



CCC Updated Resource Pack

Info Session - 10/01/2024

Q&A

- **Question 1: We are using version 2 of the template, we plan to submit in Window 3 (March 2023), do we have to consider the new version of the template?**

Answer 1: You do not need to switch to the new template for the Commitments and Action Plan. However, it is recommended to consult them, and especially the guidance, to ensure that the information required in it is present in your drafted. Please be aware that at the beginning of the template, it is explicitly written that the template is for guidance only. Do not feel obliged to follow the template when it does not fit your narrative or the information you want to put forward, but make sure the content required for anyone to understand your climate neutrality ambition and journey is there. The information that reflects the process that the city wants to present is more valuable than fitting data into a specific table or into a textbox. However, for the Investment Plan, it is advisable for cities to use the updated template in windows 3 and 4. The reason for this is twofold. One is that based on the feedback from EC and EIB, we made more explicit what are the details that they would like to see. Secondly, the new version is intended to be easier for cities to use. For instance, we added guidance to fill tables.

- **Question 2: Do we need to use v2.1 for the September 2024 (Window 4) submission? We are starting now to fit the current information.**

Answer 2: You can use which version is more convenient for you (2.0, or 2.1). However, we think v2.1 is easier to use, and it is more explicit regarding the flexibility that you have in using the specific format that is proposed. The template underlines the needed information and provides additional guidance. It does not matter the format that you use. What matters is the content that you input.

- **Question 3: What is the difference in terms of flexibility in the use of the template between the AP and IP?**

Answer 3: It would be advisable for cities to use the updated template of the Investment Plan (V2.1) for window 3 and 4. The reason for this is twofold. One is that based on the feedback from EC and EIB, we made more explicit what are the details that they would like to see. Secondly, the new version is intended to be easier for cities to use. For instance, we added guidance to fill tables.

- **Question 4: Is the new version (V2.1) of the checklist to be used?**

Answer 4: The checklist is aligned with the new version of the guidance. It helps understand whether the CCC has the required information. If you use the checklist, it is already a great step towards making sure that everything that needs emphasis is present in the CCC.

- **Question 5: Will there be a further update in 2024 to be considered for window 4?**

Answer 5: There will be a version 3 of the resource pack. However, it will include smaller, less significant updates. We do not envisage major changes in the new version that will be published before window 4.

- **Question 6: Our city administrative boundary will change in June 2024 as a smaller adjacent municipality will be integrated. Are we free to include the new area of the city in our CCC?**

Answer 6: Yes, you are free to include it as well as to not include it in the target and the inventory. It would be useful to include an explanation for the choice you make.

- **Question 7: We are working on electricity for charging cars. This type of project would fall under “stationary energy”. However, electricity in this case is for transport. How would you like to deal with this?**

Answer 7: The most important thing is to avoid double reporting. In general, we invite you to follow the Global Green House Gasses Protocol. There is a specific protocol for cities. That protocol is often useful to find answers compatible with reporting methods in NZC. Depending on the data, you can report it under either transport or energy.

- **Question 8: During the presentation, you said “You have control of all policies”. We do not have control of policies. Part of our plan takes into account that the country’s electrification will get better and that the country’s electricity mix will change. We do not have control over this. We cannot but assume that the national plan will take place.**

Answer 8: This is the case for most cities. The best is to use an estimate that reflects the reduction in case everything goes as planned, and document the risks you foresee related to the national plan in the CCC section dedicated to barriers and risks, for example, or wherever that information is relevant. Something to note is the importance of partnerships with multi-level-governance actors. We are not in control of everything, but the projections we are doing with CCCs, are part of a collective plan.

- **Question 9: You mentioned you eliminated the module C3 dedicated to financing the portfolio of actions in the Action Plan Template and guidance. Does the AP template still ask to report on costs in section B2?**

Answer 9: Yes, costs are still to be described in module B2. The old section C3 associated with costs has been deleted precisely to avoid this redundancy.

- **Question 10: On Table 2 in the Investment Plan: finance sources by field of action for 3 years back is really challenging! Is this is only referring to the municipal Budget?**

Answer 10: Data for Table 2 refers only to municipal data, not private. It should not be too challenging. Of course, it depends on how each city reports its treasury process. However, here we would like to see as much data as possible. At the very least, we are looking at data at the level of sector rather than the level of actions.

- **Question 11: When we write about potential funding or actually used costs, how much of the private actors should we include? Or do we mainly focus on the city/municipality’s share?**

Answer 12: Typically, for section A, we expect cities to include only municipality data. It is an inward-looking historical review of the municipality’s funding of climate actions. Section B, we do encourage the inclusion of private sector activities and private actors. Nevertheless, we know that this is difficult. Private actors are not always able to share their decarbonization plan.

- **Question 12: What do you consider a climate action? When reporting on the actions, what kind of numbers do you want us to put there? Especially for transport and roads, we can report whatever actions we want as “climate-related”.**

Answer 12: The [EU taxonomy for sustainable activities](#) is a good start for assessing what can and cannot define a climate action.

- **Question 13:** Table 8 of the IP lists municipality-owned companies, citizens, and private. Where is the column for the central government and the European funds? Of course, these do come through the municipality budget, but this is just accounting. In fact, the source is the central government and the EU. How should we deal with this?

Answer 13: In the updated Resource Pack Investment Plan Template, there is a space to include all sources of funding and external capital. We would encourage cities to be as granular as possible. There is space within Table 9 to include this granularity of data.

- **Question 14:** In Table 14, when you distinguish between citizens and private actors, what do you mean?

Answer 14: In this case, private stands for “for-profit” private sector. For capital linked to citizens, we mean the actual capital people would need to invest for instance for behavioural change or to buy an electric vehicle, etc.

- **Question 15:** In Table 7, is it expected to provide the yearly data for OPEX?

Answer 15: Yes, if possible, it would be better to provide the annual operating costs.

- **Question 16:** Table 15 summarizes the cost for the municipality. However, the municipality does not cover the whole cost of the stakeholder activities. Shall we only list the cost for the municipality?

Answer 16: This section refers to stakeholder engagement activities undertaken by the municipality, for example by creating public forums. That table should capture municipality costs, hence only the part that is factored into the municipal budget.

- **Question 17:** We hope that a big source of our funding will be accounting rules. For instance, rules that will change how an empty plot owned by a company can appear as its assets, so that in the end it is planted and not built.

Answer 17: If it goes along the lines of the, for example, the Inflation Reduction Act in America, this is the perfect example of what you can write in section C1.

- **Question 18:** Regarding table 8: if for certain actions the exact cost and its breakdown across stakeholders are unclear, can they be addressed with estimates, percentages, and better define them in future iterations?

Answer 18: Estimates and percentages are more than acceptable if that’s all that’s available now. The CCC is meant to be iterative. Therefore, as more data are to become available, they can be integrated into the document. We are not asking cities to answer all questions now. This would be impossible.