Feedback report to your application

ICEA - (initiative pour une Energie Alternative)

Project information

Project name: European Energy Communities Facility

Grant agreement number: 101167230

Project duration: September 2024-February 2028

Project coordinator: RESCOOP EU ASBL (RES)

Disclaimer

Co-funded by the European Union

Application score

Criterion	**Your score (points)**	**Minimum score required to pass (points)**
Criterion 1: Community operation & readiness	2.25	2
Criterion 2: Project ambition	4	4
Criterion 3: Coherence and plausibility	7	6
Criterion 4: Impact on the local community	3.5	3
Total score	**16.75**	15

Short interpretation of your results

Your application meets the minimum requirements of the ENERCOM Facility grant. However, due to extremely high competition on this call, we are sorry to inform you that your application was not successful on this occasion. You will find detailed feedback in the evaluation form below to help you strengthen your application should you wish to reapply for the Facility's second call in 2026.

Detailed feedback per sub-criterion

The following section provides detailed feedback on your application for each sub-criterion. If you have any questions on the below, please get in touch with your national expert.

Criterion 1: Community operation & readiness

1.1. The EC is an emerging energy community (max. 5 years since they started working on energy related projects)

The EC is not an emerging EC.

1.2. Governance structure and decision-making process of the EC are well described and promote democratic practices.

Governance structure and decision making process are clearly described and include democratic principles, stakeholder participation, voting mechanisms. The proposal could benefit from more information on the different working groups.

1.3. Roles, responsibilities, and experience within the EC are clearly described and appear robust enough to support the development and implementation of a business plan from an operational point of view.

The roles, responsibilities, and experience are clearly defined and support the implementation of a business plan. The proposal could benefit from details on responsibilities for the business plan and a line on relevant experience overall in the cooperative.

1.4. The plan for use of resources, based on its working structure, is reasonable and realistic.

The EC has a clear plan for using the grant, identifies specific tasks, assigns responsibilities, and states whether the business plan will be developed internally or by an external consultant. The proposal would benefit from clarification how the grant will be used for the business plan and if the employed person would be working on this and what tasks that would entail.

Criterion 2: Project ambition

2.1. The project provides a good level of ambition in terms of innovativeness within the specific context of the proposed solution (including the novelty of the solution in that context).

The project presents a moderately innovative approach, either by adapting an existing solution in a way that adds significant value in the local context or by introducing an idea that is new but not highly transformative.

2.2. The project provides a good level of ambition in terms of its intention to adress specific needs of the community within the specific context of the proposed solution.

The project identifies community needs but does not provide a strong or detailed strategy to address them.

2.3. The project provides a good level of ambition based in its up-scaling and/or replication potential within the specific context of the proposed solution.

The project has some potential for up scaling or replication, but the approach is not clearly defined.

Criterion 3: Coherence and plausibility

3.1. The proposed solution and its technology are realistic and coherent.

The proposed solution and its technology are highly coherent, well justified, and fully plausible in the given context, with a clear implementation strategy.

3.2. Investment size and funding approach are realistic and coherent.

The investment size and funding approach are fully coherent, well justified, and plausible in the given context.

3.3. Expected energy savings, renewable energy production, and/or CO2 emissions reduction are realistic and coherent.

The expected targets show some coherence but have gaps in justification or feasibility. It is not clear what assumptions were made to calculate estimated CO2 savings. However, renewable energy production estimates seem in line with the planned investment. The proposal has limited information on implementation of the loops which make it difficult to assess if the energy savings were correctly estimated for this project.

3.4. Clear and coherent stakeholder engagement strategy favors implementability.

The strategy is mostly coherent and plausible, but some aspects , stakeholder identification, needs assessment, engagement activities lack detail, or prior engagement activities are minimal.

3.5. Implementation timeline is coherent and realistic.

The implementation timeline is somewhat coherent yet shows minor gaps in justification or feasibility. The proposal would benefit from additional detail in the timeline to help demonstrate coherence across the planned activities. Providing clearer information on how the different tasks fit together, along with the key steps for implementation, would strengthen the overall plan. As currently presented, the timeline is too broad to allow for a full assessment.

Criterion 4: Impact on the local community

4.1. Clear intention and strategy to re-invest the operational economic benefits generated by the project into the energy community's long-term development and sustainability.

The project mentions reinvestment of economic benefits but does not provide a clear or structured strategy.

4.2. The practices described clearly promote inclusiveness.

The project does not include any clear strategies to promote inclusiveness.