specify.

- No

Were there any communication activities implemented following the approval of the regional SEAP? If yes, please specify who was involved?

- Yes, the strategy has been
 - published online and in paper version;
 - presented in various forums and seminars;
 - discussed and presented as part of the work as Green Pilot County towards other counties and on national level.

➤ **Needs of local and regional public authorities**

This section is based on the feedback from regional and local public authorities.

From a regional perspective

Question 1: In your case, what are the benefits and dis-benefits of implementing a collaboration process in sustainable energy planning between the regional and local levels? Please identify and discuss at least 3 benefits and 3 dis-benefits.

Benefits

Deliverable D2.4- Regional review report - NENET

- A working collaboration process between local and regional level makes it much more likely, that actions are implemented which are consistently contributing to the regional, national and EU climate and energy goals. One implemented action will trigger other activities and will in best case lead to an upward spiral of more and better coherent activities.
- Collaboration is also needed to ensure information flow between actors. This is a prerequisite for continuously improve and adapt local and regional strategies, policies and measures to match demands and to tap potentials.
- Through efficient collaboration processes a more efficient spending (“value for money”) is possible and better allocation of funding, this includes economies of scale but also experience sharing. Reinventing the wheel is uneconomic and frustrating, so it is highly desired to avoid it.
- It is also through collaboration how the region can answer to national priorities and to take advantage of them (e.g. in terms of applying for financing).
- In summary, so is multi-level collaboration and MLG considered as indispensable to create a joint approach towards energy and climate policies in the region. It is also a natural part of democratic processes. It is also a prerequisite to create the necessary momentum and drive to make things happen. Otherwise, duplication would happen and consistency of policies cannot be guaranteed.

Dis-benefits of collaborative in sustainable energy planning

- A possible dis-benefit of a comprehensive collaboration process might be that it takes time and costs money compared to a more direct decision making process. But it is not given that this means that the process is less effective as the result can be more elaborated or more effective in the long-term.
- As there are two regional authorities (County Council, County Administration Board), it can be difficult for stakeholders to understand the different responsibilities.
- In general, the more comprehensive a process is the more difficult can communication towards the public become. On the other hand, more stakeholders are directly involved who get a better understanding and feel a commitment.

Question 2: Considering the existing regional SEAP, what are the potential conflict areas or inconsistencies (due to the lack of cooperation) that could prevent its successful

implementation? Or prevent the implementation of the local SEAPs? Please provide details about the targeted area, reasons for the potential conflict and inconsistency.

- There are no major conflict areas or inconsistencies within the regional energy and climate work related to a mere lack of cooperation in the meaning of not discussing questions and trying to find joint solutions.
- But there are conflicts of politically decided goals that may harm the achievement of objectives. Examples are: energy and climate targets vs. environmental targets, e.g. regarding biomass use for energy and nature protection of forests.
- Another conflict area is that between economic growths and absolute reduction of energy demand and/or GHG emissions. In facts, regional energy efficiency targets have not been reached in the period 2010-2013 by far.
- Another example is the conflict of national interests vs. local interests. This is true for e.g. implementation of wind power, conflicting with military needs or reindeer herding (both national interest areas).

Question 3: What recommendations would you like to suggest improving the cooperation in sustainable energy planning between the regional and local levels?

- Information exchange from the local level towards the regional level should be improved, not at least in terms of energy data, project planning and strategy decisions on local level.
- Nenet as regional energy agency plays an important role as link between the local and the regional level. Unfortunately, Nenet is mainly project-funded, what makes a long-term planning of activities and service offers difficult. A stronger funding structure and less dependency on project funding would it make possible to build up a more efficient and more well-known service offer for municipalities and for the region. This would lead to a more efficient implementation of the climate and energy work.

➤ **Needs of local and regional public authorities**

From a local perspective

Question 1:

Benefits

- A working collaboration process between local and regional level makes it much more likely, that actions are implemented which are consistently contributing to the same

Deliverable D2.4- Regional review report - NENET

goals. Even consistency between local and regional plans is more likely. One implemented action will trigger other activities and will in best case lead to an upward spiral of more and better coherent activities.

- Experience exchange and capacity building are necessary for an effective regional energy and climate work, and this is much easier to reach if there is a collaboration model in place.
- Through collaboration duplication can be avoided, and work becomes more coherent. In contrary, synergies are possible, e.g. in the development of joint tools as the regional energy data observatory Energiluppen.
- Economies of scale, specifically in a region like Norrbotten which is sparsely populated and a lot of communities are quite small.
- There are benefits in collaborating in traditional energy issues, like cooperation in terms of energy production, planning of infrastructure but even through joint procurement of energy efficient services or equipment. When it comes to “climate” it is fluffy and wooly, that means, the limits of the field of activities is not clear, responsibilities can be very spread etc. Therefore, it is difficult to show clear benefits.
- From the regional perspective, there is a clear benefit if local energy and climate plans are harmonized with the regional strategy, but from the local perspective, there is less need to coordinate with the region so far.

Dis-benefits of collaborative in sustainable energy planning:

- Comprehensive collaboration process takes time and cost money especially in Norrbotten due to long distances. This is true mainly for the smaller municipalities in the rural areas.
- As there are only a few persons working with energy and climate issues, knowledge, influence and involvement are very much concentrated in a few hands. Participation and reflection of a broad range of interests are not necessarily given in any case.
- Minorities in general and the smaller communities in the countryside do not have the possibilities to engage in the same way as bigger cities in collaboration processes. Their interests can be neglected even though a participation process has happened and they have invested valuable time and money. This leads to frustration and less engagement, as resources are limited and have already been partly invested in the process.

Deliverable D2.4- Regional review report - NENET

- There is an experience that purpose, targets and objectives of MLG processes are vague or unclear. This has generated less effective processes and – the more often this experience has been made – less engagement from local authorities.
- It has also happened that a quite complicated structure has been built up but not has been followed up nor terminated, it just phased out somehow.
- If a MLG process is not well-managed, e.g. in terms of capacity planning and in timing, it is very difficult for stakeholders to really participate and contribute.
- How well a MLG model is working depends also on which persons are involved and whether they like each other or not, how reliable and engaged people are etc. That makes process instable and not replicable. Disappointments are possible.

Question 2: Considering the existing regional SEAP, what are the potential conflict areas or inconsistencies (due to the lack of cooperation) that could prevent its successful implementation? Or prevent the implementation of the local SEAPs? Please provide details about the targeted area, reasons for the potential conflict and inconsistency.

- In general, distribution of limited resources in each area of activity.
- Traditionally, the public sector and the commercial/industrial sector are not very well connected to each other. Different working cultures makes it difficult to cooperate, and political targets are not always matching private company targets. This can lead to conflicts and inefficient implementation of actions.
- Differences both in geographic position, in size of communities and cultural background result in different benefit from joint and county-wide approaches, campaigns and tools.
- Collaboration processes are often linked to persons, who can leave organisations. Often, even know-how of the process is thereby leaving the organisation and conflicts can arise due to a lack of knowledge.

Question 3: What recommendations would you like to suggest to improve the cooperation in sustainable energy planning between the regional and local levels?

- MLG processes need to take time and money, and there should be resources fairly allocated to the process, specifically giving support to smaller communities to ensure representation.
- A better analysis of the situation in the region, of knowledge, experience and demands is needed to avoid duplication but even to take advantage of resources.

Deliverable D2.4- Regional review report - NENET

- Capacity building, awareness-raising and planning for more use of distant-meeting-technologies needed as part of MLG processes. Personal meetings are indispensable but not needed for every meeting.
- Funding for pilot communities should be available to trigger development of real results that can be used by others then.
- MLG structures should build upon long-term contracts between stakeholders. A well-known and working MLG structure for a regional energy- and climate data observatory is needed.
- Seminars, forums etc as instruments within the process need to be meaningful and to have agreed objectives and responsibilities, the purpose and need to be regularly.
- Responsibilities of all partners need to be defined and to be made visible and understandable for all participants.
- Energy and climate strategy work as well as projects need to be more visible on all level. Easy access to information and more pro-active awareness-raising and information is needed.
- The process of making the energy and climate strategy well-known, accepted and integrated in stakeholders daily work is a never ending work. This needs to be done much more, as people are leaving their position in authorities and organizations and thereby taking the knowledge with them.
- Include more contextual analysis within MLG processes in energy and climate issues as well as more capacity building to ensure long-lasting effects and to give personal benefits for stakeholders.

6. Synthesis

6.1 SWOT analysis sustainable energy planning situation within your region

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad awareness of the importance of participation processes • Tradition and formal structures existing to give stakeholders opportunities to express opinion and interests (Consideration processes “remiss”) • Collaboration structures which includes bot regional authorities and local authorities in place (Regional Partnership) • Few conflict areas between local and regional interests • High potential for energy efficiency and renewable energies • Norrbotten has been appointed as Green Pilot County and got extra funding for strategic work between 2010-2013 • Governmental funding for County Administration Boards to organize, manage and coordinate regional energy and climate planning. • Regional energy agency Nenet existing, that is owned by regional and local authorities and the expert pool for the region. • Only 14 municipalities, not too many to collaborate with. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divided competencies between two regional authorities. • Nenet as regional energy agency mainly project financed, what makes long-term planning of service offers difficult. • A small number of stakeholders who needs to be involved in many processes – problem in terms of time, but also of only a few persons representing a whole county. • Long distances and sparsely population make collaboration difficult and time- and cost intensive. • Lack of capacities in small municipalities: staff, knowledge and money. • Lack of funding instruments for investments in energy and climate projects, e.g. passive houses. • Personal meetings contributing to build up confidence and ensuring continuously collaboration are difficult due to long distances. • High energy demand of industry (mining, steel, paper mills) and not enough people for public transport in remote regions.

Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linking economic growth to “Green Growths” and thereby creating momentum for ambitious energy targets. • Bundling interests through collaboration increase chances of small municipalities and other stakeholders = economy of scale • Big investments in mining areas like cities of Gällivare and Kiruna offer great opportunities for “Green Investments” and sustainable energy planning. • EU legislation and programmes as driver for more sustainable energy planning, e.g. Covenant of Mayor in which more and more municipalities join in. • Creating regional CoM coordination structure. • EU funding for collaborative and effective energy projects. • Need to and plans for EU and national relevant infrastructure in terms of railroad (Bothniabanan, Inlandsbanan, Norrbothniabanan) • High bioenergy potential while infrastructure, knowledge etc in forestry industry available. • Good examples about conflict management available on regional level (e.g. World Heritage Laponia). • Several joint tools, e.g. on monitoring of energy use and GHG emissions at regional and local levels, in place. • Governmental funding for County Administration Board for coordinating processes exists. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More people from the rural areas moving to cities and the coast, thereby weakening small municipalities even more. • Lack of effective funding mechanism for environmental investments. • Lack of regional (legal) instruments for pushing the shift towards low-carbon communities. • Lack of long-term commitments for energy and climate targets. • Conflict with other targets, e.g. nature protection and economic growths. • Failure in building up working MLG collaboration structures lead to less engagement from the few people engaged in energy and climate work. • Norrbotten’s countryside is characterized through traditional thinking what means that new and innovative services are difficult to implement and push. • Not enough governmental support for e.g. investments in public transport infrastructure. • Interest in energy, environment and climate issues could decrease. • Focus on short-term solutions instead of long-term structures.

6.2 Recommendations for collaborative sustainable energy planning based on results of regional SWOT-analysis

Revision of the regional SEAP

Themes of collaboration:

- The SWOT analysis shows, that all three cross-cutting themes of collaboration are of high relevance for a successful implementation and improvement of the regional SEAP. Lack of access to funding for local and regional sustainable energy projects is one big challenge, therefore is working with the pillar 1 (Financial instruments) needed. The lack of energy data access for evaluation of activities, control of target achievement and adjustment of planning is another big challenge for the region (pillar 2, modelling, planning and monitoring tools for decision making). Last but not least, there is a need to improve awareness raising but even more stakeholder involvement instruments (pillar 3).

Process to be followed:

- The already started process of committing regional and local public authorities for collaborative strategic energy planning will be continued. This includes building of a regional Steering Committee following the project plan. A preliminary list of participants has already been developed, although the working mode needs to be discussed further more.
- An important input to the revision of the local SEAP and improvement and strengthening collaboration MLG models will be the results of the European survey. Models will be revised and if possible adapted to the specific characteristics of Norrbotten region.
- A critical success factor in the context of collaborative MLG structures within energy and climate is a joint understanding of all participants in the process of purpose, priorities and targets, responsibilities, timeline and allocated capacities. To create this joint understanding – specifically between regional authorities vs. local authorities - is still needed and a concept for appropriate activities is under development.
- Another critical success factor for Norrbotten region is mobilising more stakeholders, to better involve civil society and to create additional communication activities for increasing impact of regional energy and climate strategy and planning. Therefore, even here a more detailed concept on how to include this part into the broader concept of improving the impact of the regional SEAP will be developed and discussed with regional stakeholders.



Deliverable D2.4- Regional review report - NENET

- The implementation of joint actions will show on a regional example the importance of MLG collaboration structures. To create most impact, the local joint action needs to be directly linked to the SEAP revision process and the 3 pillars. Discussions with the municipality of Piteå and Jokkmokk for defining more concrete focus and activities reflecting the overall purposes in the regional SEAP are ongoing.