First call for large-scale projects

Applicants’ survey
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Survey on large-scale call application process

Objective
• To identify key challenges applicants faced with the call process and to provide recommendations for how forms, procedures, applied methodologies and guidance could be improved in the future.

Process
• Implemented via EU Survey
• Sent via email to all applicants, all Helpdesk users and the IFEG
• Opened 19 November → 2 December 2020
• 225 responses
Background of survey respondents
Survey achieved broad sectoral coverage

- Bio-electricity
- Cement and lime
- Chemicals
- CO2 transport and storage
- Geothermal energy
- Hydro/Ocean energy
- Intra-day electricity storage
- Hydrogen
- Iron and steel
- Non-ferrous metals
- Other energy storage
- Other industry
- Pulp and paper
- Refineries
- Renewable heating/cooling
- Solar energy
- Wind energy

Legend:
- Large (250 or more employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Micro (1 to 9 employees)

n = 225
Good balance achieved across firm sizes

- Large (250 or more employees)
  - 121
  - 55%
- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
  - 36
  - 16%
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
  - 17...
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
  - 45...

n = 225
Good geographical spread of respondents

Location of company headquarters

Not shown:
Colombia,
Costa Rica,
Liberia &
Uganda

n = 224
Applicants did not report facing regulatory barriers or Covid-19 challenges

- Of the 31 who did not submit an application, half (15) intended to apply but did not due to:
  - Timing of application (6)
  - Maturity of project (3)
  - Unable to meet documentation requirements (4)

- Only 4% of all respondents reported facing regulatory barriers

- 11% say the Covid-19 crisis affected their company’s decision to apply
Support for applicants

Helpdesk and webinars
Helpdesk support

- More than half of respondents submitted a helpdesk question.
- Vast majority of respondents report that the answer to their Helpdesk question helped them complete the application.
- Applicants say that the time to receive responses was sometimes too long to be useful.
- Some applicants say the answers were too generic.

n = 115
Webinar attendance

- High webinar attendance – 74% of respondents
- Respondents request more time for Q&A and more complex/specific examples
- Webinars should be publicised earlier and through a more structured publicity campaign

n = 160
Application process
Logistics & availability of data

- 82% of respondents found the allotted time for completing the application to be sufficient
  - Average time to prepare application was 9 weeks
  - Most common time was 12 weeks

- 86% found the Funding & Tenders portal easy to navigate

- 75% report that it was easy to decide on the principal product

- 86% had sufficient data to allow them to write their application
Ability to meet mandatory document requirements and stick to page limits

- Around half of respondents (55%) report the mandatory documents were not challenging to produce
  - However, a greater share of medium-sized companies did not find it challenging
- Almost all respondents found the page limits for different elements of the application to be sufficient
Clarity of application documents

- Vast majority of respondents found the clarity of the documents to be *good* or better

- Fewer than 10% of respondents found the documents to be *poor*

- GHG methodologies are least clear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity Level</th>
<th>Application Process Overall</th>
<th>Application Form (Parts A and B)</th>
<th>GHG Methodologies</th>
<th>Guidance on Degree of Innovation Criterion</th>
<th>Guidance on Project Maturity Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ICF proprietary and confidential. Do not copy, distribute, or disclose.
Evaluation criteria & GHG tools

- GHG emissions avoidance criterion was the most challenging element to complete, followed by Project Maturity & Degree of Innovation.

- More than half of respondents (57%) rate the ease of working with the GHG calculation templates as good, very good or excellent.
Use of consulting services to help applicants

- Use of consulting services is common to support and/or complete most of the application
- Usage greatly varies across company size:
  - Only 12% of large-sized companies were not supported by a consulting firm
  - Only 17% of micro-sized companies were supported by a consulting firm
Initial recommendations
Recommendations from first analysis of applicant feedback

- Avoid launching call during summer holidays
- Achieve faster response times on Helpdesk questions
- Clearly stated response time expectations for Helpdesk
- Provide more time for Q&A at webinars
- Develop more specific examples in both templates and webinars