

Support service for citizens led renovation projects (phase II)

Selection and prioritisation criteria

Application and evaluation procedure

ENER/2023/OP/0036

DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR ENERGY

Directorate B – Just Transition, Consumers, Energy Efficiency and Innovation Unit B1 -Consumers, Local Initiatives, Just Transition

Submitted by: Ricardo

In collaboration with: Th!nk E, Steinbeis, Eworx, IEECP, GoParity, Stefan Scheuer Consulting, VITO, and Joanneum Research

Date: 4th April, 2024

CONFIDENTIAL

DELIVERABLE INFORMATION

Number	T1 Milestone
Title	Selection and prioritisation criteria – Application and evaluation procedure
Lead Organisation	Ricardo Energy and Environment
Main author(s)	James Roscoe (RICARDO), Leen Peeters (Th!nk E)
Contributors	Giovanni Roberti (RICARDO), Filipova Tsvetelina (RICARDO), Jan Bormans (Th!nk E)
Reviewers	Diana Süsser and Jen Heemann (IEECP), Sebastian Seebauer (JR), Michael Brenner-Fliesser (JR)
Nature	R - Report
Dissemination Level	RE – Restricted to a group specified by the EC (including EC)
Contractual Delivery Date	M1

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title	Support service for citizens led renovation projects (Phase II)
Contract Number	ENER/2023/OP/0036/B3/SER/2022-525/SI2.909732
Project Duration	24 months
Starting Date	01/01/2024

Coordinator

Name	Jan Bormans
Organisation	Th!nk E
Address	Diestsevest 32, bus B6 – 3000 Leuven (Belgium)
E-Mail	jan@think-e.be
Telephone	+32 479 29 33 17

PARTNERS

Organisation	Country
Th!nk E	Belgium
Th!nk Europe	Belgium
Steinbeis 2i	Germany
Ricardo Energy and Environment	UK
IEECP	Netherlands
EWORX	Greece
GoParity	Portugal
Stefan Scheuer Consulting	Belgium
Joanneum Research	Austria
VITO	Belgium
Th!nk Europe	Belgium

1. Executive summary

The Phase II selection process for the citizen-led renovation support service marks a pivotal advancement from its successful inception in Phase I, where foundational efforts in community mobilisation and pilot projects set the stage for broader, more impactful engagement. Phase II represents a critical juncture in empowering European communities to take a leading role in sustainable building transformation. Central to this phase is equal opportunities by placing citizens at the forefront, ensuring that every community, regardless of its current resources or level of knowledge, is empowered to participate effectively. This tailored support ensures that all communities, from the most to the least experienced, can engage meaningfully in energy-efficient renovations.

The support service operates under the premise that autonomous community action can be a powerful catalyst for change. This phase aims to validate the notion that witnessing peer success in renovations can inspire and activate community members. The strategy is to capitalise on the momentum created by energy communities, as recognised by the EU's Clean Energy Package, to scale up renovation efforts.

Energy communities are positioned as crucial actors that can:

- Elevate renovation interest through shared community values;
- Increase awareness and stimulate action in broader demographics;
- Offer innovative and locally-tailored communication strategies that resonate more effectively than conventional methods;
- Develop a culture that naturally increases energy savings post-renovation;
- Serve as showcases for successful initiatives, sparking broader replication;
- Enable co-investment schemes that pair renovations with renewable energy projects;
- Link local contractors and citizens, organise trainings (whether or not against payment);
- Make available simple tools to estimate savings;
- Combine projects to get better offers, e.g., for heat pumps, cavity wall insulation;
- Contribute overall to the community efforts on energy decarbonisation of buildings.

Central to the CLR support service is the establishment of clear, transparent eligibility and award criteria that ensure the equitable and effective engagement of diverse energy communities. These criteria are designed to:

- **Evaluate projects based on their potential to inspire and catalyse community action**, recognising that peer success can significantly motivate wider participation in sustainable renovations.
- **Identify initiatives that align with shared community values**, emphasising projects that elevate the interest in renovation and foster a culture of energy efficiency and waste minimisation.
- **Prioritise innovative communication strategies and co-investment schemes**, focusing on proposals that present novel approaches to engaging communities and linking renovations with renewable energy projects.
- **Support a broad spectrum of community members**, from seasoned energy community participants to newcomers, ensuring inclusivity and accessibility in all community actions.

The selection criteria are designed to select a variety of approaches and methodologies for citizen-led renovation to allow for the cross-pollination of ideas.

The ultimate goal of Phase II is to distil actionable insights through the deliberate selection of pilot projects, developing a supportive learning environment for Learners, to enable them to launch a renovation project in the future and for Followers, to become familiar with the concept of energy communities and citizen-led renovation. This approach sets the foundation for a sustainable, community-driven renovation ethos across the EU, with an eye towards a collective, energy-smart future.

Contents

1. Executive summary	3
Contents	4
1. Introduction	5
2. Selection process.....	5
3. Primary Screening	7
3.1 Eligibility criteria	7
3.2 Survey questions.....	12
4. Pathway survey	13
4.1. Scoring system	14
4.2. Pathway types	14
4.2. Award questions for Pathway 1 (Pilots)	16
4.3. Award questions for Pathway 2 (Learners)	26
4.4. Award questions for Pathway 3 (Followers).....	35
5. Selection process and evaluation outcome	41
5.1 Evaluation outcome	41
6. Guidance Package	41
7. Informing the applicants on the evaluation result	42
a. Proposed communication to non-selected applicants	42
b. Proposed communication to selected applicants	43
8. Participation agreement.....	43
Annex 1	44
Support Agreement	44

1. Introduction

The citizen-led renovation support service represents a transformative approach to energy efficiency and community engagement within the European Union. Born out of a growing recognition of the importance of local action in achieving broader environmental goals, this support service places citizens at the heart of the energy transition. It is a comprehensive programme that integrates building renovations and renewable energy solutions, leveraging the collective power and resources of local communities. The support service primary focus is on empowering citizen groups, enabling the development of community-led energy projects, and providing technical support to realise these ambitions.

The objective of this report is to detail the eligibility and award criteria chosen to select the pilots for the support service in an as objective and inclusive way as possible by simultaneously ensuring that the selected pilots are able to comply with the overall project goals.

2. Selection process

Phase I of the CLR support service laid the groundwork, establishing a framework for citizen participation and piloting innovative models of community engagement in energy projects. The successes and learnings from Phase I have been instrumental in shaping the next stage of this journey.

In Phase II of the citizen-led renovation support service, the focus of the selection process is on expanding and deepening the impact of this programme. Based on the selection process applicants will be assigned to three different pathways.

Pathway 1 (Pilots) will include between 5 and 8 pilot projects. Each applicant will receive at least 70 support days of technical assistance and will undergo a personalised experience that includes individualised one-on-one activities, collaboration with peers and engaging in inspiring initiatives. Additionally, webinars will be created to tackle common challenges, and a platform will be designed to facilitate interactions with different stakeholders. The selected pilots are expected to be exemplary models that can inspire and guide similar initiatives across the EU.



Pathway 2 (Learners) will include 15 learners which aim to implement the citizen-led renovation concept but are less mature as initiatives or have less resources available to follow the pace of pathway 1. They will receive up to 12 days of focused one-on-one consultancy, combined with a self-learning offer, and an elaborate Learners' community package that contains webinars, P2P exchanges, and ad-hoc discussion groups.

Pathway 3 (Followers) will include 40 followers which are at a nascent stage but demonstrate a clear interest in this area. This pathway is open to energy communities, citizen groups, local authorities, NGOs, and others. They will receive a flexible package of 10 hours for individual support, spread over the duration of the assistance, with a particular focus on facilitating self-learning, and participation in the Follower's community that offers opportunities to exchange with peers through organised sessions, and a selection of on-demand webinars.

The selection process for Phase II of the citizen-led renovation support service is designed to be robust, transparent, and inclusive, catering to a diverse range of applicants across the European Union. This process is crucial in identifying and selecting the most suitable candidates for the Pilots, Learners, and Followers.

Special considerations in the selection process

- **Geographical diversity:** The process emphasises the inclusion of entities from different climatic zones across the EU, ensuring a representation of diverse environmental conditions as well as economic and policy contexts.
- **Flexibility:** The process is flexible, with the option for applicants who do not meet the main pilot criteria to be considered for Learners or Followers pathways.
- **Transparency and objectivity:** The dual assessment system and the clear scoring criteria enhance the transparency and objectivity of the selection process.

- **Communication and feedback:** Clear communication and feedback is provided to both selected and non-selected candidates, ensuring learning opportunities for all applicants.

Overview of selection process

1. **Development of selection criteria and survey:** The process begins with the development of clear eligibility and award criteria and a corresponding survey. This survey is carefully crafted to assess applicants against these criteria, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of their capabilities, commitment, and potential impact.
2. **Online application form and guidance package:** An online application form is made available in all EU languages, accompanied by a detailed guidance package. This ensures that applicants from different linguistic backgrounds can understand and engage with the application process effectively.
3. **Primary screening survey:** Applicants undergo a primary screening where fundamental details about the organisation and the fulfilment of eligibility criteria are gathered through the survey. The survey is divided in three sections:
 - Basic details (this section asks general information like organisation's name, year of establishment, location, mission statement)
 - Energy community verification (this section allows to clarify if the organisation is a legally recognised energy community, an emerging energy community or interesting in learning to become a future energy community).
 - Support service details (this section aims to ensure that the applicant is not receiving funding for similar support activities, whether he will reduce energy consumption by at least 30% compared to the initial situation, and to ask a letter of intent signed by 3-5 members of the community)

The survey responses guide applicants to a recommended pathway for application. Nevertheless, they are also given the option to select a different pathway if they prefer.

4. **Pathway survey:** In this phase, applicants are requested to answer questions to evaluate their capacity to meet expectations and adhere to the objectives of the selected pathway, and they are awarded a score accordingly. This includes answering questions related to the nature of the project, the soundness of the approach, the expected impacts, the nature of the applicant and potential for innovation, inclusivity, and replicability.
5. **Scoring and independent review:** A detailed scoring system is used to evaluate applicants. Each application is independently reviewed by two separate organisations to ensure a fair and unbiased assessment, with the added measure of anonymising applicants' names to guard against any potential biases. This will entail scoring of applications based on the award criteria and the scoring matrix.
6. **Verification of applicant:** Upon successful assessment and scoring, applicants who are preliminarily selected will be notified via email about the verification requirement. This notification will detail the necessary documentation needed for verification, depending on the applicant's pathway.
7. **Communication of results:** After the assessment and scoring are complete, all applicants are informed of the outcomes via email. Those who are selected for any of the pathways will receive detailed instructions on the subsequent steps, including timelines, resource allocation, and expectations. Unsuccessful applicants will be provided with constructive feedback to help them understand their application's strengths and areas for improvement.

Support and accessibility

- **Guidance package:** A comprehensive guidance package is provided to all potential participants, offering clear definitions, application walkthroughs, and details on available assistance.
- **Language accessibility:** All documents and the application form are available in all EU languages, removing language barriers. Documents are written in a simple language to ensure understandability. All responses received will be translated to English prior to the independent reviews.
- **Dedicated support channel:** A dedicated email support channel (in English language) is established to address any questions or provide assistance during the application process

3. Primary Screening

3.1 Eligibility criteria

A set of eligibility requirements have been developed to ensure that eligibility is based on clear and objective criteria. Eligibility will be assessed through responses to an online survey, which will be automatically processed to swiftly inform applicants of their status. Those not meeting the criteria for certain questions will receive an explanation for the rejection and will be directed towards the guidance package to re-familiarise themselves with the offerings and responsibilities for each pathway. They will be invited to re-start the application process.

Across all pathways, a minimum planned energy saving of 30% is required to ensure a significant impact. Applicants must also verify that their projects do not benefit from existing funding sources and that they have the authorisation to submit applications on behalf of their communities. This comprehensive and transparent eligibility framework is designed to facilitate a fair, efficient selection process, aligning with the programme's high standards and ambitious goals. Special considerations for Pathway 1 (Pilots) include its designation for energy communities. Applicants must either provide legal documentation confirming this status or respond to a series of verification questions tailored for energy communities. This ensures participation from countries that may not have yet implemented the RED II or the Internal Electricity Market Directive, promoting fairness and inclusivity. Approval for participation in Pathway 1 hinges on positive responses (YES) to all eligibility questions, after which applicants can access specific application questions for Pathway 1. If one or more questions are answered (NO), then the applicant will be recommended for Pathway 2. Following the eligibility assessment, a recommendation for the most suitable pathway will be provided, although applicants retain the option to select a different pathway if they prefer.

Table 1 presents the eligibility requirements that have been developed for Pilots, Learners and Followers.

TABLE 1: ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR PILOTS, LEARNERS AND FOLLOWERS

No.	Eligibility criteria	Eligibility question(s)	Yes/No	Means of verification	Relevant to pathway type	Link to question(s)
1	Location of the applicant, members	Is the geographical location of the applicant and its activities located within the EU?	YES/NO	Threshold: 100% of the entities (applicant, members, and project) must be located within the EU.	All	3

	and project in the EU			Verification: Check addresses in registration documents, member lists, and property documents against EU geography.		
2	Inclusion of energy community in the consortium	Does the consortium include one or several energy communities?	YES/NO	Threshold: At least one entity within the consortium should qualify as an energy community. Verification: YES/NO (needs to be supported by either legal documentation or verification questions).	Pilots	7
3	Energy community legal verification	Can the applicant prove it has an energy community in the consortium?	YES/NO	Threshold: If they submit the legal documentation. Verification: If they cannot submit the verification or are located in an EU MS without transposition of directives they are then directed to the energy community eligibility questions.	Pilots	7
4	Legal entity	Does the legal entity align with typical energy community set ups?	YES/NO	Threshold: The legal structure chosen should facilitate the core objectives of RECs and CECs, which include promoting local energy generation and consumption, ensuring democratic participation and control by	Pilots (without legal verification)	8

				<p>members, particularly those within the local area, and providing broader environmental, economic, or social benefits to the community. Applicants are provided with a list of legal entities aligned with energy communities (used in RECAH).</p> <p>Verification: YES/NO answer.</p>		
5	Voluntary participation	Does the initiative allow for all types of relevant actors to be included?	YES/NO	<p>Threshold: RECs/CECs definitions emphasise the involvement of local stakeholders to be able to participate.</p> <p>Verification: YES/NO answer.</p>	Pilots (without legal verification)	9
6	Membership	Does the initiative currently include local stakeholders as members such as citizens, local authorities and small/medium enterprises?	YES/NO	<p>Threshold: REC/CECs definitions emphasise the involvement of local stakeholders to be able to become members.</p> <p>Verification: YES/NO answer.</p>	Pilots (without legal verification)	10
7	Autonomy	Does the voting system/decision making processes ensure that each member has one vote, reflecting the principle of equitable participation	YES/NO	<p>Threshold: RECs/CECs must have democratic participation/control from its members regardless of financial contribution or share ownership</p>	Pilots (without legal verification)	11

		regardless of financial contribution or share ownership?		Verification: YES/NO answer.		
8	Effective control	Are the majority of voting rights held by local stakeholders such as natural persons, citizens, local authorities, municipalities, schools, small and medium-sized companies, other energy communities, and farmers?	YES/NO	Threshold: To adhere to the REC/CECs definitions, the majority of voting rights within the community should rest with local stakeholders who are directly affected by or have a vested interest in the local energy system. Verification: YES/NO answer.	Pilots (without legal verification)	12
9	Openness	Do the current and potential board members predominantly consist of local actors, such as natural persons, citizens, local authorities, municipalities, schools, small and medium-sized companies, other energy communities, and farmers?	YES/NO	Threshold: REC/CECs definitions are centred around being inclusive. The intent is to ensure that governance and participation are accessible to all segments of the local population. Verification: YES/NO answer.	Pilots (without legal verification)	13
10	Existing funding streams	Does the applicant have conflicting funding being received for the same types of technical assistance?	YES/NO	Verified through survey questions.	Pilots, Learners, Followers	15
11	Energy savings	Does the applicant aim to achieve 30% energy savings from the renovation?	YES/NO	Verified through survey questions.	Pilots	16

12	Commitment	Does the organisation have a letter of intent and authorisation to submit this application on behalf of its members?	YES/NO	Verified through survey questions. Signed by 3-5 members.	Pilots/Learners/Followers	17 & 18
----	------------	--	--------	---	---------------------------	---------

3.2 Survey questions

This section summarises the actual questions that will be asked to applicants during the primary screening. Questions have been designed to be answered either as YES/NO or multiple choice to ensure that they can be assessed quickly and with no room for interpretation.

Basic details

1. Provide the name(s) and contact details (email address) of the responsible person(s) for this application and the technical support services if granted. (70 characters)
2. What is the name of your organisation(s)? (200 characters)
3. What is the geographical location of the main activities/projects of your organisation(s)? Provide EU Member State; name of location (e.g. commune, village, city), and postcode.
4. When was the participating organisation(s) established? (50 characters)
5. What is your organisation(s) website? (200 characters)
6. Provide a brief description of your organisation(s) mission statement (e.g. statutory objective if applicable)? (500 characters)

Energy community verification

7. Does your organisation(s) identify as an energy community?
 - a. If YES, does your organisation(s) have legal recognition as an energy community?
 - i. If YES, can you provide the legal documentation of the registered energy community (attach document).
 - ii. If NO, answer the energy community verification questions (Q8 onwards)
 - b. If NO, does your organisation(s) have a planned citizen led renovation project and classify itself as an emerging energy community?
 - i. If YES, Learner pathway recommendation in Q19
 - ii. If NO, are you interested in the concept of citizen led renovation and becoming a future energy community?
 - I. If YES, Follower pathway recommendation in Q19
 - II. If NO, Not recommended for any support service (include message here: Based on your responses, the current support service pathways do not seem appropriate to you, however please read through the CLR guidance package and re-consider whether you should re-submit your application)
8. Does your organisation(s) legal entity align with a typical energy community set up (e.g. cooperative / limited partnership / community trust / community foundation / housing association / non-profit customer-owner enterprise / public-private partnership / public utility company)
 - a. Answer: YES/NO
9. Does your organisation(s) allow for voluntary participation from local actors? (e.g. natural persons, citizens, local authorities, municipalities, schools, small companies, medium-sized companies, other energy communities, farmers)
 - a. Answer: YES/NO
10. Does your organisation(s) currently involve local actors as members? (e.g. natural persons, citizens, local authorities, municipalities, schools, small companies, medium-sized companies, other energy communities, farmers)
 - a. Answer: YES/NO
11. Does the voting system/decision making processes in your organisation(s) ensure that each member has one vote, reflecting the principle of equitable participation regardless of financial contribution or share ownership?
 - a. Answer: YES/NO
12. Does your organisation(s) ensure that the majority of voting rights are held by local stakeholders such as natural persons, citizens, local authorities, municipalities, schools, small and medium-sized companies, other energy communities, and farmers?
 - a. Answer: YES/NO

13. Do the current and potential board members of your organisation(s) predominantly consist of local actors, such as natural persons, citizens, local authorities, municipalities, schools, small and medium-sized companies, other energy communities, and farmers?
- a. Answer: YES/NO

Support service details

14. Please indicate the service(s) that you believe should be the primary focus for the support service if your community group is selected. You can choose multiple options or specify others as needed:
- Understanding needs and preferred support for the citizens
 - Setting up a local ecosystem (banks, municipality, local contractors, etc.)
 - Overviewing of legal and regulatory aspects related to renovation
 - Monitoring the progress and impact of citizen-led renovation
 - Co-designing the operational structure of the support service (process flows, IT tools, etc.)
 - Co-designing the business model of the citizen-led renovation service
 - Co-designing a set of technical solutions with economic assessment for a range of exemplary buildings.
 - Setting up communication, marketing, and engagement campaigns.
 - Co-designing IT solutions for the exchange of local practices.
 - Engaging professionals
 - Overviewing of financing options for different types of renovations
 - Collective purchase actions and bundling of projects
 - Other (please specify)
15. Are you currently receiving any funding to support the development of any activity stated in the previous question?
- a. Answer: YES/NO
- i. If YES -> please provide more information on the funding that is being received (name of fund, dates, amount and application type).
16. Will your foreseen investment in energy savings trigger at least 30% of reduced energy consumption compared to the initial situation in your planned or future project?
- a. Answer: YES/NO (If no – applicant is ineligible)
17. Can you submit a letter of intent declaring the availability to participate in the support service signed by 3-5 members?
- a. Answer: YES/NO
- i. If YES, can you attach the letter to this application? (add option to attach here)
- ii. If NO, can you provide the letter within 1 month from submission of the application?
- I. If also NO, applicant is not eligible for the support service.
18. To ensure adequate administrative, technical, and political support for this application, I confirm that I am authorised by the other members representative to submit this application.
- a. Answer: YES/NO
19. Based on your responses to the survey, we recommend that you complete this application as a [recommended pathway]. Do you agree to continue along with this recommended pathway? Please refer to the guidance package on the CLR website for more information on the different pathway types (Pilot, Learner, Follower).
- a. Answer YES/NO
- i. If YES, applicant is directed to the recommended pathway
- ii. If NO, which pathway would you like to submit an application for?
- I. Pilot, Learner or Follower (designated to that pathway)

4. Pathway survey

The process of identifying suitable participants for the CLR Phase II support service involves a comprehensive evaluation through specifically designed survey and pathway questions. These questions are integral in assessing the capabilities, readiness, and commitment of applicants, whether they are Pilots or Learners/Followers. This section provides an overview of these questions and their role in the selection process.

4.1. Scoring system

The process of identifying suitable participants for the CLR Phase II support service involves a comprehensive evaluation through specifically designed survey and pathway questions. These questions are integral in assessing the capabilities, readiness, and commitment of applicants, whether they are Pilots or Learners/Followers. This section provides an overview of these questions and their role in the selection process.

To ensure a rigorous and fair selection, a detailed scoring system has been developed that effectively separates eligible applicants. Incorporating learnings from Phase I of the project, the scoring system has been meticulously refined. The initial 1-3 scoring range (low, medium, high) in Phase I was found to be insufficient in delineating meaningful comparative differences between applicants. As such, the scoring range to 1-5 points: low, below average, average, above average, high. This scoring mechanism also eliminates the need for a subjective interview process. As a result, this further safeguards the fairness of the selection procedure, as the evaluation is primarily based on the factual information provided in the application. The removal of interviews eliminates any potential subjective bias that could arise from personal interactions. Each applicant is evaluated on the merit of their application alone, underpinning a fair and transparent selection process. Confirmation emails will be sent out to the selected candidates, and if they do not respond within the timeframe (1 week) they will be called to assess their commitment. To further guarantee objectivity and thorough scrutiny, a dual assessment system is employed. Each application is independently reviewed by two separate organisations, and the final score is an average of these two assessments. If an applicant receives two scores on a specific criterion that deviate by three or more steps (e.g., one assessor scoring the criterion as 'low', the other assessor scoring as 'above average'), the assessors will discuss and, if possible, resolve this discrepancy; this will further ensure that the assessment builds on aligned assessment rules.

Following the development of a final score for the applicant, a weighting system is applied, which is established for the award criteria across all pathways. It is designed to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the projects, emphasising areas that are pivotal to achieving the overarching goals of energy efficiency, community involvement, and sustainability. This system assigns greater importance to sections that are fundamental to project success, such as the clarity of objectives, the feasibility of the approach, and the magnitude of expected impacts, thereby ensuring that projects are assessed on aspects most critical to their effectiveness and alignment with the initiative's objectives. For instance, while the 'innovation, inclusivity, and replicability' section are important, they are assigned a lower weighting when compared to key sections such as 'nature of the project'. Further details on the percentage splits and example calculations are included at the end of each of the award pathway questions.

4.2. Pathway types

The three application pathways, designed for Pilots, Learners, and Followers, cater to the diverse spectrum of applicants, with each path offering a tailored assessment.

Pathway 1 (Pilots)

For applicants eligible for Pathway 1, a thorough methodology is applied to evaluate their suitability based on their responses to the award questions. This intensive assessment utilises the 1-5 scoring matrix's and delves into their topics such as, organisational capacity, expertise, clarity of the current business model, and commitment to citizen-led renovations. The process scrutinises the applicant's strategies and past performances to precisely evaluate their potential to succeed in the programme.

Key elements underpinning the selection criteria for Pilot applicants:

1. A strong commitment to deliver ambitious and realistic citizen-led renovation projects.
2. Given the nature of Pathway 1, substantial experience is necessary for applicants. Other pathways have been designed to nurture newer initiatives, preparing them for potential inclusion in Phase III.
3. Technical, financial and administrative capacity to undertake a Pilot project is essential.
4. A high potential for positive impact within the community is a key consideration.

Given the intense demands of the Pilot role, existing energy communities with substantial experience are sought to demonstrate their readiness for the complexities of comprehensive citizen-led renovation projects, to ensure the effective allocation of resources.

Pathway 2 (Learners)

The Pathway 2 application process is uniquely designed to recognise and facilitate the growth of emerging initiatives within the Learners. This pathway emphasises the development of Learners that demonstrate a readiness to engage with, learn from, and adapt to the energy community framework to deliver citizen-led renovations. The questions for Pathway 2 applicants focus on:

1. The applicant's enthusiasm and willingness to learn and adapt for the development (or further development) of the citizen-led renovation concept within their (prospective) energy community framework are evaluated.
2. The availability of financial, human, and technical resources necessary for effective engagement in learning activities is assessed.
3. The potential for growth and development of the applicant is explored.
4. The willingness and ability of the applicant to collaborate with other members of the community on renovation projects are assessed.

The core selection criteria for Pathway 2 revolve around the applicant's demonstrated openness to learning and their capacity to (further) develop the citizen-led renovation concept. Significant emphasis is placed on their dynamism as Learners, including their resource availability to actively participate and contribute to the learning process. Equally important, applicants with a potential for substantial growth are sought, thereby allowing them to implement citizen-led renovation services in the future. This comprehensive approach cultivates a vibrant and supportive learning ecosystem, igniting a cycle of growth that ultimately drives transformative change within the applicant that wants to get involved in citizen-led renovations.

Pathway 3 (Followers)

Pathway 3, designed for Followers, caters to applicants that may not fully meet the criteria of Pilots or Learners but still hold the potential to contribute and participate in the energy community framework to deliver citizen-led renovations. In the application process for this pathway, the questions are focused on:

1. The motivations driving the applicant's desire to participate in the programme are sought to be understood.
2. The specific areas related to citizen-led renovation in which the applicant wishes to engage within the community are identified.
3. Any limitations or constraints that might affect the applicant's active participation are determined.
4. The applicant's expectations and goals from their involvement are evaluated.

The selection criteria for Pathway 3 applicants emphasise clear intentions for participation, aligning with the broader objectives of the programme. A defined scope of involvement is accommodated, making room for applicants that may not necessarily meet the exact criteria for Pilots or Learners but still exhibit an eagerness to contribute. A keen awareness and recognition of potential resource constraints is vital, and value is placed on applicants demonstrating a commitment to overcome these challenges. Applicants with realistic expectations that align with their capacity are also sought, ensuring that their engagement in the programme is both feasible and beneficial. By means of providing a pathway for Followers, the broader diffusion of the citizen-led renovation concept is facilitated, accommodating those who may start as observers but could evolve into more active roles over time.

4.2. Award questions for Pathway 1 (Pilots)

No.	Award section	Award criteria	Question	Answer	Scoring matrix
1	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	Pilot projects should primarily focus on enhancing energy efficiency within the residential sector, with the potential to include non-residential buildings (such as commercial or community buildings) if they significantly contribute to the energy community's objectives.	Describe the focus of your project in terms of building types (residential, non-residential, or both) and outline the main objectives you aim to achieve through renovation. How many buildings do you estimate will be renovated, and what impact do you anticipate these renovations will have on energy efficiency within the community? Provide separate details for residential and non-residential buildings if both are included.	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response is vague and lacks differentiation between building types, with unclear objectives and no specific estimates. Below average: Provides a general outline of the project focus but lacks detailed objectives, specific estimates, or clear impact on energy efficiency. Average: Identifies the building types and main objectives with reasonable estimates for the number of buildings, but the anticipated impact on energy efficiency may not be fully detailed. Above average: Detailed information on building types and clear objectives, with well-estimated numbers and a solid understanding of the expected impact on energy efficiency. High: Exceptionally detailed response, clearly defining building types, precise objectives aligned with energy efficiency goals, accurate estimates, and a comprehensive outline of the expected impact on the community's energy efficiency.
2	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	Understanding the specific needs for technical assistance, its potential impact, and the applicants' plans following the completion of the support is crucial for tailoring the assistance provided and ensuring its effectiveness. For those already involved in ongoing CLR services, the ability to integrate and enhance these services with the new support is crucial for continuous improvement and scaling of their initiatives.	<p>Based on your indicated preferences for technical assistance, could you provide more detailed insights into your specific needs within this area? Elaborate on how you envision this support impacting your project and the broader objectives you aim to achieve. If you are currently involved in an ongoing CLR service, please describe how you envision integrating and enhancing this service within the framework of this support service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding needs and preferred support for the citizens 	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response provides minimal or vague insights into the specific technical assistance needs, with little explanation of the expected impact on the project or its broader objectives. Plans for integrating and enhancing ongoing CLR services are unclear or not addressed. Below average: The response outlines some technical assistance needs but lacks detail and depth in explaining how the support will impact the project and broader objectives. If involved in ongoing CLR services, the description of integration and enhancement is superficial and lacks a clear strategy. Average: The response adequately details specific technical assistance needs and provides a general understanding of how the support will benefit the project and its alignment with broader objectives. For ongoing CLR services, there are basic plans for integration and enhancement, indicating a moderate level of preparedness. Above average: The response clearly identifies detailed technical assistance needs and articulates a well-considered expectation of the support's impact on the project and broader objectives. Plans for integrating and enhancing ongoing CLR services are detailed,

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting up a local ecosystem (banks, municipality, local contractors, etc.) • Overviewing of legal and regulatory aspects related to renovation • Monitoring the progress and impact of citizen-led renovation • Co-designing the operational structure of the support service (process flows, IT tools, etc.) • Co-designing the business model of the citizen-led renovation service • Co-designing a set of technical solutions with economic assessment for a range of exemplary buildings. • Setting up communication, marketing, and engagement campaigns. • Co-designing IT solutions for the exchange of local practices. • Engaging professionals • Overviewing of financing options for different types of renovations • Collective purchase actions and bundling of projects <p>Other (please specify)</p>		<p>demonstrating a strategic approach to leveraging additional support.</p> <p>5. High: The response offers comprehensive and detailed insights into specific technical assistance needs, with a convincing explanation of the significant impact this support will have on the project and its broader goals. For ongoing CLR services, the integration and enhancement plans are robust, showcasing a commitment to continuous improvement and scaling of initiatives without double funding.</p> <p>6.</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--

3	Nature of the project – Ambition	Pilots project should provide clear details regarding the specific renovation measures they want to implement. Clarity of intent, feasibility and alignment with the objectives and scope of the CLR should be assessed as an award criterium.	<p>What percentage of energy savings does your project aim to achieve compared to the current status quo?</p> <p>Could you provide details on the specific renovation measures your project intends to implement to meet the energy saving target, such as insulation upgrades, installation of new windows, air-tightness enhancements, indoor heating pipe insulation or other? Additionally, describe how these measures go beyond renovation measures that are already planned or (partially) executed.</p>	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response vaguely outlines renovation measures without clear linkage to the stated energy savings target. It lacks specifics on how these measures will achieve the proposed percentage reduction in energy consumption, with no mention of employing diverse renovation strategies to meet the ambitious goals. Below average: Provides a basic outline of the planned renovation measures but fails to connect these plans with the feasibility of achieving the stated energy savings target. The response lacks detailed information on the diversity of measures and how they collectively contribute to exceeding standard energy efficiency improvements. Average: Identifies specific renovation measures with a moderate level of detail and attempts to correlate these with the stated energy savings target. However, the response only provides a basic explanation of how these measures collectively contribute to the overall energy efficiency goals, suggesting an intention to employ multiple types of renovations but lacking a clear, comprehensive strategy to meet the ambitious savings target. Above average: Offers detailed information on a variety of specific renovation measures and effectively links these to the feasibility of achieving the stated energy savings target. The response demonstrates a strategic approach to implementing multiple types of renovations, indicating a solid understanding of how each measure contributes to the overall energy efficiency improvement and aligns with the ambitious savings goal. High: Provides an exceptionally detailed and coherent response, clearly outlining a wide range of innovative renovation measures and directly linking them to the ambitious energy savings target. The response indicates a comprehensive and well-thought-out strategy for employing multiple types of renovations, perfectly aligned with high energy efficiency goals, and convincingly demonstrates the feasibility of achieving the stated percentage of energy savings.
4	Nature of the project - Ambition	Pilot projects are expected to integrate renewable energy technologies to enhance energy efficiency, primarily in residential sectors, with potential inclusion in non-residential buildings if	What renewable energy technologies do you plan to integrate into the renovated buildings or their vicinity, and what is the expected energy	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response provides minimal or vague information about the renewable energy technologies planned for integration. There is a lack of specific details on technologies such as heat pumps, PV panels, solar thermal systems, and water turbines. Feasibility considerations for each technology are not addressed, indicating a

		<p>they substantially contribute to the energy community's objectives. Applicants should detail their approach to incorporating renewable energy solutions such as heat pumps, PV panels, solar thermal systems, and water turbines. The evaluation will focus on the clarity of intent, local conditions, regulatory compliance, the feasibility of the proposed technologies, and their alignment with the CLR's objectives and scope.</p>	<p>production from each of these technologies?</p> <p>Please specify your approach to incorporating technologies such as heat pumps, solar panels for electricity production (PV), solar thermal systems, and water turbines. Focus on detailing the feasibility considerations for each proposed technology.</p>		<p>superficial or incomplete approach to sustainable energy integration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Below average: The response mentions some renewable energy technologies but lacks depth in specifying the approach for incorporation. Details on feasibility considerations are limited or generic, with little to no explanation of how local conditions, building characteristics, or regulatory challenges will be managed, suggesting a basic but insufficiently thought-out plan for technology integration. 3. Average: The response identifies specific renewable energy technologies to be integrated and provides a general outline of the approach for each. There are some considerations of feasibility, including brief mentions of local climate conditions or building characteristics, but the analysis lacks comprehensive depth, indicating a moderate level of preparedness for sustainable technology integration. 4. Above average: The response offers a detailed account of the renewable energy technologies planned for integration, with a clear and specific approach outlined for each technology, including heat pumps, PV panels, solar thermal systems, and water turbines. Feasibility considerations are well-explained, covering local climate conditions, building characteristics, regulatory compliance, and logistical aspects, demonstrating a thorough and well-considered plan for sustainable energy integration. 5. High: The response provides an exceptional level of detail on the integration of renewable energy technologies, with innovative and tailored approaches for each specified technology. Comprehensive feasibility considerations are addressed, including in-depth analyses of local climate conditions, building-specific factors, regulatory frameworks, and logistical challenges. The response demonstrates an outstanding commitment to sustainability and a highly strategic and feasible plan for technology integration.
5	Nature of the project - Ambition	Pilot projects should detail their foreseen investment in both renovation measures and renewable energy integration, demonstrating how this financial commitment aligns	Please specify the total foreseen investment for your project. How does this investment support your energy efficiency and renewable energy goals? Describe how the allocation of	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response provides a minimal outline of the planned investment with vague connections to the energy savings targets and renovation measures. There is a lack of detail on how the investment will be allocated, raising concerns about the project's feasibility and ambition credibility.

		with the CLR's objectives and the project's ambition for energy efficiency. To ensure a fair comparison across countries with varying cost structures, investments will be evaluated relative to the local Purchasing Power Parity index and typical costs associated with the energy efficiency/renewable energy measures.	funds will ensure the successful implementation of your project's objectives.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Below average: The planned investment is mentioned, but the response lacks a clear breakdown or explanation of how it will support the specific renovation measures and energy savings targets. The connection between the investment and the project's ambition appears weak, questioning the credibility of the project's goals. Average: A reasonable estimate of the planned investment is provided, with a basic explanation of its allocation towards renovation measures and energy savings. While the response indicates a level of ambition, there may be gaps in detailing how the investment enhances the project's credibility and feasibility. Above average: The response offers a detailed breakdown of the investment, clearly linking it to well-defined renovation measures and the energy savings target. The explanation demonstrates a strategic approach to funding allocation, reinforcing the project's ambition credibility and overall feasibility. High: An exceptionally detailed and transparent account of the foreseen investment is provided, with a comprehensive explanation of how it will be strategically used to achieve ambitious renovation measures and energy savings. The response convincingly showcases the project's high level of ambition and the credibility of its goals, reflecting thorough planning and a strong commitment to energy efficiency improvements.
6	Nature of the project - Soundness of the approach	The project's delivery timeline is crucial for its success. Applicants must demonstrate that their launch plan for the citizen-led renovation service is well-structured, realistic, and aligns with the timeframe outlined for the Pilots in the guidance package. Additionally, the identification of risks and measures to mitigate them should be clearly detailed.	Can you outline your project's launch timeline, ensuring it aligns with the 5 to 8 months window post the initiation of support services provided by this pilot collaboration? Please provide a brief plan that includes key milestones and any anticipated challenges, along with your strategies to address them, ensuring timely launch and effective execution.	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response is vague, lacking a clear timeline or key milestones for the project launch. There is no acknowledgment of potential challenges or strategies for addressing them, showing little alignment with the pilot's expected timeframe. Below average: Provides a general timeline for the project launch but lacks detailed planning, specific milestones, or a clear understanding of potential challenges. Minimal consideration is given to strategies for mitigating delays, indicating a weak alignment with the 5 to 8 months launch window. Average: Outlines a basic launch timeline with some key milestones and acknowledges potential challenges. The response hints at mitigation strategies but lacks a detailed, comprehensive plan to ensure alignment with the pilot's expected timeframe. Above average: Offers a well-structured launch timeline, including specific milestones and a clear identification of potential challenges. Demonstrates a strategic approach to mitigating risks and ensuring

					<p>the project aligns with the 5 to 8 months launch window, indicating a good understanding of the project's requirements.</p> <p>4. High: Presents an exceptionally detailed and realistic launch timeline, with comprehensive milestones and innovative strategies for overcoming challenges. The plan shows strong alignment with the pilot's expected timeframe, indicating thorough preparation and a high likelihood of timely and successful project execution.</p>
7	Nature of the project – soundness of approach	Developing a comprehensive funding strategy is essential for the successful implementation of renovation support services, utilising a mix of public-private partnerships, EU funding programs, other subsidies, and innovative approaches like community investment through crowdfunding. It's crucial that this strategy ensures transparency and accountability to avoid double funding from overlapping sources.	Can you outline your funding strategy for the renovation support service, detailing any existing public-private partnerships, EU funding programmes, and use of other subsidies? Additionally, explain any initiatives to incorporate community investment through crowdfunding, highlighting your approach to mobilise local support. Please also describe the measures in place to prevent double funding from similar or overlapping EU funding sources for the same type of support service.	Open text (1500 characters)	<p>1. Low: The response provides minimal or vague information about the funding sources, with no clear strategy for leveraging diverse funding opportunities or ensuring the avoidance of double funding. There's little to no mention of community investment through crowdfunding or measures to ensure transparency and prevent double funding.</p> <p>2. Below average: The response outlines some funding sources but lacks detailed strategies for accessing and combining these funds effectively. There's a basic mention of crowdfunding but without a clear plan for mobilisation. Minimal or unclear measures are described to prevent double funding, indicating a need for more robust planning.</p> <p>3. Average: The response describes a moderate range of funding sources, including a general strategy for leveraging them and engaging in community investment through crowdfunding or other citizen-related funding streams. There are some measures mentioned to ensure the avoidance of double funding, but these could be more detailed and comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Above average: The funding strategy is well-articulated, showcasing a thoughtful approach to leveraging diverse funding sources, including detailed plans for community investment through crowdfunding. The response includes clear measures to ensure transparency and prevent double funding, demonstrating a high level of accountability and financial management.</p> <p>5. High: The response presents an exceptional funding strategy, clearly detailing how various sources, including innovative community investment through crowdfunding, will be utilised. Comprehensive measures are outlined to ensure transparency, accountability, and the avoidance of double funding, indicating an exemplary approach to financial management and community engagement.</p>

8	Nature of the applicant	The capability to execute citizen-led renovation projects effectively depends on the community's collective expertise and skills. This includes competencies in project management, construction, renewable energy source (RES) development, legal frameworks, and financial management, among others.	How many volunteers/staff are committed to actively participate in the project? Can your community demonstrate the collective expertise and skills required for the successful execution of citizen-led renovation projects? Please provide detailed information on the relevant expertise present within your team, particularly in areas such as project supervision, construction techniques, renewable energy development, legal compliance, and financial management. Highlight how these skills will contribute to the successful implementation of your project.	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response provides minimal or vague information about the community's expertise and skills, with a very low number of volunteers/staff committed to the project. This limited team size suggests a constrained capacity for successful project execution, raising concerns about the feasibility of implementing the planned renovation measures effectively. 2. Below average: While listing some areas of expertise, the response lacks depth and fails to convincingly demonstrate the community's readiness, compounded by a low number of committed volunteers/staff. This indicates a basic but insufficient level of readiness that may struggle to meet the project's requirements, given the small team size and the limited detail on their roles and integration. 3. Average: The community's expertise in essential project areas is adequately detailed, with a moderate number of volunteers/staff committed to the project. This level shows a reasonable capacity and readiness level, yet the response might lack full clarity on how the team's size and expertise are optimally utilised for project success. 4. Above average: Provides a detailed account of the community's collective expertise, with specific examples, qualifications, and experiences across critical project areas. A significant number of volunteers/staff are committed, indicating a high level of project readiness, a strong capacity for successful implementation, and evidence of effective team collaboration. 5. High: Offers an exceptionally detailed and comprehensive overview of the community's expertise, with a wide range of specific qualifications, proven experiences, and past successes. The response also highlights a large and actively involved team of volunteers/staff, clearly demonstrating an outstanding capacity for complex project execution and robust evidence of collaborative and integrative skills across all domains.
9	Nature of the applicant	Assessment of past proven experiences in community-based renovation projects, or readiness to engage in such activities	Could you detail any past experiences or notable successes you've had in community-based renovation or renewable energy projects, emphasising the scale, impact, and innovative approaches employed? For communities new to this field, please	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response provides minimal information, with little to no detail on past projects for established entities or vague and unfocused plans for newcomers. It indicates a lack of substantial experience or a clear strategy for engaging in community-based renovation or renewable energy projects. 2. Below average: For established entities, the response lists some past projects but lacks details on the scale, impact, or innovative aspects. For newcomers, the plans for future engagement are

			describe your readiness and future plans to engage in such initiatives, highlighting any innovative strategies, preparatory steps already taken, and how you plan to contribute fresh perspectives to community-based renovation efforts.		mentioned but lack specificity, innovative strategies, or clear preparatory steps. 3. Average: Established entities describe past projects with moderate detail on scale and impact, including some innovative approaches. Newcomers outline a reasonably clear plan for future engagement, with mentions of innovative strategies and initial preparatory steps, showing potential for fresh contributions. 4. Above average: Established entities provide detailed accounts of successful, impactful past projects, clearly highlighting innovative methods that enhanced outcomes. Newcomers present well-defined plans for engaging in community-based renovation or renewable energy projects, including specific innovative approaches and comprehensive preparatory work, demonstrating readiness and potential. 5. High: Established entities showcase a strong track record of significant, innovative community-based renovation projects with clear, measurable impacts. Newcomers offer detailed, robust plans for future initiatives, featuring groundbreaking strategies, significant preparatory actions, and a clear vision for contributing new perspectives and value to the sector.
10	Innovation, inclusivity and replicability	The project's innovation, particularly in citizen engagement strategies, renovation methods, and technology utilisation, is a critical aspect of its success. Applicants must illustrate how their project introduces novel approaches or solutions that significantly enhance the project's impact and effectiveness.	Could you highlight the innovative aspects of your project? Please provide specific examples of innovations in citizen engagement, the renovation measures you plan to implement, and any advanced technologies you will deploy. Explain how these innovations contribute to the project's goals and set it apart from conventional approaches.	Open text (1000 characters)	1. Low: The response vaguely mentions innovation but fails to provide specifics on how the project introduces new approaches in citizen engagement, renovation measures, or technology use. There is no clear explanation of how these innovations contribute to the project's effectiveness. 2. Below average: Provides a general description of one or two innovative aspects but lacks detailed information on how these innovations are applied in citizen engagement, renovation measures, or technologies. The explanation of their impact on the project's goals is minimal or unclear. 3. Average: Identifies some innovative components with a moderate level of detail, including how these innovations are implemented in the project. However, the explanation of how these innovations enhance the project's effectiveness or distinguish it from conventional approaches could be more comprehensive. 4. Above average: Detailed descriptions of innovative approaches in citizen engagement, renovation measures, and technologies are provided. The response clearly explains how these innovations contribute to the project's goals and highlights their significance in enhancing the project's effectiveness and uniqueness.

11	Innovation, inclusivity and replicability	Projects must demonstrate the potential for mobilisation of citizen involvement in the support service. Citizens must be integral parts of the support service, not passive beneficiaries.	How does your project ensure inclusivity within the energy community through community engagement? Detail your strategies for involving citizens as active contributors in the planning, decision-making, and implementation processes. Describe the specific mechanisms, strategies, and platforms you have utilised or plan to utilise to ensure diverse community member involvement and how these efforts contribute to the project's overall inclusivity.	Open text (1000 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response offers minimal information on community engagement, with little to no evidence of strategies to involve citizens as active participants. It suggests a lack of clear planning or past success in mobilising citizen involvement. 2. Below average: Provides a basic overview of planned or past community engagement activities but lacks detail on how citizens are or will be actively involved. The strategies mentioned are generic, with limited evidence of their effectiveness in ensuring active participation. 3. Average: Describes a solid plan or past examples of community engagement, with some clear strategies for involving citizens as active contributors. The response includes a few examples of mechanisms or platforms used to facilitate active participation, showing a moderate level of effectiveness. 4. Above average: Offers a detailed account of comprehensive and innovative community engagement strategies, with clear examples of past successes or well-defined future plans. The response demonstrates effective mechanisms for ensuring active citizen involvement, highlighting the roles and contributions of community members in a meaningful way. 5. High: Presents an exceptional overview of community engagement activities, with a strong emphasis on innovative and effective strategies for active citizen participation. The response showcases significant past achievements or detailed, robust plans for the future, with clear evidence of mechanisms that ensure citizens are integral, contributing members of the energy community.
12	Innovation, inclusivity and replicability	The project's design should inherently support replication in other communities or contexts, demonstrating scalability and adaptability. The ability to share project outcomes, methodologies, and best practices effectively to facilitate broader adoption is crucial.	How do you envision the potential for replication of your project in other communities or contexts? Please also outline any strategies you plan to employ to share the project's approach, technologies, and outcomes. If applicable, describe how your past projects have been replicated or how their findings have	Open text (1000 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: Provides minimal or vague details on replication potential, with no clear strategies for sharing project outcomes or evidence of past dissemination efforts. 2. Below average: Mentions replication potential but lacks a detailed strategy for sharing outcomes or examples of past dissemination that led to broader adoption. 3. Average: Describes a basic strategy for replication and sharing of outcomes, with some reference to past dissemination efforts or how project findings could be applied in other contexts. 4. Above average: Offers a well-thought-out strategy for replication, including specific plans for disseminating project outcomes. Provides examples of successful past dissemination or replication of project findings.

			been disseminated to promote broader adoption.		5. High: Presents a comprehensive and innovative strategy for ensuring the project's replication, with detailed plans for sharing outcomes and technologies. Includes compelling evidence of past projects being replicated or findings adopted widely, demonstrating a significant potential for broader impact.
--	--	--	--	--	--

Weighting for Pathway 1 (Pilots)

Q No.	Award category	Weighting	Rationale	Example calculation
1-2	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	30%	These questions assess the project's foundational goals and relevance, making them crucial for the overall direction and alignment with energy efficiency objectives.	Average score: $(4 + 3) / 2 = 3.5$ Weighted score: $3.5 * 30\% = 1.05$
3-5	Nature of the project – Ambition	25%	Assesses the project's ambition in terms of energy savings, renewable energy integration, and overall investment, critical for gauging its potential impact and innovation.	Average score: $(4 + 5 + 3) / 3 = 4$ Weighted score: $4 * 25\% = 1$
6-7	Nature of the project – Soundness of the approach	20%	This section evaluates the feasibility and practicality of the approach, which is vital for the project's likelihood of success and efficient objective achievement.	Average score: $(3 + 4) / 2 = 3.5$ Weighted score: $3.5 * 20\% = 0.7$
8-9	Nature of the applicant	15%	The skills, experience, and capacity of the applicant underpin the project's execution capabilities, making this category important for evaluating the potential for successful implementation.	Average score: $(3 + 3) / 2 = 3$ Weighted score: $3 * 15\% = 0.45$
10-12	Innovation, inclusivity, replicability	10%	While these aspects are crucial for the project's broader impact and potential for wider adoption, they are supplementary to the foundational criteria and hence given a slightly lower weighting.	Average Score: $(2 + 4 + 5) / 3 = 3.67$ Weighted score: $3.67 * 10\% = 0.367$

Total score (based on example results)

- 1.05 (Clarity and pertinence of the objectives) + 1 (Ambition) + 0.7 (Soundness of the approach) + 0.45 (Nature of the applicant) + 0.367 (Innovation, inclusivity, replicability) = 3.567 (weighted score).

Conversion to percentage: (project's total weighted score / maximum possible total weighted score) * 100

- $(3.567 / 5) * 100 = 71.34\%$

4.3. Award questions for Pathway 2 (Learners)

No.	Award section	Award criteria	Question	Answer	Scoring matrix
1	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	Learners are expected to contribute to projects that enhance energy efficiency primarily in residential settings, with the option to extend to non-residential buildings if such inclusion significantly benefits the energy community's objectives. This question assesses the clarity and pertinence of the project's proposed focus, including the types of buildings targeted, the main objectives, the estimated number of buildings to be renovated, and the expected impact on energy efficiency.	As a learner, describe your planned project in terms of the types of buildings (residential, non-residential, or both) you will focus on. What are the main objectives you aim to achieve with regard to energy efficiency improvements? Estimate the number of buildings you anticipate being involved with in the renovation process and discuss the expected impact of these renovations on energy efficiency within the community. Please provide details for both residential and non-residential buildings if applicable.	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response is vague and lacks differentiation between building types, with unclear objectives and no specific estimates. 2. Below average: Provides a general outline of the project focus but lacks detailed objectives, specific estimates, or clear impact on energy efficiency. 3. Average: Identifies the building types and main objectives with reasonable estimates for the number of buildings, but the anticipated impact on energy efficiency may not be fully detailed. 4. Above average: Detailed information on building types and clear objectives, with well-estimated numbers and a solid understanding of the expected impact on energy efficiency. 5. High: Exceptionally detailed response, clearly defining building types, precise objectives aligned with energy efficiency goals, accurate estimates, and a comprehensive outline of the expected impact on the community's energy efficiency.
2	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	The project's objectives should be clear and directly aligned with the goals of the CLR initiative. Applicants are expected to provide detailed descriptions of the specific renovation measures they plan to implement, ensuring these	Could you detail the specific renovation measures you plan to implement as part of your planned project? (e.g. improved insulation, the installation of new windows, air-tightness measures, and the insulation of heating pipes indoors). If possible, please specify	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response provides vague or minimal details about the specific renovation measures, lacking clarity on how these measures improve upon existing or planned renovations. There is little to no demonstration of how the proposed measures align with CLR objectives, the estimated investment amount and/or the expected energy savings. 2. Below average: The response lists some renovation measures but fails to provide detailed descriptions. The alignment with CLR objectives is mentioned but not clearly articulated, and/or limited credibility to the investment amount and energy savings.

		measures are feasible and significantly enhance the existing state of the buildings involved.	an estimated investment amount and expected energy savings (%) as a result of the renovation measures.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Average: The response describes specific renovation measures with a moderate level of detail. There is an evident attempt to align the proposed measures with CLR objectives and, though the added value could be more comprehensively detailed. Investment amounts and energy savings are reasonable for the planned approach. 4. Above average: The response offers a detailed account of planned renovation measures. The alignment with CLR objectives is well-explained, showcasing the proposed measures' feasibility and significant added value. Aligns well with the estimated investment amount and expected energy savings. 5. High: The response provides an exceptional and comprehensive description of innovative renovation measures. The proposed measures are perfectly aligned with CLR objectives, indicating a high level of clarity, feasibility, and substantial enhancement to the project's value. Perfectly aligns with the estimated investment amount and expected energy savings.
3	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	Learners in the pathway should provide clear details regarding the specific renewable energy technologies they plan to integrate into their renovation projects. The clarity of intent, feasibility, and alignment with the objectives and scope of the CLR, focusing on enhancing energy efficiency and sustainability, should be assessed as an award criterion.	Can you describe the renewable energy technologies your project plans to integrate into the renovated buildings or their vicinity? Please specify an estimated investment amount and the approach to incorporating technologies such as heat pumps, solar panels for electricity production (PV), solar thermal systems, and water turbines. Focus on detailing the feasibility considerations for each proposed technology, and how these technologies enhance the project's contribution to energy efficiency and sustainability beyond current or planned measures.	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response is vague and lacks specifics about the renewable energy technologies to be integrated, with no clear explanation of feasibility or how these technologies extend beyond standard or already planned energy solutions. There is no mention of employing diverse types of renewable energy technologies and/or misalignment to estimated amount of funds. 2. Below average: Provides a general outline of the planned renewable energy technologies but lacks detailed information on the diversity of technologies and how they exceed standard or planned energy solutions. There is minimal evidence of multiple types of renewable energy technologies being considered and/or links to the estimated value of investment. 3. Average: Identifies specific renewable energy technologies with some level of detail and includes a basic explanation of how these technologies improve upon standard practices or planned energy solutions. The response suggests an intention to employ multiple types of renewable energy technologies but lacks a clear, comprehensive strategy. Some alignment to the estimated investment value. 4. Above average: Detailed information on a variety of specific renewable energy technologies is provided, along with clear explanations of their feasibility and how these technologies exceed standard or planned energy solutions. The response demonstrates a strategic approach to

					<p>implementing multiple types of renewable energy technologies, indicating a solid understanding of the project's potential impact on energy efficiency and sustainability. Strong links to the investment value.</p> <p>5. High: Exceptionally detailed response, clearly outlining a wide range of innovative renewable energy technologies and their strategic value beyond standard practices. The response indicates a comprehensive and well-planned approach to employing multiple types of renewable energy technologies, perfectly aligned with energy efficiency and sustainability goals, and offers a thorough outline of the expected impact on the community's energy efficiency and environmental footprint. Plans are very closely aligned to the typical investment costs estimated</p>
4	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	Understanding the specific needs for technical assistance, its potential impact, and the applicants' plans following the completion of the support is crucial for tailoring the assistance provided and ensuring its effectiveness. This question seeks to elicit detailed information on these aspects to better align support services with applicants' requirements and long-term project sustainability.	<p>Based on your indicated preferences for technical assistance, could you provide more detailed insights into your specific needs within this area? Elaborate on how you envision this support impacting your planned project and the broader objectives you aim to achieve. If you are currently involved in an ongoing CLR service, please describe how you envision integrating and enhancing this service within the framework of this support service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding needs and preferred support for the citizens • Setting up a local ecosystem (banks, municipality, local contractors, etc.) 	Open text (1500 characters)	<p>1. Low: The response provides minimal or vague insights into the specific technical assistance needs, with little explanation of the expected impact on the project or its broader objectives. Plans for integrating and enhancing ongoing CLR services are unclear or not addressed.</p> <p>2. Below average: The response outlines some technical assistance needs but lacks detail and depth in explaining how the support will impact the project and broader objectives. If involved in ongoing CLR services, the description of integration and enhancement is superficial and lacks a clear strategy.</p> <p>3. Average: The response adequately details specific technical assistance needs and provides a general understanding of how the support will benefit the project and its alignment with broader objectives. For ongoing CLR services, there are basic plans for integration and enhancement, indicating a moderate level of preparedness.</p> <p>4. Above average: The response clearly identifies detailed technical assistance needs and articulates a well-considered expectation of the support's impact on the project and broader objectives. Plans for integrating and enhancing ongoing CLR services are detailed, demonstrating a strategic approach to leveraging additional support.</p> <p>5. High: The response offers comprehensive and detailed insights into specific technical assistance needs, with a convincing explanation of the significant impact this support will have on the project and its broader goals. For ongoing CLR services, the integration and enhancement plans are innovative and robust, showcasing a commitment to continuous improvement and scaling of initiatives.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overviewing of legal and regulatory aspects related to renovation • Monitoring the progress and impact of citizen-led renovation • Co-designing the operational structure of the support service (process flows, IT tools, etc.) • Co-designing the business model of the citizen-led renovation service • Co-designing a set of technical solutions with economic assessment for a range of exemplary buildings. • Setting up communication, marketing, and engagement campaigns. • Co-designing IT solutions for the exchange of local practices. • Engaging professionals • Overviewing of financing options for different types of renovations • Collective purchase actions and bundling of projects • Other (please specify) 		
--	--	--	--	--	--

5	Nature of the project - Soundness of the approach	The project's success is partly determined by its timely delivery in accordance with the specified Learners' timeline in the guidance package. Applicants must demonstrate how their proposed timeline aligns with this schedule, acknowledging any potential challenges and how they plan to address them to ensure alignment.	Does your proposed timeline for launching the service align with the schedule for Learners as outlined in the guidance package? Please elaborate on how your timeline corresponds with the specified Learners' timeline, including any anticipated challenges or considerations in ensuring alignment.	Open text (1500 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response lacks a clear explanation of how the proposed timeline aligns with the Learners' schedule, with no mention of key milestones or phases. Anticipated challenges and considerations for ensuring alignment are not addressed. 2. Below average: The proposed timeline is mentioned but only vaguely aligns with the Learners' schedule. There is minimal discussion of milestones or how anticipated challenges will be managed, indicating a need for further planning. 3. Average: The response outlines a timeline that generally aligns with the Learners' schedule, including some key milestones. A few anticipated challenges are identified, with basic strategies for addressing them, showing moderate preparedness. 4. Above average: The proposed timeline is well-aligned with the Learners' schedule, clearly detailing key milestones and phases. Anticipated challenges are thoughtfully considered, with effective strategies outlined for ensuring alignment, indicating a high level of preparedness. 5. High: The response demonstrates an excellent alignment of the proposed timeline with the Learners' schedule, with all key milestones and phases comprehensively detailed. Anticipated challenges are thoroughly addressed, with innovative and robust strategies for maintaining alignment, showcasing exceptional project planning and management.
6	Nature of the project – Soundness of the approach	Developing a comprehensive funding strategy is essential for the successful implementation of renovation support services, utilising a mix of public-private partnerships, EU funding programmes, other subsidies, and innovative approaches like community investment through crowdfunding. It's crucial that this strategy ensures transparency and accountability to avoid double	Can you outline your funding strategy for the renovation support service, detailing any existing public-private partnerships, EU funding programmes, and use other subsidies? Additionally, explain any initiatives to incorporate community investment through crowdfunding, highlighting your approach to mobilise local support. Please also describe the measures in place to prevent double funding from similar or	Open text (1000 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response provides minimal or vague information about the funding sources, with no clear strategy for leveraging diverse funding opportunities or ensuring the avoidance of double funding. There's little to no mention of community investment through crowdfunding or measures to ensure transparency and prevent double funding. 2. Below average: The response outlines some funding sources but lacks detailed strategies for accessing and combining these funds effectively. There's a basic mention of crowdfunding but without a clear plan for mobilisation. Minimal or unclear measures are described to prevent double funding, indicating a need for more robust planning. 3. Average: The response describes a moderate range of funding sources, including a general strategy for leveraging them and engaging in community investment through crowdfunding. There are some measures mentioned to ensure the avoidance of double funding, but these could be more detailed and comprehensive.

		funding from overlapping sources.	overlapping EU funding sources for the same type of support service.		<p>4. Above average: The funding strategy is well-articulated, showcasing a thoughtful approach to leveraging diverse funding sources, including detailed plans for community investment through crowdfunding. The response includes clear measures to ensure transparency and prevent double funding, demonstrating a high level of accountability and financial management.</p> <p>5. High: The response presents an exceptional funding strategy, clearly detailing how various sources, including innovative community investment through crowdfunding, will be utilised. Comprehensive measures are outlined to ensure transparency, accountability, and the avoidance of double funding, indicating an exemplary approach to financial management and community engagement.</p>
7	Nature of the applicant	A well-conceived project idea is essential for the successful execution of citizen-led renovation projects, and the collective expertise of the community plays a crucial role in bringing these ideas to fruition. This question assesses the applicant's initial project ideas or concepts and the team's relevant expertise in key areas required to successfully implement these projects.	How many volunteers/staff are committed to actively participate in the project? Can your community demonstrate the collective expertise and skills required for the successful execution of planned renovation project(s)? Please provide detailed information on the relevant expertise present within your team, particularly in areas such as project supervision, construction techniques, renewable energy development, legal compliance, and financial management. Additionally, highlight areas where you will require further support and training to develop.	Open text (1500 characters)	<p>1. Low: The response provides minimal or vague information about the community's expertise and skills, with a very low number of volunteers/staff committed to the project. This limited team size suggests a constrained capacity for successful project execution, raising concerns about the feasibility of implementing the planned renovation measures effectively.</p> <p>2. Below average: While listing some areas of expertise, the response lacks depth and fails to convincingly demonstrate the community's readiness, compounded by a low number of committed volunteers/staff. This indicates a basic but insufficient level of readiness that may struggle to meet the project's requirements, given the small team size and the limited detail on their roles and integration.</p> <p>3. Average: The community's expertise in essential project areas is adequately detailed, with a moderate number of volunteers/staff committed to the project. This level shows a reasonable capacity and readiness level, yet the response might lack full clarity on how the team's size and expertise are optimally utilised for project success.</p> <p>4. Above average: Provides a detailed account of the community's collective expertise, with specific examples, qualifications, and experiences across critical project areas. A significant number of volunteers/staff are committed, indicating a high level of project readiness, a strong capacity for successful implementation, and evidence of effective team collaboration.</p> <p>5. High: Offers an exceptionally detailed and comprehensive overview of the community's expertise, with a wide range of specific qualifications, proven experiences, and past successes. The response also highlights a large and actively involved team of volunteers/staff, clearly demonstrating an outstanding capacity for complex project execution</p>

					and robust evidence of collaborative and integrative skills across all domains.
8	Nature of the applicant	Effective governance structures for renovation projects should ensure proper oversight and accountability, while also actively involving citizens in decision-making processes. This criterion assesses the applicant's ability to integrate community members into the governance framework, thereby enhancing transparency, inclusivity, and community engagement in project initiatives.	How does your governance structure actively involve citizens in the management and decision-making processes of your renovation projects? Please detail the mechanisms and strategies you employ to ensure citizen participation is integral to project governance, highlighting how this approach facilitates effective project management, accountability, and stakeholder engagement, especially in the context of community-driven renovation initiatives.	Open text (1000 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response provides little to no information on how citizens are integrated into the governance structure, indicating a lack of mechanisms for community involvement in project management and decision-making processes. Below average: The governance structure includes some basic mechanisms for citizen involvement, but these are either too limited or not clearly defined, suggesting minimal community engagement in decision-making and project oversight. Average: The response describes a governance structure that moderately involves citizens, with clear but standard mechanisms for community participation. The approach to ensuring citizen involvement in project governance is reasonable but could be further enhanced. Above average: The governance structure is well-designed to actively involve citizens, with comprehensive mechanisms that facilitate effective community participation in decision-making and project management. The approach demonstrates a strong commitment to transparency, inclusivity, and stakeholder engagement. High: The response outlines an exceptional governance framework that places citizens at the core of project management and decision-making processes. Innovative and robust strategies ensure deep and meaningful community involvement, showcasing exemplary commitment to community-driven governance and project execution.
9	Innovation, inclusivity and replicability	The project's innovation, particularly in citizen engagement strategies, renovation methods, and technology utilisation, is a critical aspect of its success. Applicants must illustrate how their project introduces novel approaches or solutions that significantly enhance the project's impact and effectiveness.	Could you highlight the innovative aspects of your planned project? Please provide specific examples of innovations in citizen engagement, the renovation measures you plan to implement, and any advanced technologies you will deploy. Explain how these innovations contribute to the project's goals and set it apart from conventional approaches.	Open text (1000 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response vaguely mentions innovation but fails to provide specifics on how the project introduces new approaches in citizen engagement, renovation measures, or technology use. There is no clear explanation of how these innovations contribute to the project's effectiveness. Below average: Provides a general description of one or two innovative aspects but lacks detailed information on how these innovations are applied in citizen engagement, renovation measures, or technologies. The explanation of their impact on the project's goals is minimal or unclear. Average: Identifies some innovative components with a moderate level of detail, including how these innovations are implemented in the project. However, the explanation of how these innovations enhance the project's effectiveness or distinguish it from conventional approaches could be more comprehensive.

					<p>4. Above average: Detailed descriptions of innovative approaches in citizen engagement, renovation measures, and technologies are provided. The response clearly explains how these innovations contribute to the project's goals and highlights their significance in enhancing the project's effectiveness and uniqueness.</p> <p>5. High: Exceptionally detailed response, showcasing a wide range of innovative components across citizen engagement, renovation methods, and technology deployment. The explanation vividly illustrates how these innovations are integral to achieving the project's objectives and significantly set the project apart from standard practices, indicating a high level of creativity and strategic thinking.</p>
11	Innovation, inclusivity and replicability	Projects must demonstrate the potential for mobilisation of citizen involvement in the support service. Citizens must be integral parts of the support service, not passive beneficiaries.	How will your planned project ensure inclusivity within the energy community through community engagement? Detail your strategies for involving citizens as active contributors in the planning, decision-making, and implementation processes. Describe the specific mechanisms, strategies, and platforms you have utilised or plan to utilise to ensure diverse community member involvement and how these efforts contribute to the project's overall inclusivity.	Open text (1000 characters)	<p>1. Low: The response offers minimal information on community engagement, with little to no evidence of strategies to involve citizens as active participants. It suggests a lack of clear planning or past success in mobilising citizen involvement.</p> <p>2. Below average: Provides a basic overview of planned or past community engagement activities but lacks detail on how citizens are or will be actively involved. The strategies mentioned are generic, with limited evidence of their effectiveness in ensuring active participation.</p> <p>3. Average: Describes a solid plan or past examples of community engagement, with some clear strategies for involving citizens as active contributors. The response includes a few examples of mechanisms or platforms used to facilitate active participation, showing a moderate level of effectiveness.</p> <p>4. Above average: Offers a detailed account of comprehensive and innovative community engagement strategies, with clear examples of past successes or well-defined future plans. The response demonstrates effective mechanisms for ensuring active citizen involvement, highlighting the roles and contributions of community members in a meaningful way.</p> <p>5. High: Presents an exceptional overview of community engagement activities, with a strong emphasis on innovative and effective strategies for active citizen participation. The response showcases significant past achievements or detailed, robust plans for the future, with clear evidence of mechanisms that ensure citizens are integral, contributing members of the energy community.</p>

11	Innovation, inclusivity and replicability	The project's design should inherently support replication in other communities or contexts, demonstrating scalability and adaptability. The ability to share project outcomes, methodologies, and best practices effectively to facilitate broader adoption is crucial.	How do you envision the potential for replication of your planned project in other communities or contexts? Please also outline any strategies you plan to employ to share the project's approach, technologies, and outcomes.	Open text (1000 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: Provides minimal or vague details on replication potential, with no clear strategies for sharing project outcomes. Below average: Mentions replication potential but lacks a detailed strategy for sharing outcomes. Average: Describes a basic strategy for replication and sharing of outcomes. Above average: Offers a well-thought-out strategy for replication, including specific plans for disseminating project outcomes. High: Presents a comprehensive and innovative strategy for ensuring the project's replication, with detailed plans for sharing outcomes and technologies.
----	---	--	--	-----------------------------	---

Weighting for Pathway 2 (Learners)

Q No.	Award category	Weighting	Rationale	Example calculation
1-4	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	35%	These questions assess the project's foundational goals and relevance, making them crucial for the overall direction and alignment with energy efficiency objectives.	Average score: $(4 + 3 + 4 + 5) / 4 = 4$ Weighted score: $4 * 35\% = 1.4$
5-6	Nature of the project – Soundness of the approach	30%	This section evaluates the feasibility and practicality of the approach, which is vital for the project's likelihood of success and efficient objective achievement.	Average score: $(4 + 5) / 2 = 4.5$ Weighted score: $4.5 * 30\% = 1.35$
7-8	Nature of the applicant	20%	The skills, experience, and capacity of the applicant underpin the project's execution capabilities, making this category important for evaluating the potential for successful implementation.	Average score: $(4 + 4) / 2 = 4$ Weighted score: $4 * 20\% = 0.8$
9-11	Innovation, inclusivity, replicability	15%	While these aspects are crucial for the project's broader impact and potential for wider adoption, they are supplementary to the foundational criteria and hence given a slightly lower weighting.	Average Score: $(3 + 4 + 4) / 3 = 3.67$ Weighted score: $3.67 * 15\% = 0.55$

Total score (based on example results)

- 1.4 (Clarity and pertinence of the objectives) + 1.35 (Soundness of the approach) + 0.8 (Nature of applicant) + 0.55 (Innovation, inclusivity, replicability) = 4.1 (weighted score).

Conversion to percentage: (project's total weighted score / maximum possible total weighted score) * 100

- $(4.1 / 5) * 100 = 82\%$

4.4. Award questions for Pathway 3 (Followers)

No.	Award section	Award criteria	Question	Answer	Scoring matrix
1	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	Understanding the comprehensive planning behind future energy renovation projects is crucial for assessing the project's alignment with sustainability and energy efficiency goals. This includes the types of renovations planned, the building types targeted for these renovations, and the integration of renewable energy installations to enhance the project's sustainability.	Could you please describe the key aspects of the energy renovation projects you plan to implement in the future? Detail the types of renovations you intend to undertake, the types of buildings (residential, commercial, community, etc.) these renovations will target, and any renewable energy installations you plan to incorporate within these projects. Highlight how these aspects collectively contribute to the project's goals of improving energy efficiency and sustainability.	Open text (800 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response provides minimal or vague details about the planned renovations, building types, and renewable energy installations, lacking clarity on how these elements contribute to energy efficiency and sustainability goals. 2. Below average: Some aspects of the planned projects are mentioned, but the response lacks specificity in renovation types, targeted building types, or renewable energy installations. There is minimal explanation of how these aspects align with the project's sustainability objectives. 3. Average: The response outlines key aspects of the planned projects, including general types of renovations, building types, and some renewable energy installations. However, the integration and contribution of these aspects to the project's energy efficiency and sustainability goals could be more detailed. 4. Above average: Detailed information is provided on the renovation types, building types, and renewable energy installations planned, with a clear explanation of how these elements are integrated and contribute significantly to the project's sustainability and energy efficiency objectives. 5. High: The response offers a comprehensive and detailed description of the planned projects, including innovative renovation types, diverse building targets, and extensive renewable energy installations. It convincingly demonstrates how these key aspects are strategically integrated to maximise the project's impact on energy efficiency and sustainability, showcasing a well-thought-out and ambitious project plan.

2	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	Understanding the specific needs for technical assistance, its potential impact, and the applicants' plans following the completion of the support is crucial for tailoring the assistance provided and ensuring its effectiveness. This question seeks to elicit detailed information on these aspects to better align support services with applicants' requirements and long-term project sustainability.	<p>Indicate the support service(s) that you believe should be the focus for the support service if your community group is selected. Provide details regarding your specific needs for each service selected, what goals you are aiming to achieve by receiving this service and how to leverage the outputs to move from learnings to action and implement a Citizen-led renovation project. If you are currently involved in an ongoing CLR service, please describe how you envision integrating and enhancing this service within the framework of this support service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding needs and preferred support for the citizens • Setting up a local ecosystem (banks, municipality, local contractors, etc.) • Overviewing of legal and regulatory aspects related to renovation • Monitoring the progress and impact of citizen-led renovation • Co-designing the operational structure of the support service 	Open text (800 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response provides minimal or vague details about the preferred support services, with limited information on specific needs, goals, or how the outputs will be leveraged to transition from learning to action. There's a lack of clear connection between the selected services and the implementation of a citizen-led renovation project. 2. Below average: The response identifies some support services but offers limited details on the community group's specific needs or the goals for each service. The explanation of how to utilise the service outputs for future project implementation is weak. 3. Average: The response adequately identifies preferred support services and provides a general outline of the specific needs and goals associated with each. There's a moderate level of detail on how the service outputs will be used to facilitate the future application of learnings in a citizen-led renovation project, but the plan may lack depth. 4. Above average: The response clearly details selected support services, along with well-defined specific needs and ambitious goals. It effectively demonstrates how the outputs from these services will be leveraged to transition from theoretical learning to the future implementation of a citizen-led renovation project, indicating a comprehensive approach. 5. High: The response provides an exceptional and thorough explanation of the chosen support services, detailing precise needs and goals for each. It convincingly outlines a future strategic plan for utilising the service outputs to move from learning to shaping action, demonstrating an in-depth understanding of implementing citizen-led renovation projects. The response showcases innovative and actionable strategies tailored to the community group's context.
---	--	--	--	----------------------------	--

			<p>(process flows, IT tools, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-designing the business model of the citizen-led renovation service • Co-designing a set of technical solutions with economic assessment for a range of exemplary buildings. • Setting up communication, marketing, and engagement campaigns. • Co-designing IT solutions for the exchange of local practices. • How to engage professionals • Overview of financing options for different types of renovations • Collective purchase actions and bundling of projects • Other (please specify) 		
3	Nature of the project - Soundness of the approach	Identification of constraints and limitations should be clearly detailed and provide a thorough understanding of the context the organisation is navigating. This includes resource availability, technical capabilities, financial constraints, regulatory	Are there any resource constraints or limitations that might affect your active participation in the programme? If yes, please could you elaborate on your answer?	Open text (800 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low: The response indicates major resource constraints with minimal or no mitigation strategies. 2. Below average: The response outlines moderate resource constraints with basic mitigation strategies. 3. Average: The response suggests minor resource constraints, coupled with feasible mitigation strategies. 4. Above average: The response indicates minimal constraints and outlines comprehensive mitigation strategies. 5. High: The response suggests no significant resource constraints affecting participation in the programme.

		challenges, or other factors that could affect active participation in the program.			
4	Nature of the project - Soundness of the approach	The project's success is partly determined by its timely delivery in accordance with the specified Followers' timeline in the guidance package. Applicants must demonstrate how their proposed timeline aligns with this schedule, acknowledging any potential challenges and how they plan to address them to ensure alignment.	Does your proposed timeline for launching the service align with the schedule for Followers as outlined in the guidance package? Please elaborate on how your timeline corresponds with the specified Followers' timeline, including any anticipated challenges or considerations in ensuring alignment	Open text (800 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response lacks a clear explanation of how the proposed timeline aligns with the Followers' schedule, with no mention of key milestones or phases. Anticipated challenges and considerations for ensuring alignment are not addressed. Below average: The proposed timeline is mentioned but only vaguely aligns with the Followers' schedule. There is minimal discussion of milestones or how anticipated challenges will be managed, indicating a need for further planning. Average: The response outlines a timeline that generally aligns with the Followers' schedule, including some key milestones. A few anticipated challenges are identified, with basic strategies for addressing them, showing moderate preparedness. Above average: The proposed timeline is well-aligned with the Followers' schedule, clearly detailing key milestones and phases. Anticipated challenges are thoughtfully considered, with effective strategies outlined for ensuring alignment, indicating a high level of preparedness. High: The response demonstrates an excellent alignment of the proposed timeline with the Followers' schedule, with all key milestones and phases comprehensively detailed. Anticipated challenges are thoroughly addressed, with innovative and robust strategies for maintaining alignment, showcasing exceptional project planning and management.
5	Citizen involvement	Successful projects must actively involve citizens in the support service, engaging them as integral contributors to the energy community's initiatives. This involvement goes beyond participation, requiring citizens to play active roles in decision-making, planning, and implementation processes.	Could you share your vision or initial plans for engaging citizens within the context of your project? Highlight any preliminary strategies or ideas you have to ensure that citizens play a significant role in shaping and contributing to the project.	Open text (800 characters)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Low: The response offers minimal insight into future plans for citizen engagement, lacking clarity on how citizens will be involved in the project. It indicates a need for more thought-out strategies to ensure meaningful citizen participation. Below average: There are hints of intention to involve citizens in the project, but the response provides limited details on the envisioned engagement strategies. It suggests a foundational understanding of the importance of citizen involvement but lacks concrete plans. Average: The response outlines a basic vision or preliminary plans for citizen engagement, including some initial strategies for involving community members. While detailed past activities may be absent, there's an evident commitment to ensuring future citizen participation in the project.

					<p>4. Above average: Detailed initial plans or visions for engaging citizens are provided, with clear and promising strategies for active community involvement. The response demonstrates a proactive approach to planning for meaningful citizen participation, indicating a strong potential for developing a participatory and inclusive project.</p> <p>5. High: The response presents a comprehensive and well-articulated plan for citizen engagement, showcasing innovative and feasible strategies for ensuring active community involvement. Despite being at the start of the renovation journey, there's a clear commitment and a robust framework in place for developing meaningful citizen participation in the project.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Weighting for Pathway 3 (Followers)

Q No.	Award category	Weighting	Rationale	Example calculation
1-2	Nature of the project - Clarity and pertinence of the objectives	40%	These questions assess the project's foundational goals and relevance, making them crucial for the overall direction and alignment with energy efficiency objectives for future projects.	Average score: $(4 + 4) / 2 = 4$ Weighted score: $4 * 40\% = 1.6$
3-4	Nature of the project – Soundness of the approach	40%	For followers, evaluating the feasibility and practicality of their approach is vital to adapt successful strategies to their unique circumstances, ensuring the likelihood of future success.	Average score: $(3 + 4) / 2 = 3.5$ Weighted score: $3.5 * 40\% = 1.4$
5	Citizen involvement	20%	Active citizen involvement is key for followers to ensure project success and develop a sense of ownership and engagement within the community, making it an essential component for achieving broader impact and adoption.	Score: 3 Weighted score: $3 * 20\% = 0.6$

Total score (based on example results)

- 1.6 (Clarity and pertinence of the objectives) + 1.4 (Soundness of the approach) + 0.8 (Citizen involvement) = 3.6 (weighted score).

Conversion to percentage: (project's total weighted score / maximum possible total weighted score) * 100

- $(3.6 / 5) * 100 = 72\%$

5. Selection process and evaluation outcome

The selection and prioritisation preparation will be done based on the input from EU Survey. This input will be summarised by the subtask leader in a structured overview ensuring that the eligibility is checked. For those applicants where information is missing, an email will be sent to ask for missing information. Following the email, a phone call will be made within 5 working days with the primary objective of ensuring a smooth and expeditious completion of all cases by asking applicants to respond to the email. The task leader will ensure that all communication related to the application is well-documented.

For those applications that are eligible, the agreed award criteria will be applied to provide a first ranking. A sum of the combined scores, listed in the matrices described in detail for each of the determined pathways will be generated. This assessment will be two-fold, with two different partners making the evaluation and then the average score will be provided as a final score.

The Consortium will update the Contracting Authority regarding the number of applications received every two weeks. Once the call for application will be closed the Consortium will share with the Contracting Authority a document containing all applications received and the evaluation outcome.

5.1 Evaluation outcome

The ranking will be discussed with the subtask partners, and a **list of up to 5-8 pilots with 3 reserve applicants** will be prepared. Applicants who cannot be supported under Pathway 1, will be invited to join Pathway 2. Applicants will receive notification of the outcome within two weeks of the application closure and will be asked to confirm the acceptance of the offer within 7 calendar days by replying to the email. If applicants choose not to take the Pathway 2 support, they will remain on the reserve list for Pathway 1 according to their score. Once the 3 moved candidates from Pathway 1 to Pathway 2 have confirmed or rejected the offer (within 7 calendar days), the final list for Pathway 2 will be available. For Pathway 3, the first 40 candidates will be immediately selected. It is important to note that candidates for Pathway 3 are not distributed over climatic zones as outlined in the technical proposal.

A list of candidate pilots, along with backup candidates, will be prepared for presentation to the Contracting Authority. After agreement by the Contracting Authority, the selected pilots will be contacted and invited to participate through Task 2. For the Learners and Followers, they will be contacted and invited to participate through Task 4. For those candidates whose position (selection or not, reserve list or not) depends on the applicants that are redirected from pathway 1 to pathway 2, further communication will await the answer of those applicants, before informing the other candidates.

Each candidate will receive a detailed evaluation report via email, outlining the strengths and areas for improvement as identified during the review process. This report aims to provide constructive feedback, helping unsuccessful candidates enhance future submissions and successful applicants to understand the factors contributing to their selection. Candidates are encouraged to use this feedback for professional development and to strengthen future applications. The report will include:

- **Overall score:** A summary of the applicant's score based on the evaluation criteria.
- **Criteria-specific feedback:** Detailed comments on each criterion, including the applicant's performance and suggestions for improvement.
- **Pathway recommendation:** For those not selected for their initial pathway choice, recommendations for alternative pathways will be provided, including the rationale for such recommendations.

6. Guidance Package

1. Explanatory document serves as a concise overview of the citizen-led renovation pilot support service, outlining what it offers to energy communities and clarifying the expectations and commitments required

from participating in each of the 3 pathways. It provides a clear understanding of the support service, motivates interest and excitement, while conveying the benefits it offers to energy communities.

2. Guidance document serves to facilitate the application process, which will be prepared as a 2–5-page guidance document that assists applicants in completing the online application. This document provides step-by-step instructions, guidance, requirements for information to be submitted, explanations for each section of the application form, and information on the selection procedure, ensuring that applicants have a clear understanding of the information required. Through offering an accessible guide, we aim to streamline the application process and enhance the chances of successful applications. Additionally, it should be noted that the approach with pathways 1, 2, and 3 enables a very broad group of stakeholders to participate and benefit from diverse capacity building offers. This inclusive approach ensures that interested parties can participate and engage in the programme, share knowledge and promote the growth of citizen-led initiatives in the field of renovation and renewable energy.

3. Enhanced support resources include templates, sample responses, and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) as part of the guidance package. These resources aim to alleviate any potential barriers and maximise the opportunities for applicants to submit comprehensive and compelling applications

Translation and language accessibility

Recognising the diverse linguistic landscape within the European Union, we are committed to providing language accessibility. Both the explanatory document and the guidance document will be written in a plain language and translated into all EU languages. This ensures that stakeholders across the EU can access the information in their preferred language, eliminating language barriers.

Support and communication channel

To address any questions or requests for assistance during the application procedure, we will establish a dedicated mailbox: applications@citizenledrenovation.eu. This mailbox will be active from the launch of the application process until its closure. Applicants can reach out to this channel to seek clarifications, receive guidance, and obtain support throughout the application period.

7. Informing the applicants on the evaluation result

Information with regard to selection is provided through a personalised email with an evaluation raster attached to it. The email for non-selected members is provided below, followed by the email for the Pilots, Learners and Followers.

a. Proposed communication to non-selected applicants

The below presents the draft email to the non-selected pilots.

Subject: Outcome of Your Application for Phase II - Citizen-Led Renovation Support Service (DG ENER/2023/OP/0036)

Thank you for your application to Phase II of the support service for citizen-led renovation projects (DG ENER/2023/OP/0036). We recognise the time and effort you have put into your submission and appreciate your commitment to developing sustainable, community-driven renovation efforts.

After a comprehensive review process, it is with regret that we inform you that your project has not been selected for this phase. Attached, you will find a detailed evaluation of your application, which we hope will provide useful insights for any future submissions.

While your project was not chosen for direct support in this round, your interest in and dedication to citizen-led renovation are highly valued. We would like to encourage you to stay engaged with the support service and consider applying for future opportunities. Our programme continues to evolve, and there may be more avenues for collaboration and support that align with your project goals.

To stay updated on these opportunities and the broader work in citizen-led renovation, we invite you to connect with our community through our communication channels. You can follow us on [our website](#), join the Futurium [exchange platform](#), and subscribe to our [newsletter](#). These platforms will offer regular updates, insights, and information on upcoming calls and initiatives.

Thank you again for your interest and efforts in supporting sustainable renovation practices. We hope to see your continued participation in our community and look forward to the possibility of future collaboration.

Kind regards,

James Roscoe, coordinator of the support service selection process for citizen-led renovation.

Jan Bormans, coordinator of the Citizen-Led Renovation contract.

b. Proposed communication to selected applicants

The below presents the draft email to the selected pilots.

Subject: Outcome of Your Application for Phase II - Citizen-Led Renovation Support Service (DG ENER/2023/OP/0036)

Dear XXX,

We are pleased to inform you that your project has been selected as a Pilot/Learner/Follower for the support service for citizen led renovation projects (DG ENER/2023/OP/0036). The evaluation result of your application can be found in the attachment.

In the next 2 weeks, you will be contacted via email to start the onboarding process, and will be introduced to your main contact person for this service provision. Following this, a phone call will be arranged at a time that suits availabilities. Together, you will initiate the collaboration and start on the design of the tailored support service.

To ensure a smooth onboarding process, we kindly request that you also upload the necessary documents outlined in our previous communication. These documents are essential for verifying your eligibility and facilitating the support service. Please refer to the list of required documents and upload them through the provided platform.¹

We look forward to this collaboration and remain available for any questions you have. Meanwhile, we would encourage you to subscribe to our communication channels (@newsletter, @communication platform) where we will soon announce your selection.

Kind regards,

James Roscoe, coordinator of the support selection service for Citizen-Led Renovation.

Jan Bormans, coordinator of the Citizen-Led Renovation contract.

8. Participation agreement

The collaboration will be formalised with a mutually signed cooperation agreement. The template for this is provided in Annex 1.

¹ Depending on the pathway of the applicant, that specific eligibility/verification information will be requested.

Annex 1

Support Agreement

This Support Agreement is made between [Name of community] and the Citizen-led Renovation Phase II project, funded by the European Commission.

INTRODUCTION

The [applicant:] applied with the citizen-led renovation (CLR) support service for the call for different types of support in [date (month/year)]. This collaboration agreement ("Agreement") is entered into on [date] (the "Effective Date") by and between CLR support service, and the [applicant].

Online onboarding meeting took place on [date (day/month/year)] between the community representatives outlined below and CLR support service experts to specify the scope of support. The agreement provided as part of the Support plan has been drafted by and between:

the [applicant] represented by:

[name], [institution]

The CLR support service., represented by

[name], [institution]

SCOPE OF SUPPORT FOR ENERGY COMMUNITY

The CLR support service provides possibility for the necessary technical, administrative, policy, and financial support for successful citizen-led renovation projects.² The level of assistance provided depends on the status of supporting measures like one-stop shops in each region and the needs and priorities of the energy community. The scope of this bespoke support is defined here.

The CLR support service will include the tasks listed in the table below, all to be completed until November 2025.

Pilot task name	Task description	Time period

² The consortium offers expertise in technical assistance, project development, and monitoring of energy pilot projects. They have experience in behavioural effects monitoring and indicator development for energy communities. Additionally, they excel in stakeholder dialogue management, fact-based approaches, and impactful policy advice.

The projects' scope may be adapted during the development of the tasks. Changes to the scope will need to be agreed by [applicant] and the CLR support service team and will be added as an addendum to this collaboration agreement.

The support is considered as finished once the final monitoring data have been delivered by the agreed end date [date].

The CLR support service may grant exceptions to individual projects if specific circumstances occur beyond the control of the community representative. Exceptions will require a clear justification and are subject to the agreement between [applicant] and the CLR support service.

The signature of this agreement is a requisite to start implementation of the above defined support and tasks.

SUMMARY OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES

The expectations and roles of [applicant] and the CLR support service are:

a. Joint Decision-Making Process:

The [applicant] agrees to participate in meetings with the CLR support service, where they will have an equal voice and decision-making authority in determining the processes of their support, defined in this agreement. The decisions made jointly if significantly changing the process agreed here will be added as an addendum to this agreement.

Furthermore, the active participation of the [applicant] in workshops and the availability of necessary staff to implement citizen-led renovation (CLR) initiatives will be required in order to enable the community to reach their energy efficiency (EE) and investment targets.

b. Data Sharing:

The [applicant] commits to sharing all the data necessary for the preparatory co-design phase, effective implementation, and monitoring of the project with the CLR support service. The data shared shall adhere to applicable privacy and data protection regulations and will be used solely for the purposes of this project.

Additionally, the collaboration will facilitate data exchange among the pilots, either through the designated platform or through organized events, to foster communication, networking, and the exchange of experiences.

c. Cooperation with Local Stakeholders:

The [applicant] and the CLR support service agree to collaborate in involving local stakeholders who are not part of the energy community, including local and regional authorities, utility and building service providers, energy providers, and other relevant actors. The [applicant] and the CLR support service will work together to ensure their active participation in the project through regular communication, consultation, and engagement activities. This cooperation aims to create a network for communication, networking, and exchange of experiences among the different actors involved.

d. Inclusion of Local/Regional Actors:

The [applicant] and the CLR support service commit to bringing on board local/regional actors who are relevant to the roll-out of the pilot support services and the design of complementary services, such as the one-stop shop. The [applicant] and the CLR support service will work collaboratively to identify, engage, and involve these actors in the project, leveraging their expertise and resources to enhance the success of the initiatives. This inclusive approach will contribute to a comprehensive and well-rounded implementation of the project.

- e. Implementation and Review:
The [applicant] and the CLR support service agree to implement this Agreement in good faith, with regular reviews to assess progress, address any challenges, and make necessary adjustments to ensure effective collaboration and achievement of project goals.

Agreement to cooperate with the communication and events team (e.g., contributing information and/or articles for the newsletter): Both the [applicant] and the CLR support service commit to actively cooperate with the communication and events team. They will contribute relevant information and articles for the newsletter to enhance communication and dissemination of project updates and achievements.

Warning system

In case of non-responsiveness from the energy community representatives and/or failure to provide the inputs by the above identified timeframe, the contract coordinator may issue up to **two warnings**. The contact coordinator may decide to terminate the support based on this agreement if the energy community representatives do not react to the issue raised in the warnings in a period of two-weeks following the second warning.

Approval

By their signatures below, the parties have caused this collaboration agreement to be executed and effective as of the signature date:

[Applicant]

Date

[name, role]

Jan Bormans, CLR support service

Date