

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in  
Schools  
FLICK THE SWITCH  
Project No. EIE/07/639**

**Minutes of KICK-OFF Meeting**



**Meeting Location:** Castelldefels (Spain)  
**Date:** 27<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup> October 2007  
**Issue Date of Minutes:** 30<sup>th</sup> October 2007 (first circulation)  
**Circulation:** All partners and Project Officer  
**Issued By:** Iberian Productivity and Innovation Centre



## Kick-off meeting

Date: 27<sup>th</sup>& 28<sup>th</sup> October 2008

Venue: Facilities of IPIC, Parc Mediterrani de la Tecnologia (<http://www.pmt.es>)  
 Avenida del Canal Olimpic No. 15, 08860 Castelldefels

Day 1-Monday, 27 <sup>th</sup> Oct. 2008		
Time	Agenda item	Responsible
13:10	Pick-Up from the Hotel Lobby	IPIC
13:30	Arrival and informal sandwich lunch, tea and coffee	IPIC
14:00	Opening Address Address by Mr. Jeremy Domis- Innovation Unit, Patronal de la Petita i Mijana Empresa de Catalunya (PIMEC)	
14:10-15:15	<u>Introductions</u> Welcome, Overview of Agenda Overview of the FLICK THE SWITCH project and its objectives and goals Short presentation of each partner and role in the project (approx. 5-6 minutes per partner)	Ms. Oonagh Mc Nerney, IPIC  All partners
15:15-15:40	<u>Presentation by Project Officer</u> Introduction to IEE programme Key technical and administrative issues	Mr. Bernd Decker, Project Officer, EACI
15:40-16:15	<u>EC Grant Agreement/Administrative matters</u> Management structure, Reporting System Financial matters: Timesheets, Cost Statements  Questions and open discussion	Ms. Oonagh Mc Nerney, IPIC  All Partners
16:15	Coffee Break	
16:30-17:45	<u>Working Session 1: Research and Definition of Campaign (WP2)</u>  Overview of WP2 and Presentation of work carried out on Questionnaire for European wide market survey	Session chaired by Donald Mc Donagh, IPIC  Mr. Donald Mc Donald/IPIC

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

	<p>Open discussion and input from all partners on Questionnaire and planning the implementation of work in the research and definition of the campaign</p> <p><u>Conclusion of Session with an Action Plan</u></p>	ALL partners
17:45 21:00	<p>Excursion to Barcelona for sighting seeing or shopping</p> <p>Joint dinner at "Els 4 Gats" Restaurant in Barcelona (Catalan cuisine)</p>	IPIC
<b>Day 2- Tuesday, 28<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2008</b>		
09:10	Pick up from Hotel Lobby	IPIC
09:30- 11:00	<p><u>Working Session 2: Design &amp; Development of the Campaign, Materials and Tools (WP3)</u></p> <p>Overview of WP3 and its implementation</p> <p>Presentation by IPIC of developments in website, logo, etc.</p> <p>Open interactive session involving all partners to plan the implementation of work in the design and development of campaign</p> <p><u>Conclusion of Session with an Action Plan</u></p>	<p>Session chaired by Mr. Tomislav Puksec, UNIZAG</p> <p>Mr. Tomislav Puksec, UNIZAG</p> <p>Ms. Sylvia Schaal/Deborah Vento, IPIC</p> <p>ALL Partners</p>
11.00	Coffee Break and networking	IPIC
11.20- 12:30	<p><u>Working Session 3: Communication and Dissemination (WP6)</u></p> <p>Overview of WP6, its planning and implementation</p> <p>Presentation and review by each partner of the work carried out to date (mainly building of Database of contacts) and their plans for assisting in dissemination</p> <p>Open interactive session involving all partners to plan the implementation of work in Communication and Dissemination</p> <p><u>Conclusion of Session with an Action Plan</u></p>	<p>Session chaired by Shahla Azirani, CLIMATE ENERGY</p> <p>Ms. Shahla Azirani</p> <p>ALL Partners</p> <p>ALL Partners</p>
12:30- 13:00	<p><u>Working Session 4- Other issues to be discussed</u></p> <p>Setting up of Advisory Committee- securing letters of intent from schools (if not fully finalized in session 1)</p>	Session chaired by Ms. Oonagh Mc Nerney, IPIC

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

	<p><b>Involvement of schools</b></p> <p><b>Role of pupils/responsibilities in schools to influence energy decisions, etc.</b></p> <p><b>Sponsorship issues, etc.</b></p> <p><b>Risks, challenges, etc.</b></p> <p><b><u>Conclusion of Session with an Action Plan</u></b></p>	
<b>13:00</b>	<p><b><u>Closure of meeting</u></b></p> <p><b>Visit to nearby English speaking school "The British School of Barcelona"</b></p>	<b>IPIC</b>
<b>14:00 approx.</b>	<b>Lunch at beach front</b>	<b>IPIC</b>



**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

**KICK-OFF 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>st</sup> of October 2008**

**Location:** Parc Mediterrani de la Tecnologia, Av. Canal Olímpic 15, 08860 Castelldefels, Spain  
 (Facilities of Iberian Productivity and Innovation Centre)

### Attendees List

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Representative (s)</b>
Iberian Productivity and Innovation Centre ( <b>IPIC</b> )	Ms. Oonagh Mc Nerney Mr. Donald Mc Donagh Ms. Sylvia Schaal Ms. Geraldine Mc Nerney Ms. Deborah Vento Mr. Colm Digby
Projects in Motion ( <b>PIM</b> )	Ms. Stefan Schaa Mr. Brian Restall
University of Zagreb ( <b>UNIZAG- FSB</b> )	Mr. Tomislav Puksec
Energy and Environment Agency of Province of Perugia ( <b>AEA</b> )	Ms. Francesca Pignattini Ms. Sara Masolli
Climate Energy Ltd. ( <b>CLIMATE</b> )	Ms. Shahla Zare Azirani Mr. Richard Britton
PPS Karmoy ( <b>PPS Karmoy</b> )	Mr. John Rullestad Mr. Per Fagerland Mrs. Marianne Fagerland
Rakvere Gümnaasium ( <b>RG</b> )	Ms. Maie Podramagi Mr. Triinu Podramagi
Kursenai Pevanciai Secondary School ( <b>PVM</b> )	Ms. Janina Baniene
Instituto Comprensivo Statale- Gagliano ( <b>ISC Gagliano</b> )	Ms. Anna de Masi Ms. Silvana Russo Ms. Rosalba Arigliano Mr. Cesare Daquino
Rakvere City Government ( <b>RAKVERE LV</b> )	Mr. Ain Suurkaev Ms. Katrin Joselin
European Commission ( <b>EC</b> )	Mr. Bernd Decker

### Apologies List

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Representative</b>
Western Education and Library Board ( <b>WELB</b> )	Mr. John Coney

## Minutes

**Day 1, 27<sup>th</sup> October**

### **1- Welcome and Opening of Meeting.**

Oonagh Mc Nerney from IPIC (hereafter OM) introduced herself, welcomed all Partners and reviewed the planned Meeting Agenda. She explained that the meeting would be split into informative sessions which would then be followed by 4 working sessions over the course of the next day and a half and would end with a visit to a nearby school. She stressed the importance of the Kick Off meeting for getting all partners behind the project and working towards a common goal. She explained that all partners had been provided with a Handbook which condensed the most important parts of the Technical Annex. She asked partners to keep the Handbook over the duration of the project and to bring it with them to all meetings.

### **2- Overview of Flick the switch project, objectives and goals.**

OM presented a thorough overview of the project and its objectives and goals (copy attached- Annex 1). She also mentioned how close monitoring of the progress of the work plan would be crucial and this would enable early identification of risks.

This was followed by a short 5-6 minute presentation from each of the partners, introducing themselves and explaining their role in the project. (copies attached- Annex 2-IPIC; Annex 3- PIM; Annex 4-UNIZAG; Annex 5-AEA; Annex 6-CLIMATE; Annex 7- PPS Karmoy; Annex 8- RG; Annex 9-Kursenia; Annex 10-ISC Gagliano; Annex 11- Rakvere City.).

During the individual partner presentations Mr. Brian Restall from PIM (hereafter BR) explained that his company had received excellent feedback from schools in Malta, that they were interested in the project and eager to be involved. At present there was about 15-16 schools interested and Malta could already have reached its quota. OM took the opportunity to point out that the target of 200 schools and their proposed distribution per countries were only minimums, so she stressed that more schools were welcome to participate. She also stressed that the more schools involved the better and this would heighten the results and impact of the project. She said that more schools would create more competition and stressed that the involvement of more schools would not necessarily add to the workload of the partners.

BD said they were also targeting other countries. OM said this was great as during the project we had the commitment to target EU-27 (and of course Croatia and Norway). She said that it should not be a problem to target all these extra countries as we were a big consortium, already geographically well distributed.

Mr. Bernd Decker, the Project Officer from the EACI (hereafter BD) said that it would be great if by the end of the Kick Off meeting we could define how many schools we had interested to date so that he could share this positive information with the agency.

- ✓ **Action 1:** Provide Mr. Decker with an overview of the number of schools that had already expressed interested in FLICK THE SWITCH to date.

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

**3- Introduction to IEE Programme.**

BD presented the IEE Programme and he also discussed the most important key technical, administrative and financial issues. (copy attached- Annex 12).

He stressed to all partners the importance of reading the Technical Annex properly and being familiar with the project content. He said that all communication was to be via the project coordinator and all partners were responsible to the European Commission concerning budgeting and work.

During his intervention he also touched on some of the risks that OM had mentioned earlier. In particular he mentioned the issue of whether pupils actually had the authority to switch off lights and other devices in schools. He said it was important for us to establish exactly what pupils could do in schools.

He also said that the inclusion of schools from EU-29 was feasible and possible.

He also mentioned the ECO-Schools network and said that outreach into this important network would be vital.

John Rullestad from PPS Karmoy (hereafter JR) asked if the cost statements were declared in local currency. BD replied that they were declared in local currency and that only the summary sheet was converted into Euro.

In relation to staff costs JR also asked what the situation was if an individual participant had a wage increase. BD said that people were to report their actual costs at the time of reporting and that copies of payslips should be kept in a file. This information could then be produced if requested by the EC. JR also asked about whether the cost/hour also included insurance costs and holiday pay, etc. BD said that this indeed was the case.

In relation to non-eligible costs and VAT in particular, BD stressed that VAT was not considered as an eligible cost unless of course a beneficiary could provide proof from their Tax Authority that they are unable to recover it. OM asked about situations where VAT is not identifiable on a bill. BD replied that in such cases, which sometimes is the case with hotel bills, flight tickets, among others, that this might not be readily identifiable, and if the beneficiary could not identify it then more than likely the financial officer would also be unable to do so.

Per Fagerland from PPS Karmoy (hereafter PF) asked how many people would be allowed to travel to meetings and events. BD answered that the Financial Officers typically accept 2 people to attend Kick Off meetings and 1 person travelling to partner meetings. However, he did say that exceptions could be made, especially if they were justifiable. He advised that people inform the coordinator if they want to bring more people to a meeting or an event and then the project officer can decide. JR said that he assumed it would be no problem to bring additional people if this was funded from sources other than the project. BD said that of course this was fine.

Shahla Azirani from Climate Energy (hereafter SA) asked what the situation was if staff changed and a beneficiary needed to include a new staff member in the project. BD said that they would just need to inform the EACI and provide CVs of the new staff in advance of reporting.

In relation to timesheets, DB said that each partner should keep copies of their own timesheets in a file so that they could be provided if requested by the Financial Officer. SA asked if the timesheets were kept on a monthly-basis, to which the answer was yes. OM then advised partners to get into the habit of filling out timesheets every day.

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

SA also asked if it was necessary to provide the EACI with photocopies of receipts to which the answer was no. BD explained that the EACI asked to see copies of the three largest receipts, but that there was no need to provide copies of the smaller receipts.

OM pointed out that partners should keep copies of everything for 5 years.

#### **4- EC Grant Agreement and Administrative matters**

Given that the agenda had already overrun, OM quickly ran through her presentation on the EC Grant Agreement and Administrative matters (copy attached- Annex 13), as much of the material had already been covered by BD. On the issue of reporting staff costs, she said that it was important for each partner to justify the planned hours in the project irrespective of wage increases.

#### **Work Session 1: Research and Definition of Campaign (WP2)**

Donald Mc Donagh from IPIC (DMD) delivered a presentation on WP2 explaining the work that will be carried out on the research and definition of the campaign. (copy attached- Annex 14), as well as the work carried out to date on the market survey questionnaire.

In relation to Education Authorities, PF wanted to clarify if by Education Authorities/Boards we were talking about municipal level or political level. OM said that while it would be very interesting to generate the interest of politicians in FLICK THE SWITCH, the emphasis should be on targeting education boards or authorities that could provide the project with outreach or a multiplier effect to many schools. BR said that in Malta each school has its own internal board, and he wondered if this is what we meant by Education Board. OM said that we were not talking about internal boards, rather boards with multiplier effect or organisations that acted as Umbrella entities for schools.

DMD then opened a discussion on the draft questionnaire (copy attached- Annex 15).

BR said it was crucial to include questions that would gather demographic statistics of the respondents.

OM suggested that we needed to decide how many questionnaires we were going to edit. She said that apart from a questionnaire for schools that maybe one would also be required for teachers, as well as another for students. Regarding a questionnaire for students, BR expressed concerns about the difficulty in getting answers from students and made reference to the data protection act. He said that getting access to pupils might thus prove difficult.

SA shared some of her experiences with the consortium in terms of working with other schools and projects, local authorities and energy auditing, etc. Following her input, it was agreed that the questionnaire should be supplemented with visits to schools and that both approaches should go hand in hand. OM reminded partners that this indeed was an activity that was already planned as part of WP2 (task 2.2).

DMD suggested focusing the discussion on a review of the existing questions that had been prepared prior to the Kick Off meeting. A lively discussion ensued.

It was suggested that the technical questions were more suitable for teachers or schools, rather than for students. OM questioned the need at all for such technical questions. She said they more resembled questions that would feature in an energy audit. She stressed that the focus of the questionnaire was to gather information to enable us to design an effective campaign for schools.

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

Also it was asked in which class teachers should discuss the project with their students. OM suggested that English lesson might be a good alternative and this would greatly facilitate the challenge of having all the materials in the different EU languages.

BR raised the issue about whether kids had access to switching off lights in school and argued that the responsibility lay with caretakers. OM suggested that in this case the kids could set up a committee to liaise with the caretaker and in this way they could influence over the schools energy consumption patterns. Naiara Elejalde from IPIC (hereafter NE) suggested we ask the partners schools for their comments on this matter. Janina Baniene from Kursenai Pevanciai Secondary School (hereafter JB), Mrs. Marianne Fagerland from PPS Karmoy (hereafter MF) and Ms. Maie Podramagi (MP) all said that their pupils can switch off lights in their schools. Tomislav Puksec from Unizag-FSB (hereafter TP) felt that there were already too many questions. He said that the time devoted to answering them should be as short as possible. Also we need to decide the direction of the questions and establish whether it was about switching off lights, closing windows, energy efficiency. OM said that the questions should provide us with information that we could use in WP3 to design the most suitable and effective campaign possible for schools.

Anna de Masi from ISC Gagliano (hereafter AM) suggested that there should only be about 15 questions on one page. She also said that the questions were too hard for primary school kids. She suggested that the language being used should be simplified. DMD asked to whom the questions should be directed to at primary school level, the kids or the teachers. TP said that the answers should come from the students, and to do this we would need to focus on a few schools to determine basic behaviour patterns.

PF asked who the target group was students or teachers. It was suggested that the target group was both. PF suggested targeting the students via a web-based questionnaire with questions oriented to students. BR wondered would the questions for students need to be approved. PF said that in the case of their school the questionnaires could be sent home to their parents via teachers for approval.

BR asked what type of questions should be asked to pupils. AM said that the questions that had already been formulated for kids were good. SA suggested that the project was more about lighting and we should focus on this and how to measure it. OM said that it was about lighting, but also about electronic and electrical devices in general, such as TVs, laptops, games, etc. SA mentioned a previous project she had been involved in (FEEDU), they had a simple questionnaire and got good feedback after about 4 weeks. She talked about a before and after approach. OM suggested applying this method to determine how the kids feel about energy, however, said that this approach was more oriented to the questionnaires that would be designed as part of WP5 to determine the impact of the campaign. She said that the questionnaire to be designed as part of WP2 should help us to design the actual campaign.

BD stated that it was not fully clear measuring before and after, the figures involved those measuring the energy bills (caretakers), so how do you measure the pupil's performance. He suggested the first question should be what motivates them to get involved.

JB mentioned that energy efficiency varies from country to country and feels that answers will vary as a result. She feels some schools will not be honest with their answers.

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

MF said that in her school 6-12 year olds are allowed to switch off lights etc. and this should be rewarded with incentives.

RB suggested that on the website we should ask schools if they want to be a partner of Flick the Switch, after their first visit they should have the option to join and according to the information they provide their partnership should vary from bronze to platinum.

BR asked about customising a campaign for different countries.

OM suggested the need to remove waste questions from questionnaire as they are not an energy concern.

Triinu Podramagi from RG (hereafter TP) asked what language would be used particularly for small children. It was agreed that partner languages, at least, would be used. At this point it was agreed to go down through all the questions and decide which the partners felt were relevant and not.

At the close of day 1 it was agreed that further discussion was needed on the questionnaire structure, so it was agreed that at the start of day 2 all the partners would split up into 3 groups to discuss changes to be made. It was felt that this approach would be more constructive rather than trying to achieve results via email. BR added that he was very interested to hear suggestions on how to define the campaign. BD was in agreement to continue with the questionnaire on day 2.

Day 2, 28<sup>th</sup> October

### **5- Further Discussion of Questionnaire**

OM opened the meeting by thanking everyone for attending the dinner, which was very important for contributing to build a sense of team.

She also said that she felt some guidance and direction was required in order to assist the partners in moving forward with the questionnaire. She felt the approach so far was too technical and that the questionnaire resembled more the approach of an audit. She delivered a very short presentation about the questionnaire and its objectives (copy attached- Annex 16) and reminded partners that the purpose of the questionnaire was to gather information for schools that would help us to design an effective and meaningful campaign that they would be interested in getting their schools involved and one that would mean something for European pupils.

As agreed on day 1 further discussion on the draft questionnaire continued and each group was given 30 minutes to prepare suggestions for possible amendments. Each group presented a summary of their suggestions and comments, and a number of conclusions emerged:

- The questionnaires should be embedded in the webpage and schools provided with a link
- There should be a questionnaire for schools with no more than 10-15 questions per questionnaire, and separate questions for pupils (approx. 6 questions for primary pupils and 10 questions for secondary pupils)
- A limited number of demographic questions should be included
- All the questions from the heating/cooling section should be removed

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

- The questions already prepared for teachers and kids are suitable, however, all questions should be in closed format offering multiple choice answers and where appropriate providing respondents with the opportunity to add short questions
- There should be some incentive for respondents, especially for the pupils

It was agreed that IPIC would work on new drafts of these questionnaires and that they would circulate these new drafts as soon as possible among the partners for comment.

- ✓ **Action 2:** IPIC to circulate new drafts of the questionnaire from WP2 to the other partners for comment

It was also agreed that that each partner should visit 1-2 schools in their region and IPIC would send out a short script of what each visit should be aiming to achieve.

- ✓ **Action 3:** Each partner to visit 1-2 schools in their region
- ✓ **Action 4:** IPIC to send out script of what the school visits should be aiming to achieve

Before the close of Working Session 1, OM clarified to BR that there was a difference between the questionnaire that needed to be defined in WP2 and that which would need to be defined as part of WP5. She explained that the questionnaire that was being designed now as part of WP2 was aimed at gathering data and feedback from schools that would enable us to design an effective campaign. The questionnaires that would be designed as part of WP5 would centre on measuring the impact of the campaign and establishing how effective we were in meeting our performance indicators. She stressed that they were completely different, with totally different aims. BR said it would be important to start thinking about WP5 as soon as possible.

OM urged all partners to carefully read the work plan from the Technical Annex and she said that all partners should already have done so. She stressed that all the work we needed to do was very clearly outlined in the Technical Annex (or indeed in the abridged Handbook that had been prepared and distributed to all partners).

#### **6- Work Session 2: Design/Development of Campaign, Materials -Tools (WP3)**

TP gave a thorough presentation on Work Package 3 which could focus on the design and development of the campaign, its tools and materials. He also explained how the WP would be implemented and the role of each of the partners (copy attached- Annex 17).

Silvia Schaal from IPIC (hereafter SS) gave a presentation on the work that will be carried out in terms of developing the campaign website, logos, tools, etc. (copy attached- Annex 18).

These presentations were followed by an open interactive session involving all partners.

PF asked about incorporating new tools into the website, making it more interactive. He suggested using web2.0. He said that kids were used to these kinds of environments and liked using you-tube, chats, blogs, etc. It was mentioned that kids would quickly get bored with a static web environment. OM said that IPIC was planning to create a highly interactive, virtual platform.

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

BR suggested the idea of creating costumes based on the FLICK THE SWITCH logo in order to make the character more real for kids, this would be ideal for school visits. OM suggested seeking sponsorship to fund the cost of these suits.

- ✓ **Action 5:** PIM to look into the cost of getting FLICK THE SWITCH suits made.

SS asked partners if they liked the logos of FLICK and his Friends. All partners said that they liked them. It was also agreed that feedback about the website and logos should be obtained from the kids from the partner schools.

- ✓ **Action 6:** ISC Gagliano, RV Rakvere, Kursenia, PSS Karmoy to get feedback and suggestions from their students about the logos and website and report back to IPIC.

TP suggested that the website address should be changed. Ain Suurkaev from Rakvere LV (hereafter AS) also agreed with this point saying that it was too long for the younger kids. OM then asked all partners if the name FLICK was suitable work to use in their respective languages. It was agreed as suitable.

SS explained that [www.flicktheswitch.eu](http://www.flicktheswitch.eu) had already been registered. A discussion ensued and it was concluded that [www.flick.eu](http://www.flick.eu) might be an easier domain for the actual campaign website, whereas [www.flicktheswitch.eu](http://www.flicktheswitch.eu) could be reserved for the actual official project website.

- ✓ **Action 7:** IPIC to register [www.flick.eu](http://www.flick.eu) if it is free

With respect to the Campaign website it was agreed that if the website was too text heavy we could run the risk of losing the attention of the younger kids and it was concluded that lots of imagery and interactive activities would be needed in order to engage pupils.

It was suggested that 2 websites were needed, 1 for public use and 1 for campaign use. OM said that this indeed was the case and this was already accounted for in the Work Plan. A project website would be designed as part of WP6 and a campaign website aimed at schools and their pupils would be designed as part of WP3.

SA suggested that the websites should be available as soon as possible so that partners could refer to them during their school visits. OM said that the project website would be ready by the end of M2 and that this site would be sufficient for the time being for the purpose of presenting the project. SA said we would need specifications from schools soon as to the design of the campaign website.

SA also asked how many schools each partner should visit. OM reminded her that partners should visit at least 2 schools (see action 3 above).

BR stated that some schools have their own IT department and could give advice on the web tools and materials.

It was discussed that a secure area would be provided on the Project website which would be reserved for the partners. This secure area would enable partners to access all project working documents, meeting agendas, presentations, minutes, etc. OM also suggested that it might also incorporate a forum discussion tool so that partners could discuss topics, upcoming work tasks, etc. She said that a first draft of the project website would be available in 2 weeks time.

- ✓ **Action 8:** IPIC to have a first draft of the project website within 2 weeks of the KO meeting

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

With regard to the training materials that would be developed or gathered for use during the project, BR asked would anyone be able to download these or would they be reserved for registered user only. OM confirmed that they would be reserved for registered users only.

JR inquired about the languages that the website would be available in. OM said it would at least be available in all partner languages. She also said that IPIC would cover French.

BR referred to the posters and leaflets and said that he would like to have these available as soon as possible for handing out to schools. OM explained that there would be 2 leaflets, 1 for the project and another for the campaign. She said that the project leaflet would be available at the end of M2. Regarding the campaign leaflet for schools she said it was too early to define this as it required research. With regard to posters, OM discussed the possibility of schools and their pupils participating in a competition to design a poster, and the winner poster could be published. She suggested that the EACI might agree to use the image from the winning poster on the cover of one of their publications. JB said that kids like to draw and would enjoy this.

OM also suggested that feedback from partner schools would be welcome about ringtones, wallpaper and other website features that would be stimulating for their pupils. TP emphasised the importance of these tools to attract kids to use the portal. Also he suggested that the school partners should get feedback from their pupils regarding this, maybe 3 suggestions from each partner.

- ✓ **Action 9:** Suggestions from ISC Gagliano, KURSENAI, RV Rakvere and PSS Karmoy about the features they would like to see on the website- at least 3 suggestions from each school.

SA suggested that the website should have a counter to determine how many visits the website receives. SS said that this had already been contemplated.

OM said that the partners would need to think about how we would determine the winning school in a Campaign and she opened up a discussion on this topic.

OM wondered would this be done on the basis of energy bills. TP said that in Croatia school bills go directly to the ministry, so schools might not necessarily have access to bills for this purpose. JB said that schools in Latvia know their bills. TP suggested that the school comparisons in terms of energy performance should be on the basis of energy bills otherwise it becomes subjective. However, he also suggested rewarding creativity and having diplomas for creativity. Partners agreed that some combination of these two approaches might be the best way forward.

Regarding the time period for measuring the energy campaign, TP felt 1 year was too long for some schools. Northern countries for example have larger consumption of energy in winter. He felt there was a need to define a more specific approach to bills. He asked are schools going to send bills to us, for example scanning bills seems complicated. OM said that the web would have to incorporate some simple upload facility. Francesca Pigmattini from AEA (hereafter FP) believed that comparing schools energy consumption was possible. Overall it was agreed that looking at similar campaigns or competitions that had been run at regional or national level would be a good idea in order to see how they had managed their campaigns.

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

- ✓ **Action 10:** To identify similar campaigns/competitions that have been carried out at regional/national/European level and to establish contact with them in order to gather experiences for the FLICK campaign

AS asked about the measurement period and whether it would be monthly. It was agreed that it would more than likely be monthly.

BR felt that the 12 month period for the campaign was too short in order to have an impact. He said that we should start now. OM explained we were bound by the school year and it was too late to start now. She also said that we needed to define and structure the campaign before we started. BR said that many schools carry out maintenance over the summer months that would affect campaign, and he felt for example in the case of light bulbs, these would be changed over the summer when the schools were closed and not during the school year. OM explained that the project was about instigating behavioural changes in schools and not one about infrastructure changes. She said that other projects exist that focus on promoting the uptake of Renewable Energy Sources and energy efficient technology in schools. She said we must not forget that the objective of FLICK was to instigate simple energy efficient behaviour. She said that according to the work plan, the campaign was due to start in M12 and to run for 8 months in schools. OM said that we could look into approaching campaign schools a few months before they break up for the summer holidays so that they can start preparing themselves for the campaign.

DMD suggested that we would need to avoid the danger of some schools putting money into clever infrastructural changes in order to be more competitive, if the campaign was based purely on readings from their electricity bills. OM suggested a bonus point system could be put in place so that the campaign would then not only reward behaviour changes, but also have a bonus point system for investments in energy saving or renewable technology, or even for creativity in the designing of posters, etc.

JB stated that schools which were older and not renovated would have serious disadvantages competing with modern schools. She felt her own school could not possibly win the competition.

TP felt that savings from switching off the lights would not represent a vast saving compared to for example that savings that could be achieved through installing more energy efficient air conditioning units.

MP said that in her school they have after school activities, so the energy consumption is not just during school hours. DMD stated that it was not just about the energy bill but the potential to improve it.

OM again reinforced the need to consult with previous campaigns and get their feedback, so that we did not reinvent the wheel (see action 10 above) . She said that all similar campaigns in the past would have faced the same challenges and risk as we were facing and we could learn from them.

TP also said that he would discuss the whole issue of how to set up and manage such a campaign/competition with his energy experts back at the University of Zagreb.

- ✓ **Action 11:** TP to discuss internally in UNIZAG about how to set up and manage the FLICK THE SWITCH the campaign

BD said to focus on the campaign and the behavioural changes. He said we would need to consider both quantitative and qualitative aspects. In order to measure

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

impacts we could find these out through questionnaires to schools about what they were doing before the Campaign and what they are doing after the campaign. He suggested the award should not be just about saving most energy, should use a combination of awards. OM said that in terms of questionnaires to measure the impact of the Campaign that these indeed had already been contemplated in the work plan, as part of WP5.

Then the whole issue of performance indicators was raised and how these were arrived at. BR said that we should not be looking at monetary savings of 400,000€ but we should instead have stated savings in the consumption of units. OM said that it was stated in monetary terms now and we would base the monetary savings on the average cost of units. She also said that this should have been addressed in contract negotiations when partners were reviewing the Technical Annex. She reminded partners that FLICK THE SWITCH was their project as well.

She asked BR if he felt that we might not reach our performance indicators if the project was based on instigating energy efficient behaviour alone. BR said that he felt that infrastructure changes in schools would be required to ensure the project met its performance indicators.

OM explained that the starting point for arriving at the performance indicators in terms of monetary and CO<sub>2</sub> savings was using data found in a literature review claiming that by switching off 5 lights in hallways in homes when they are not in use could save 60 €/year in energy costs and lead to savings of 400 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/annum. This data was then extrapolated out to EU level and by estimating how many lights might be left on unnecessarily in schools. She said the figures were realistic. She said she did not want the consortium to see the Performance Indicators as a black cloud looming over the project. She said that this was not what they were designed for rather the performance indicators were there to make sure we were ambitious and driven. OM also stressed the importance of not trying to change the objectives of the project in order to meet our performance objectives. She said that this was the wrong way to think. OM said that we needed to believe in the objectives of the project and feel confident that by fulfilling these objectives we will arrive at meeting our performance indicators.

Regarding the campaign/competition among schools, she said that of course it had not been defined yet and this was precisely why she wanted to open up a discussion on the topic in order to get partners thinking about how we might focus a campaign. This was the reason for the discussion. She hoped now that partners were becoming aware of the need for carrying out research to define the campaign in WP2. She said that it is precisely this type of information we should be looking to gather from the schools and their pupils. Information on how to design the best possible energy campaign for schools! She said that this is why she felt that originally many of the questions we were asking schools were not going to give us this information. She hoped that all partners were aware at this stage of the importance of a good questionnaire-based survey among schools.

OM said that in her opinion, the FLICK THE SWITCH campaign, whether it was quantitatively or qualitatively based, or a combination of both, needed to reward change- not just based on energy bills but also other aspects. She said we needed schools and their pupils to guide us at this level. This is why the project had gone for a logical bottom-up approach.

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

She added it was a hugely positive project with small changes bringing about big impacts. It was about empowering the students as it has to be driven by them, once it becomes second nature they will take these habits home with them.

An open discussion ensued about the potential campaign. JB said that schools should get a certificate for participation. Some schools are very active and will have interesting ideas. They should be invited to conferences. Action and behaviour should be kept in mind. Some schools could do a lot but this might make very little difference to the energy bills. On the website there should be an action page for schools to send information on what they are doing. There should be a committee to find out who the strongest schools are. A focus should be put on action not on bills. DMD suggested encouraging people to be communicative through the web portal.

Before closure of the session, OM suggested that it would be a good idea to conclude on the other upcoming actions that would need to be carried out. It was agreed that:

TP would define 2 or 3 crucial questions that would need to be included in the questionnaires, based on his discussions with his colleagues in UNIZAG and which would help in defining the campaign

- ✓ **Action 12:** TP to define crucial questions that will need to be included in the questionnaire and will help in defining the campaign

Work will commence on task 3.2 in order to identify interesting project and initiatives (IEE and other) that would be beneficial and synergistic with the FLICK THE SWITCH project.

- ✓ **Action 13:** Commence work on task 3.2

At this point, in view that it was already past 13:00, OM recommended that the group split up. She suggested that some people accompany SS for the school visit and the rest remain to carry on with the 2 remaining work sessions.

### **7- Working Session 3: Communication & Dissemination (WP6)**

SA went through her presentation giving an overview on the communication and dissemination of work package 6 and its planning and implementation. (copy attached- Annex 19). OM then delivered a presentation on other issues being led by IPIC in WP6. (copy attached- Annex 20).

OM then opened an interactive discussion.

OM asked all partners if the database excel sheets prepared by SS and circulated to all partners were okay. SA suggested that an additional column be provided where partners could insert any comments they might like to add.

DMD observed that in many of the excel sheets that had been completed by partners that no email addresses had been provided. He pointed out the fact that most communication was going to be done via email, so it was vital to include email addresses. TP agreed with this.

JR questioned the feasibility of emailing schools without first speaking to them. He felt most people would delete the emails without even reading them. Maybe they would need prior warning. OM wondered if this would be feasible when contacting 2000 schools from across Europe. JB says she sent out a lot of information by email

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

but didn't get many replies. On the other hand she said that when she contacted a school that knew her and they agreed to be involved because of this. Also some teachers from her school attended a cooperation event between schools and were able to pass on packages about the project to other attending schools. PF added that they would be attending a conference and are hopeful to get many contacts, they will have a stand and felt that the personal contact aspect will be more successful. BR suggested an effective approach which was successful in Malta, informing the Ministry of Education and Department for Curriculum Development as a way of contacting all schools. SA used a similar approach in England. BR stressed that private schools were outside the scope of such an approach however. JR agreed that this approach could be done in Norway also.

OM suggested that an introductory letter could be sent in each partner language to their respective Ministries/ Education Boards. RB suggested approaching the National Union of School Teachers (UK). OM advised that each country must define its key authorities and stakeholders who could be targeted in a first dissemination effort and she thought that was already been done by partners via excel sheets that had been circulated to all partners by SS.

SA asked if the consortium had had the chance to review the letters she send out to everybody for comment. OM said that IPIC would get back to her regarding these shortly after the KO meeting.

- ✓ **Action 14:** IPIC to discuss introduction letters from CLIMATE ENERGY with SA.

Getting back to the issue of the questionnaire that was discussed in working session 1, BR suggested having the questionnaire on line. OM agreed that this was the best way, and mentioned that in her questionnaire working group that morning, that the teachers in the group suggested that the web-based questionnaire incorporates the functionality to make noise or sounds when the kids respond to the questions.

JB asked in relation to the database, what we should do if we didn't know the contact person. OM advised partners at this stage just to fill in the sheets with the information they have.

OM also suggested building an events database, so that we would be aware of the upcoming events and we could think about how we might disseminate at them. BR mentioned about attending the Sustainable Energy Week in February 09, said he would clarify the dates for this.

JR said in relation to the target groups he would prefer if all partners contacted the contacts in their own country instead of it all being done from Barcelona.

OM said that we need to assign additional countries to partners. It was concluded to do this by email and all partners could comment.

- ✓ **Action 15:** IPIC to assign additional countries to partners by email.

BR asked if there was a printing budget for the Project Leaflets. OM said there was. She also took the opportunity to remind all partners of the importance of being aware of their budgets and what they had money to spend on.

BR said they were responsible for attending dissemination events with IPIC. JR announced that he was attending an event on 14th November and DMD said IPIC would provide him with information about FLICK. JR said he would like a copy of Oonagh's powerpoint introducing the project.

- ✓ **Action 16:** OM to provide JR with a copy of her Introduction powerpoint

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

SA mentioned that the Communication and Dissemination plan which was being lead by CLIMATE ENERGY needed to be delivered by end of M2. OM explained to all partners that they would need to think about Dissemination activities and actions that could be carried out by the project in general or that each partner could carry out in their region and to send these to SA (and keep OM and IPIC in copy).

- ✓ **Action 17:** All partners to send ideas and input for the Dissemination and Communication Plan to SA from CLIMATE ENERGY (keeping OM and IPIC in copy).

Finally, partners were reminded that the project would set up a Communication and Dissemination Committee that would take care of all activities relating to dissemination. This Committee would be chaired by the Dissemination Manager. OM suggested that seeing that CLIMATE ENERGY were the leaders of WP6 that it might be logical for SA to act as the Dissemination Manager, however this was only a suggestion and could be confirmed. OM also said that each partner should recommend 1 representative to sit on the Communication and Dissemination Committee, and this could be communicated via email after the email.

- ✓ **Action 18:** Creation of Communication and Dissemination Committee and election of Dissemination Manager.

#### **8- Work Session 4: Other issues to be discussed**

OM chaired this session. She said that most the aspects she had listed for potential discussion had already come up over the course of the two days, so she said she would only focus on a few remaining outstanding issues.

Regarding letters of intent, she informed partners that we needed to gather at least 10 letters of intent from schools and school networks stating that they support the project. PF asked if this was 10 letters per partner or for the project as a whole. OM said for the project as a whole. BR said that we already had a number of letters of support gathered at proposal preparation stage. OM said that IPIC will work on a template for such a letter.

- ✓ **Action 19:** IPIC to provide consortium with template for Letter of Support

Regarding establishing an Advisory Committee, OM asked all partners to suggest 1 or 2 schools or school authorities/boards/multipliers that they could approach for joining the Advisory Committee. She said we would offer them visibility for their support on the project website and campaign website.

- ✓ **Action 20:** Each partner to bring 1-2 schools onboard the Advisory Committee

Regarding sponsorship JR asked about the types of organisations should we approach. OM said let's think big and approach the likes of Playstation, etc. She said we would also define a sponsorship package.

BR asked about the whole issue of income generated from sponsorship and how this would affect the project. OM said that there was a mechanism for reporting this in the cost statements and that one of the sheets focussed on declaring income generated for their part sources. She said that we could use income from

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

sponsorship to supplement our 25% own contribution. BR said it would be better to check this with the EACI.

- ✓ **Action 21:** OM to discuss issue of sponsorship with the financial officer

BR said it might be better to focus on getting in kind sponsorship as opposed to cash sponsorship. OM agreed and felt that in any case the issue of cash sponsorship would be a non issue in the current climate. BR suggested that maybe a sponsor could provide us with the FLICK suit he had mentioned earlier.

AS spoke about keeping the design of letters and communication materials as similar as possible for all partners- using the same letterhead, presentation, design, this way we could get strong branding. OM agreed and said that if we standardise as much as possible this will show good partnership.

DMD asked about the 6 month meeting venue. OM said that she thought that it was Italy. It was agreed that the dates for this M6 meeting should be finalised as soon as possible by email.

- ✓ **Action 22:** to discuss the M6 meeting venue and dates by email

With regard to the M12 campaign launch event in Malta, BR asked if children from EU would be brought to this. All partners have the budget to bring 1-2 people. OM said that partners will more than likely bring adults from other schools, multipliers but it would be good to have Maltese kids at the event. BR suggested October would be good to have children there but added the start of the month was not possible. The end of the month would be better or during refreshers week.

BR suggested that the gap between 6 month meetings was too long and maybe we should instigate a number of teleconferences. OM agreed and said IPIC had teleconferencing packages that we could use.

BR asked if everybody was comfortable using SKYPE or messenger. It was agreed that it was a good communication tool.

No other issues were raised and in view of the time OM suggested to close the meeting. She thanked all partners for their energy and enthusiasm. She said everybody had participated actively and this was a great start to the project.

### **Minutes of School visit**

Ms. Sylvia Schaal, Ms. Deborah Vento, Mr. Bernd Decker, Ms. Triinu Podramagi, Ms. Katrin Joselin and Mrs. Marianne Fagerland went to the British School of Barcelona.

Lluís Farrés (School Manager) welcomed the group and showed them around the school. Mr. Farrés and Ms. Clair Orbarry (Head of the primary school) then assembled the primary children in the school gymnasium and SS delivered them a presentation about FLICK THE SWITCH (Copy attached- Annex 21).

Interactive questions were asked to the children in order to get them involved, participating and most importantly to listen to their feedback. All the pupils seemed to be conscious of the need to switch off lights, turn off appliances. However, they did say that they do so because adults ask them to, as opposed to them being aware

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

about the environment of climate change issues. This did seem to confirm a need to clearly explain climate change issues to primary school children and the link with the importance of saving energy.

At the end of the presentation, the logos were presented one by one to the pupils and they were very enthusiastic about them and liked almost all of them, except the logo with Flick & the skateboard. Deborah Vento (graphic designer from IPIC) already had thought that this logo was more geared to secondary school pupils.

After the presentation a small meeting was organized with the partners of the consortium and Ms. Amanda Hughes (Head of Secondary School). This meeting was supervised by Lluís Farrés. 3 teenagers came to express their ideas about the FTS project and how to save energy in their schools. They thought that post-its or stickers should be near all the switches in order to remind the youngest to turn off the lights. They were in favour of the shutting down of computers being checked at the end of each day, they also felt that the light in the gymnasium could be switched off when not in use, as currently these lights are left on all day.

Mr. Bernd Decker (BD) stressed the importance of the FLICK THE SWITCH campaign being used to stimulate more interaction and dialogue between students and schools. The consortium will think about how to stimulate such interaction, especially via the web. During the KO meeting it was mentioned that we cannot try to compete with “youtube” and “Facebook”, but these tools should be used to seduce students.

The school visit confirmed that the FTS consortium should not forget that the FTS campaign is addressed to pupils and we need to establish close contact with them to assure the good design and implementation of the campaign, via discussions and testing our tools and materials. The British Schools of Barcelona is very interested in the project and IPIC will be able to interact with them regularly and they will be involved in using little focus groups to test out tools.

**Table of Actions (in numerical order)**

No.	Description	Responsible	Deadline	Status
1	Provide Mr. Decker with an overview of the number of schools that had already expressed interested in FLICK THE SWITCH to date.	<b>Leader: IPIC</b> All partners to give IPIC their input	07/11/08	DMD
2	IPIC to circulate new drafts of the questionnaires from WP2 to the other partners for comment	IPIC	12/11/08	In progress OM/DMD/SS
3	Each partner to visits 1-2 schools in their region- and report back to IPIC	All partners	11/12/08	DMD follow-up
4	IPIC to send out script of what the school visits should be aiming to achieve	IPIC	14/11/08	In progress OM/DMD/SS
5	PIM to look into the cost of getting FLICK THE SWITCH suits made.	PIM	18/12/08	SS follow up

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**

6	ISC Gagliano, RV Rakvere, Kursenia, PSS Karmoy to get feedback and suggestions from their students about the logos and website and report back to IPIC.	ISC Gagliano PSS Karmoy RV Rakvara Kursenai	19/11/08	SS follow up
7	IPIC to register <a href="http://www.flick.eu">www.flick.eu</a> if it is free	IPIC	07/11/08	DONE (it is not free)
8	IPIC to have a first draft of the project website within 2 weeks of the KO meeting	IPIC	12/11/08	DV/SS
9	Suggestions from ISC Gagliano, KURSENAL, RV Rakvere and PSS Karmoy about the features they would like to see on the website- at least 3 suggestions from each school.	ISC Gagliano PSS Karmoy RV Rakvara Kursenai	19/11/08	SS follow up
10	To identify similar campaigns/competitions that have been carried out at regional/national/European level and to establish contact with them in order to gather experiences for the FLICK campaign	<b>Leader:</b> <b>UNIZAG</b> TP will mobilise the participation of all partners	First overview by 21/11/08	DMD follow-up
11	TP to discuss internally in UNIZAG about how to set up and manage the FLICK THE SWITCH the campaign	UNIZAG	First suggestions by 21/11/08	DMD follow-up
12	TP to define crucial questions that will need to be included in the questionnaire and will help in defining the campaign	UNIZAG	To give these to IPIC by 10/11/08	DMD follow-up
13	Commence work on task 3.2 (looking at tools and materials we can use from other IEE projects)	<b>Leader:</b> <b>UNIZAG</b> TP will mobilise the participation of all partners	First overview by 18/12/08	DMD follow-up
14	IPIC to discuss introduction letters from CLIMATE ENERGY with SA.	<b>IPIC and CLIMATE</b>	11/11/08	OM follow up
15	IPIC to assign additional countries to partners by email.	IPIC	07/11/08	DONE
16	OM to provide JR with a copy of her Introduction powerpoint	IPIC	31/10/08	DONE
17	All partners to send ideas and input for the Dissemination and Communication Plan to SA from CLIMATE ENERGY (keeping OM and IPIC in copy).	CLIMATE	20/11/08	SS to follow up
18	Creation of Communication and Dissemination Committee and election of Dissemination Manager.	CLIMATE	14/11/08	SS to follow up
19	IPIC to provide consortium with template for Letter of Support	IPIC	12/11/08	OM
20	Each partner to bring 1-2 schools onboard the Advisory Committee	All partners	18/12/08	DMD follow-up
21	OM to discuss issue of sponsorship with the financial officer	IPIC	14/11/08	OM
22	To discuss the M6 meeting venue and dates by email	IPIC	14/11/08	DMD

**Instigating Simple Energy Efficient Behavioural Practices in Schools**  
**FLICK THE SWITCH**  
**Project No. EIE/07/639**