MINUTES

Joint meeting of the Ecodesign Consultation Forum and ad hoc Consultation Forum under the Energy Efficiency Directive

Primary Energy Factor

Brussels, 11 December 2014 (10.00 – 13:00)

Participants: See “Attendance List” in Annexes

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chair welcomed the participants and indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the process for adopting delegated acts under the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED) and the opportunity of using a delegated act to review the Primary Energy Factor (PEF) laid down in Annex IV of the EED.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Chair asked participants if the agenda could be adopted. NO indicated that before having a discussion on the methodology to be used for calculating the Primary Energy Factor (PEF) a specific point discussing the necessity of using a PEF under the Ecodesign Directive (ED), the Energy Labelling Directive (ELD), the Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (EPBD) and the EED should be added.

The Chair replied that it was indeed intended also to discuss also that point.

The agenda was adopted.

3. GENERAL INFORMATION ON DELEGATED ACTS UNDER THE ENERGY EFFICIENCY DIRECTIVE

The Commission services presented the process for adopting delegated acts laid down in Article 22 of the EED.

PL indicated that this meeting was involving the ED Consultation Forum and the EED Expert Group. They asked if meetings will always be joint meetings.

The Commission services explained that this meeting was a joint meeting as discussions were relevant for both groups of experts but before adopting any delegated act, there would be at least on meeting of the EED Expert Group only.
4. PRIMARY ENERGY FACTOR

The Commission services made a presentation indicating how the PEF had been used up to now under the ED and the ELD in order to compare products using different energy carriers.

The UK asked if any decision to review the PEF value would have any impact on the flexibility granted to Member Estates in the EED to use other factors if justified. FI added that, if more than the value was to be changed, the legal basis for doing so should be checked. The Commission services confirmed the flexibility was not proposed for discussion.

2.1. The necessity of using a PEF

NL indicated that, even if a decision was taken to not compare products using different energy carriers in the same label, a PEF would still be needed for products that use electricity and any other fuel. They said that the discussions should be simple and focused on the value. Discussions on the use of the PEF on specific product groups should take place within the discussions for such products. SK said that, if final energy was used, a PEF would not be needed. UK supported the case by case discussion.

DE supported the use of the PEF for ED and the ELD as they are linked to the free movement of goods. For the EED and the EPBD the use of a European average should remain voluntary. This was supported by PL and AT. ES also supported the use of the PEF with a single value throughout Europe. NL and BE supported the comparison of different carriers in the same label based on a single PEF. IE said that a PEF is essential for ELD and added that, for EPBD purposes, it would be useful to compare buildings among MS.

SE indicated that they only support the use of the PEF when needed and added that its use should not have a negative impact on the level of stringency of the ED requirements for products using specific energy carriers. NO said that, in the case of ED requirements, it should be checked if a PEF was really needed.

FR supported the provision of information based on final energy consumption to consumers and asked for product specific discussions. PT agreed on final energy being the best indicator for consumers.

IT mentioned that they wanted different labels for different heating products and that these labels should be based on final energy. They said that, if the PEF was used, it would need to be periodically reviewed. For the EPBD and EED, national factors must be retained. CZ also supported the idea of having different requirements and labels depending on the source of energy.

FI doubted the value added of the comparison between different energy carriers and indicated that product policy is not to be used to choose between different carriers. They added that having products using different fuels in the same label reduced the room for differentiation among products using the same fuel.

NO said that, from a consumer perspective, different labels based on final energy consumption are the best solution. They added that climate change should be also considered and also the effect of the PEF on product innovation.

SE asked the Commission to develop a PEF not only for electricity but also for other fuels.
INFORSE supported the use of the PEF and said that its current value is not so far from the currently used 2.5. ANEC / BEUC supported the use of a single PEF in Ecodesign and Energy Labelling in order to ensure technological neutrality and to provide consumers with transparent and comparable information. EPEE and EHPA also supported comparability and asked the Commission services to work on the determination of the value from a scientific point of view. ORGALIME advocated a technology neutral solution and said that an option could be better targeting the scope of ED and ELD Regulations. EUROHEAT & POWER said that consumers compare between different carriers, so a PEF would be needed. MARCOGAZ said that the PEF should be maintained in order to give the right signals to consumers. EHI added that, while they would have preferred different labels for different heating products, now that the Regulations have been published enough time should be granted to industry to adapt to them before making changes. EHPA also expressed concern about changes on the label. COGEN Europe pointed out that the PEF was only about energy efficiency and that climate discussions shouldn’t be mixed in. They added that the PEF might be higher in winter time when heating is used. AEGPL also supported the use of the PEF and argued that it was the right tool for making the comparison between different products. EUROFUEL supported the use of the PEF.

EURELECTRIC opposed the use of the PEF and claimed that its use had negative consequences for climate change. The Commission services asked for clarification regarding the support or opposition of EURELECTRIC regarding the comparison of electric products with others within the same label and on the value of the PEF. EURELECTRIC said that they favour comparison. EUHA supported the use of final energy consumption for ED and ELD.

EFIEES said that discussions regarding ED / ELD and the EPBD need to be separated.

2.2. Aspects to take into consideration when calculating the PEF

The Commission services opened the discussion by asking participants whether, if a PEF is indeed to be used, it should be calculated based on the average efficiency of the electricity system or on its marginal efficiency. The Commission services added that also the time basis for calculating the PEF would need to be discussed as it could be calculated using current, future or desired values.

DK said that expected developments could be taken into account and that periodic reviews should be envisaged.

DE said that the calculation method should be simple and based on today’s electricity mix. If the future is brought into the picture, different PEFs would be needed for products with different lifetimes. DE supported the use of average values. The method also needs to be as transparent as possible. NL agreed and asked for simplicity and transparency of calculation methods. SE also supported simplicity and transparency and the use of the average present value as a basis. ES and AT agreed.

FI agreed that simplicity is needed but said that the methodology must take into account the most important issues affecting the PEF value.

SK said that a proper calculation methodology is needed.
EURELECTRIC said that, if a PEF is used, it should reflect the future situation. EUROFUEL said that, if the future situation was fixed by law, it might be used for determining the PEF. MARCOGAZ said that the PEF should reflect efficiency over the whole lifetime of the appliance. EHPA said that using a marginal value would be too difficult, but that using a future factor could be envisaged. EPEE supported EHPA and said that the value should be updated regularly. EUROHEAT & POWER declared that the PEF should reflect the reality.

INFORSE said that using the current value of the PEF is less complex; they added that using the marginal efficiency of generation would be too difficult and said that using projections for the future had the risk of them not materialising. COGEN Europe said that it would be difficult to build on something that is not the average current value. They indicated that the Eurostat calculation with respect to Annex VII of the Renewable Energy Directive already provides values for the average efficiency of the electricity sector, which were lower in 2012 and 2011 compared to 2010, hence the need to be careful not to use projections in the PEF for electricity. In addition, they insisted that EE policy needs to be separated from other policies until an holistic approach is reached.

CECED said that smart appliances that are able to use energy at different moments should be brought to the picture.

ESTIF called for a clear and stable framework.

2.3. Conclusions

The Commission services summarized the discussions:

- A majority of MS and stakeholders attending the meeting are not in favour of stopping using the PEF for the purposes of the ELD (to allow proper functioning of the internal market).

- The value of 2.5 currently used needs to be revised.

- Even if the value is revised in the EED, no instantaneous change of its value within the ED or the ELD should take place. Any review would take place in the context of the relevant regulation.

- When numeric information about the energy consumption of the product is to given, it should be based on final energy.

- The flexibility available under the EED and the EPBD should not be affected by any modification of the default PEF value.

- A study will therefore be launched in order to update the value of the PEF. The study will look into issues such as the use of average or marginal efficiencies and the current, future or desired PEF value. It will examine the extension of the use of primary energy factors to other energy carriers, taking into account the time when energy is consumed calculating the PEF.

- Participants (Member States and stakeholders) of the meeting will be invited to take part on the study. Once finished, conclusions of the study will be discussed in an equivalent
ad-hoc meeting of the Ecodesign Consultation Forum and the EED Expert Group. If a delegated act is proposed it will be discussed with members of the EED Expert Group.

Participants were invited to provide written comments by 12 January.

FI asked about the timing of the study. The Commission services said that it will take several months to have the contract in place. The duration of the study can be reduced, but enough time should be granted in order to reflect on the decisions to be taken. A possible next meeting could take place in a year’s time.

5. AOB

No further issues were raised.
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