

Public consultation on the Smart Cities and Communities Initiative

Meta Informations

Creation date

12-05-2011

Last update date

User name

null

Case Number

851329819331713211

Invitation Ref.

Status

N

Language

en

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENT

1.1. To which of the following categories do you belong?

Non-governmental organisation (NGO)

1.2. If you represent a business organisation, which is your main sector of activity?

Other

Which other main sector activity?

Quaker Council for European Affairs: 3960234639-24

2. PRIORITIES AND MEANS FOR THE SMART CITIES AND COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE

2.1. What is your opinion on the importance of the following areas for a Smart Cities and Communities Initiative?

01. Buildings (in general)	5
a. Public buildings	4
b. Private buildings	4
c. Retrofitting of existing buildings	5
d. Green / brown field development	4
02. Energy grids (in general)	4

a. Electricity grids	3
b. Heating & cooling grids	4
03. Communication grids	3
04. Local supply technologies (in general)	4
a. Solar electricity	4
b. Solar heat	5
c. Wind	4
d. Heat-pumps	5
e. Biomass	2
f. Ground source heat (or shallow geothermal)	4
g. Lake/sea/river cooling	3
h. Waste heat	5
05. Capacity-building for the integrated management of energy flows	3
06. Urban mobility (in general)	4
07. Public transport	5
08. Clean fuel solutions (in general)	3
a. Biofuels	1
b. Electricity (electromobility)	4
c. Hydrogen	3
09. Water management	4
10. Waste management	5
11. Information and communication technologies	3
a. Energy	3
b. Transport	3

2.2. Please mention one concrete proposal for an innovative project in one of the areas listed above which should definitely be part of a Smart Cities and Communities initiative.

Demand reduction via behavioural change is more crucial than technological innovation. SMART cities won't work without efforts to shape SMART consumers-studies show energy efficiency improvements may not translate into energy savings unless accompanied by changing consumption patterns & lifestyle: bit.ly/iEHa4h. Projects should integrate social sciences-we have technology/know-how, but lack social insight-an interdisciplinary approach is needed to encourage individuals to be part of the solution

3. SELECTION OF SMART CITIES AND COMMUNITIES

3.1. To which extent are similar conditions regarding the following city characteristics conducive to the collaboration of cities and to enhance the replication potential of the demonstration projects.

a. Climatic zone	4
b. Economic morphology (e.g. harbour city, industrial or service oriented city)	4
c. Demographics (population development)	4
d. Governance structure (centralised versus decentralised administration)	4
e. Competition and Innovation (competitive strength, willingness to innovate)	3
f. Degree of economic development	4
g. City size	3

3.2. How should the participating cities in a collaborative project exchange information and best practices and ensure a successful technology transfer among themselves and with other Smart Cities? Which existing urban initiatives could be helpful in this process?

It is imperative to use lessons from CONCERTO on what did & didn't work re. info/tech/best practice transfer between cities. Info exchange with all relevant stakeholders is crucial—engineers, construction workers, landlords, utilities, local government & especially citizens, since the users behaviour matters most. Communication, participation and getting residents on side are crucial to success. The Build Up web portal is a good example of knowledge sharing, as is the Covenant of Mayors' work.

3.3.a. Do you consider that the cities' efforts to increase efficiency and sustainability should be measured on the basis of quantitative indicators? (such as for example primary energy consumption per inhabitant or per m ² ; increase of share of renewable energy sources; reduction of CO ₂ per inhabitant or per m ²)	Yes
---	-----

Should the quantitative indicators be defined at EU level to ensure comparability between cities and projects or should the individual cities themselves decide on indicators according to their situation?	Definition at EU level
---	------------------------

3.3.b. Should cities themselves define the precise level of ambition with respect to these indicators (i.e. a certain target such as for example 60 kWh/m ² /year)?	Yes
--	-----

3.4. Your individual comments regarding question 3.a and 3.b

Cities should decide their precise level of ambition on specific indicators, to reflect their specific contexts, but there should be a minimum threshold of ambition set at European level. Quantitative indicators coordinated at EU level is important, because without monitoring, to see what is (not) working & why, and data that is easily comparable, SMART cities cannot achieve their potential. This must be balanced with minimal red tape & bureaucratic burden, to avoid stifling project creativity.

3.5. In the longer term, the Smart Cities and Communities Initiative may include certain market uptake measures to promote the development and use of

innovative low carbon products and services.

a. Public procurement	4
b. New innovative business models (e.g. for energy service companies)	4
c. Standardisation, labelling, certification (e.g. of products, services, professions)	4
d. Innovative financial schemes (e.g. combining different financial sources, addressing the entire continuum of risks)	3

3.6. Please mention one concrete market uptake measure which in your opinion would enhance best the mass deployment of low carbon technologies at city level.

End subsidies for inefficient & environmentally harmful products/services/fuels. Binding legislation for min. efficiency standards-people can't pick inefficient products if they're not available. Levies on polluting tech/fuel to make low-carbon tech more competitive & provide funds for upfront investment to retrofit buildings, which should be a priority. City-wide congestion charges with revenue invested into viable public transport alternatives. Homebase study-bespoke advice-see: bit.ly/mCAsvq