



# **EUROPEAN CITY FACILITY**

## **Feedback Report**



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 864212. The sole responsibility of this publication lies with the author. The European Union or EASME are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

<b>Feedback report - European City Facility</b>	
Application number	03PL000622X
Title of proposed investment concept	Krosno Zero emission path
Name of the municipality/local authority, grouping, or local public entity aggregating municipalities/local authorities	Krosno
Organization	Krosno Municipal Office

<b>Evaluation result</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b> (considering weightage factors)
20.50 / 25

**OVERALL FEEDBACK:**

Overall, the application addresses the EUCF criteria very well. The aim of the application is to promote energy efficiency in the building sector and renewable energy production, which is well aligned with the EUCF objectives. The application is particularly strong in regard to the stakeholder engagement strategy and ambition level of the expected investment size, energy savings and renewable energy generation. More detailed feedback per evaluation criterion can be found below.

<b>Evaluation results per criterion</b>	
<b>Category A - Weightage 60%</b>	
<b>A1. Investment size</b>	
<p><b>SCORE:</b></p> <p>4.0 / 5</p> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i> <i>Weighting 50%</i></p>	<p><i>The following aspects are taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative assessment:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Level of ambition of the expected size of investment of the planned investment project in relation to the other submitted applications in the regional call.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Qualitative assessment:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Level of ambition of the expected size of investment of the planned investment project in relation to the local context (e.g. population number of municipality/local authority, grouping, or local public entity aggregating municipalities/local authorities);</li> <li>o Appreciation of bundling/pooling of investments.</li> <li>o Overall coherence and plausibility of the elements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>A1. FEEDBACK</b>	<p>The expected investment size is ambitious in relation to the other submitted applications in the regional call and to the local context, particularly due to the high absolute investment size and the high investment per capita ratio.</p>
<b>A2. Energy savings</b>	
<p><b>SCORE:</b></p> <p>4.0 / 5</p> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i> <i>Weighting 50%</i></p>	<p><i>The following aspects are taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantitative assessment:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Level of ambition of the expected energy savings and/or renewable energy production generated by the planned investment project in relation to the other submitted applications in the regional call.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Qualitative assessment:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Level of ambition of the expected energy savings and/or renewable energy production generated by the planned investment project in relation to the local context (e.g. baseline, population number of municipality/local authority, grouping, or local public entity aggregating municipalities/local authorities).</li> <li>o Overall coherence and plausibility of the elements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>A2. FEEDBACK</b>	<p>The expected energy savings and renewable energy production of the investment project are high compared to the other applications in the regional call and to the local context. The figures are ambitious in regard to the savings per capita ratio.</p>

<b>Category B - Weightage 40%</b>	
<b>B1. Governance structure</b>	
<p><b>SCORE:</b></p> <p>4.3 / 5</p> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i> <i>Weighting 20%</i></p>	<p><i>The following aspects are taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate and robust internal organisational structure for the development of the investment concept; including.</li> <li>• Clearly defined roles and responsibilities of all actors involved; appointment of person(s) in charge for the investment concept development.</li> <li>• Clearly defined decision-making processes, indicating people with decision-making power and process how decisions are taken.</li> <li>• Good understanding whether internal capacities are sufficient for the successful development of an investment concept or how external experts can be involved in the process to provide a value added/build capacities.</li> <li>• Overall coherence and plausibility of the elements.</li> </ul>
<b>B1. FEEDBACK</b>	<p>The application presents the criterion governance structure well, particularly due to the clear identification of the actors involved and the decision-making process. The proposed organisational structure seems appropriate for the development of the investment concept, as it includes internal and external capabilities. More information on the specific tasks of the different actors involved could be added.</p>
<b>B2. Stakeholder engagement</b>	
<p><b>SCORE:</b></p> <p>4.5 / 5</p> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i> <i>Weighting 40%</i></p>	<p><i>The following aspects are taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear identification of important stakeholders and good understanding of their needs and expectations towards the planned investment project.</li> <li>• Appropriate strategy to involve identified stakeholders in the investment concept development process; including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Adequate activities of engagement (and their intended timing and objectives).</li> <li>o Adequate instruments for communication to reach the different stakeholders.</li> <li>o Overall coherence and plausibility of the elements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>B2. FEEDBACK</b>	<p>Criterion stakeholder engagement is well addressed, describing the identified stakeholders and various engagement activities and communication instruments. The presented strategy for stakeholder engagement is coherent and adequate to the proposed investment concept due to the wide range of stakeholders to be involved.</p>
<b>B3. Alignment with EUCF objectives</b>	

<p><b>SCORE:</b></p> <p>4.0 / 5</p> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i></p> <p><i>Weighting 40%</i></p>	<p><i>The following aspects are taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment of the proposal with the ultimate objective of the EUCF, i.e. to build a substantial pipeline of sustainable energy investment projects across cities in Europe by providing targeted financial, technical, legal and capacity building support.</li> <li>• Demonstration of potential to develop a sound (and new) investment concept, considering the information available at this stage, including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (Initial) estimations of additional impacts (e.g. avoided CO2 emissions) and consideration of the investment project's potential for replication and/or up-scaling.</li> <li>o Overall coherence and plausibility of the elements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>B3.</b></p> <p><b>FEEDBACK</b></p>	<p>The application is well aligned with the EUCF objectives, demonstrating a sound concept to enhance energy efficiency and renewable energy production. Moreover, the replication potential is well presented and highlights how the proposed investment project can be disseminated on a regional and national scale. Overall, the proposed concept seems coherent and plausible.</p>

### INTERPRETATION OF THE SCORE:

- 5 - Excellent** - The application addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in an **outstanding** manner; any shortcomings are minor.
- 4 - Very good** - The application addresses the criterion **very well**, but with a small number of shortcomings.
- 3 - Good** - The application addresses the criterion in a **satisfactory** manner, but with a number of shortcomings.
- 2 - Fair** - The application **broadly** addresses the criterion, but with significant weaknesses.
- 1 - Poor** - The application addresses the criterion in an **inadequate** manner with serious inherent weaknesses.
- 0** - The application fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing information.

For more information on how the evaluation is conducted and how the final score is derived, please take a look at the [Guidelines for Applicants](#), chapter 3.1 Evaluation process.