

# Minutes of Meeting on Regulatory Barriers & Bottlenecks of energy & water projects

Monday 15 June 2015 10.00 – 12.30 | House of the Dutch Provinces | Trierstraat 59-61, Brussels

**Reference documents:** Agenda and “Barriers, bottlenecks (B&B) & uncertainties”-document

The EIP Water Action Group Energy & Water Works (EIP AG EWW) was established early 2014 under the umbrella of the European Innovation Partnership Water. Its main goal is to enhance European interest in the innovative crossovers between energy and water in the development of policy, markets and knowledge, and to further the relevant industrial policies.

On 15<sup>th</sup> June 2015, the Action Group held its third plenary meeting in Brussels during the EU Sustainable Energy Week. The main objective of the meeting was to discuss regulatory barriers, bottlenecks & uncertainties to innovation, caused by (lack-of) legislation encountered in innovative water and energy cross-over projects. In preparation of this meeting a Discussion Paper was drafted and circulated.

As special invited guests, Pavel Misiga (Head of the Water Unit at DG Environment) and Guido Schmidt and Eef Leeuw (EIP Water secretariat) joined the meeting to listen to the various cases and formulate follow up and actions.

## **AG1 Emphasize the role of EU removing regulatory barriers for stimulating innovation in the Water sector**

- Pavel Misiga explains his view on how we can help each other by working together on the innovation potential of the EIP Water; we must remain leaders on the global markets
- Innovation is the key; however we need a focus on the barriers and bottlenecks to put effort into system transitions

## **AG2 Introduction of members of the Action Group, EU-DG Environment; Head of Water and the EIP Water support Unit**

- Introduction of members see <http://www.EIPWater.eu/EWW>
- Eef Leeuw (EIP Water secretariat) is the EU support attributed to the EIP Water Action Group Energy and Waterworks: energizing Delta's: Eef gives further information about the Action Group being a test-case for the European Commission: better regulations for better results
- Guido Schmidt (EIP Water Secretariat) coordinates between EIP Water Action Groups (+/- 30 AG's) and EU DG Environment

## **AG3: Introduction to the B&B-document by Sander van Hees: How to speed up innovation?**

- Sander takes out 3 B&B from a legal perspective:
  - Extensive environmental assessment requirements (e.g. VHR)
  - Permitting process (reuse of baseline data; relevance of the size and scope of the project; monitoring)
  - Large number of public authorities involved (multi-level implementation process)

## **AG4: Presentation of cases from the EIP Water AG EWW**

**Case I:**

**Afsluitdijk** (flood protection barrier in the Netherlands) **project Kornwerderzand (Wim Kloezen; Antea Group)**

A new tidal energy demo site will be built on the Afsluitdijk: about 18 turbines (+/- 3 MW). To be built at a major dike, which is a national monument; interaction with salt and fresh water bodies.

**Problem-1: Overlapping issues in different legislations; lack of knowledge at authorities***Situation*

Seven authorities (National, provincial, regional and municipality levels) involved in permitting a single location. Most authorities lack knowledge on marine renewable issues. Authorities do not use the right environmental criteria. They want to reduce all potential risks, mainly related environment and spatial planning. Sometimes they require measures that are not relevant to the species actually living in the area. Also there is overlap between environmental issues/permits, e.g. Fish Mortality has to be addressed under both Natuurbeschermingswet and Waterwet.

*Approach in solving the problem*

- Every project has to collect its own environmental baseline data and monitoring data. Calls on generic research on sharing evidence-based data of impacts of marine energy projects might solve this problem.
- Permitting authorities need to get better access to (international) acceptable evidence based data, which demonstrate negligible impacts by the project proposed. This evidence may come from international projects all over the world, e.g. UK, Canada and USA. It should be encouraged that such evidence data can be used in permitting procedures in other projects.
- In most funding programmes, developers need to have all licenses before they can apply. EU might create funding programmes for the expensive permitting phase of innovative marine energy projects, in order to accelerate market uptake of the technology.
- Peter Scheijgrond : Marine Scotland Licensing Operations Team (MS LOT) provides a 'one-stop-shop' (one governmental level) for all marine licence applications in Scottish waters. This model might be suitable in other Member States dealing with innovative marine energy projects (e.g. Spain, Portugal, France, Ireland, Denmark and Netherlands)
- Better understanding is needed on which authorities refer in their licensing process to which EU legislation. It is unclear if certain problems occur due to European regulation or due their implementation in national regulations. Several national authorities refer in licenses to Natura 2000, WFD, EIA, but all from a different angle, this would be problematic and the EC could ask to harmonise this at a national level. EU-Law: There are 3 kinds of assessments (EIA) using different indicators; The EU will push to align. There will also be a bilateral conversation between EC and NL about the N2000-assessment, end of 2016. If there is more information about the licenses, then the EC can ask the Dutch government to harmonise their licenses.
- Andre Oldenkamp: Regulatory implementation often is based for 25% formal regulations and for 75% on informal aspects and interpretation. This implies that specific issues are a problem in one project and aren't in another project. Exchange of best practises will solve certain problems

**Problem-2: State-aid***Situation*

- State aid: unclear information to which level subsidies can be combined for this type of project. Especially when up scaling from current test site (with 3 turbines at another location at the Afsluitdijk) to a demonstration project.
- Raised by Peter Scheijgrond: Specific State Aid issue in INTERREG.

The new INTERREG programmes wishes to see more pilots and experimental infrastructure build and increased involvement from industry. However the General Block Exemption Regulation (GBER) applies exclusively to SMEs only, thus severely limiting the possibilities for large enterprises (or SMEs with large shareholders) to get involved in the programme (only Deminimis applies, which offers very limited involvement in large projects (max 200k€)). It should be understood that promising SMEs with innovative technologies, will attract investment from large enterprises, who may become majority shareholders behind the SMEs, thus illuminating those SMEs from participating in INTERREG.

*Approach to solving the problem*

- Online knowledge based support for State Aid questions
- GBER in INTERREG should also apply for (innovative) Large Enterprises

**Conclusion:**

Pavel Misiga summarized the most important aspects of the case I Afsluitdijk: Kornwerderzand project

- Pushing National Governments
- Reference documents (research)
- One-stop-shop (example UK)

**Actions**

Pavel Misiga summarizes the mutual actions:

1. Pavel Misiga will establish contact between the Nature Unit, the Water Unit, the EIA Unit of DG Environment, DG R&I unit and DG competition with members of the Action Group EWW to address the problems and develop an approach to overcome these (after summer)
2. Within two weeks specialists of the DG ENVI units will be selected. They will be linked with the EWW specialists through the EIP and EWW Secretariats (Peter Scheijgrond and Eef Leeuw)

**Case II**

**Afsluitdijk** (flooding barrier): Salinity Gradient Energy at the Afsluitdijk, Rik Siebers (REDstack).

**Problem-3: Inflexibility of permits in relation to changes***Situation*

The permitting process is a fairly rigid process. Innovation and technology development require regulations that can be adapted due to the progress of this development. Once a permit is given, there is not sufficient flexibility for modifications and expansions under these existing permits. On the other hand Deltas are usually very sensitive areas and require protection. Whatever you do: estuaries or rivers can be influenced. There is an obvious social interest and need for the protection of nature. Therefore the authorities need to be precautionous.

*Approach to solving the problem*

- More flexible licensing for innovation processes could be an option, using maximum parameters and assessing the worst-case impact scenario, without having to define all the details of the technology in that stage. E.g. The Rochdale envelope licensing system could give flexibility as to the technique, about what exact turbine, or specifications will be used. Guido Schmidt suggests using a less sensitive site (laboratory) or a proven- site.
  
- Rick Siebers asks for help in the communication between EU and the national Authorities. Guido informs us about the Guidance document about the implementation of Article 7 of the HVR-directive (EIB-infra –projects). Therein is documented how to interpret the assumptions in the directives. There has also been a workshop on art 4. WFD about what to request as part of licensing procedures. Such could also be done for the problems faced by the action group.

**Conclusion**

Pavel Misiga summarized the most important aspects of the case Afsluitdijk: project Salinity Gradient Energy

- Too rigid processes: more flexibility is needed
- Changing EU directives is unlikely route; There are possibilities however to add guidance to the directives (see above)

**Actions**

Pavel Misiga summarizes the mutual actions:

3. We must raise awareness and stimulate communication with national governments

**Case III****Small Scale Marine Energy pilots projects: The Texel Tidal-project. Peter Scheijgrond (MET-Support)****Problem-4: Permitting requirements not appropriate to the scale of the project***Situation*

- A pilot project, such the Texel Tidal Project, with a single turbine is too small to have significant impacts on birds, seabed, noise, fish. This may be even more obvious if the body of water is many times larger than the turbine and when there are a large number of existing activities that are likely to have more impacts (e.g. heavy shipping, dredging, mining, fishing etc)
- Nevertheless the entire consenting process has to be done even for a small pilot: including bird counts (and updated when there is new data), cumulative impacts (e.g. with the extension of a harbour), environmental studies.

*Approach to solving the problem*

- Some permitting laws have exemptions from small installations (e.g. for small (urban) wind turbines below a certain power rating or small solar systems). Such exemptions should also apply for small-scale marine energy pilots. However, since the technology is so new, current permits do not even consider the technology in the exemptions (especially relevant for the Dutch Milieuvergunning/Environmental Permit).
- There is a need for permitting and monitoring conditions appropriate to the scale of the project. Also the licensing should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate modifications in the pilot project.

**Conclusion**

Pavel Misiga summarized the most important aspects of the case III Small scale Marine Energy pilots projects

**Actions**

Pavel Misiga summarizes the mutual actions:

4. Pavel Misiga repeats the need to contact between the Nature Unit, the Water Unit and the EIA Unit of DG Environment with members of the Action Group EWW to address the problems and develop an approach to overcome these.

**Case IV****The Eastern Scheldt Storm surge barriers tidal project:** Hans van Breugel (Tocado International BV)**Problem-5: positive impacts cannot be used to offset negative impacts***Situation*

- Experience during consenting of a tidal power scheme in the Eastern Scheldt Storm Surge Barrier: one bird species with improvement objective. No data. But project developer had to make an estimation about how many birds would be killed. The estimation was: 100 birds in 20 years. A heavy storm, which occurs once every year, does the same amount of damage to those birds. However, the positive effect of renewable electricity and thus avoided CO2 emissions could not be included in the licensing process (as a form of compensation). It took about 3 years to complete the licensing procedure, and then when the government changed, the feed-in subsidy changed as well. Looking back, a lot of time and money was wasted.

*Approach to solving the problem*

- Is possible to reduce the time of licensing procedures? Can the positive effects of renewables be considered under Natura 2000 legislation? I.e. to compensate negative effects with positive effects?
- Frank Neumann adds that it is possible if it refers to the same wetland. A change in European Directives is not possible, but extra guidance for assessment procedures would be (see UK as an example)
- Hans van Breugel asks if the Action Group EWW can be involved in the alignment process

**Conclusion**

Pavel Misiga summarized the most important aspects of the case IV The Eastern Scheldt Storm surge barriers tidal project

- The question of weighing of positive effects in the assessment procedures is about the implementation at national level; Note: 20% = rules, 80% = interpretation. Therefore it does not make sense to change the European directives and/or regulations

**Actions**

Pavel Misiga summarizes the mutual actions:

5. Pavel will asked DG ENVI Head of Nature, if there is a need for specific Natura 2000 guidelines for marine energies. He notes that there are guidelines already.
6. Pavel will contact colleagues of the Nature department to form a platform for new methodology; support for Research and to organize an alignment process
7. Pavel advises to use the process of the Marine Strategy Framework Directive as a vehicle. Make sure that issues of the action group EWW will be included in the directive (including of positive effects in licensing)

**Case V**

**The Brouwersdam Tidal Power Plant:** Hugo Niesing (Resourcefully) on behalf of the Province of Zuid-Holland

**Problem-6: conflicts between WFD and Natura 2000***Situation*

- The Grevelingen Lake is suffering from stratification and oxygen depletion. Solution: opening the dyke. The water will then be saltier and there will be more tidal circulation. The latter is an issue under the water and habitats directives. Clash between WFD and Natura 2000. It is difficult to change the protection standards for specific sites (N2000- management plans) and that is an EU legislative problem

*Approach to solving the problem*

- Hugo asks how, when and where to allocate this discussion: What kind of guidance can Europe give?; Pavel Misiga says: Europe can facilitate in cooperation and discussion < see case IV>

**Conclusion**

Pavel Misiga summarized the most important aspects of the case IV The Brouwersdam Tidal Power Plant

- There is a project in place on how to coordinate better between WFD, MSFD and HBD are working on it and will come with recommendations at the end of the year. This is also a priority of the Luxemburgish presidency.

**Actions**

Pavel Misiga summarizes the mutual actions:

8. Guido Schmidt will provided to the action group EWW information about the coordination – project
9. Pavel Misiga will ask DG ENVI Head of Nature, if there is a need for specific Natura 2000 guidelines for marine energies. He notes that there are guidelines already. Pavel will contact colleagues of marine department to see if the issues of the action group can be included in MSFD

## Case VI

The Pro-tide –project: **Comparative Analyses of regulation and legislation in 5 European Countries projects**, Frank Neuman

**Problem-7: the need for harmonization of regulations (permits) in Europe on behalf of building and exploring tidal energy facilities**

*Situation*

- In a joint study the regulation and legislation of 5 EU Member States (Flanders, France, UK, Netherlands and Scotland) were analysed and compared. A checklist regarding necessary permits for companies who want to build and explore a tidal energy facility is made and a recommendation- report about harmonization of regulations in Europe is in edition
- The Key slower downs are:
  - o The Precautionary Principle. Small companies don't always have financial endurance to go through lengthy consenting processes. Authorities don't know much about the technologies.
  - o Each project has to find out again
  - o One – stop- shop- is not faster, because the 'non-communication" is going on (the Fastest (water) regulations < 90 days> are in Flanders
  - o Communication between different governments
  - o Finance
- Advise to speed–up the processes:
  - o To share base-line data
  - o Not duplicating: Providing information and up-to-date-knowledge about technologies to e.g. the Committee of the Regions and other governmental processes
  - o Connect to on-going processes of DG Mare, DG R&I, DG ENVI and Ocean Energy Forum
  - o Involve other countries
  - o Get political support (Environmental planning group)

*Approach to solving the problem*

- How can EU facilitate sharing baseline data? Can EU give best practices examples to MS for permitting procedures?
- The action group can participate in other initiatives, e.g. with DG Mare and DG ENVI. It should also avoid duplicating work with the **Ocean Energy Forum**. Peter and Frank are in the environmental planning group of the OEF and are aware of the work and recommendations taking place there. Peter suggests to ask an expert from the steering committee to review and comment these minutes (e.g. [Anne Marie O'Hagan](#) from UCC)
- In Flanders there are projects that can be implemented without a license when it stays in the water for 90 days only. This will also offer a lot of information which can be shared with other MS. Keep an eye on that! (Peter Scheijgrond: Same applies in UK as well, as long as device is anchored instead of fixed to sea bed, e.g. pilot site in Solent has 3 months permit without and consenting work required).

**AG 5: Wrap-up, Summarized Conclusions and Roadmap of Actions**

**Wrap-Up by Guido Schmidt**

1. It is good to have: Database, One-stop-shop and comparability of assessment procedures
2. EIP Water secretariat will give information about the coordination project between the directives WFD, MSFD and HBD
3. Check by the DG ENVI Nature Unit on fish mortality; Check DG ENVI Marine Unit on feedback MSFD
4. Check Proposal LIFE
5. Approach DG Competition regarding State Aid

**Summarized conclusions**

Pavel Misiga summarizes the 6 cases of EIP Water AG EWW CASES

He emphasises that he is very committed to help us by coordinating, communicating and participating in meetings; particularly in coordination with DG R&I; It is important that we all understand the B&B of the implementation of innovations.



**We have identified four categories of Regulatory Barriers & Bottlenecks of the Water-Energy-Nexus-projects:**

1. Institutional set up too complex: too many authorities involved
2. Lack of governmental coordination (alignment processes) and flexibility (lack of 'extra' - guidance for licensing procedures /sometimes disproportionate requirements)
3. Lack of a platform for alignment of new methodology, research and assessment procedures
4. Lack of clear information about state aid-questions during innovation implementation phase (SME's mostly involved in small scale pilots; Large Enterprises invests in large scale / LIGHTHOUSE demonstration projects)

**Pavel Misiga informs us about new EU-initiatives**

1. Environmental technology verification (ETV). This New initiative of the EC. Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) is a tool to help innovative environmental technologies reach the market. The Statement of Verification delivered at the end of the ETV process can be used as evidence that the claims made about the innovation are both credible and scientifically sound. By the independent accreditation bureau, the proof of performance credibly is assured, reducing the technological risk for technology purchasers, innovations can expect to:
  - Attract investment
  - Increase market share
  - Differentiate from competitors
2. The Juncker plan. Pavel Misiga says that his WaterUnit (DG Environment) would like to agree on an action plan, funded through the EIB and or an intermediate bank. At this moment the Water Unit and financial engineers are setting up the basic parameters for the scheme (size of projects, level of funding); Execution will be done by other organizations. At this stage he cannot give us more information because there is no formal approval yet. Therefore he says that we first need to adopt the legal instrumentation. DG ENVI will push the thematic platform for innovation, which is relevant to EIP AG EWW. He needs therefore the interest and demand from industry. He advises us to start developing project ideas for financing, risk guarantee facilities.

<b>Roadmap of Actions</b>
---------------------------

**Short term actions** (immediate: July 2015)

- Update the regulatory barriers & bottlenecks document with: Lack of baseline evidence data on impacts / comparability of assessments/ one stop shop & Rochdale envelope/ state aid issues
- Pavel Misiga will ask Ms Marianne Wennink (DG Environment: directorate Quality of LIFE, Water & Air) to accept the invitation for the Water Innovation day during the World Expo Milan and take part in the dialogue, as speaker and/or as participant in the dialogue. Mr. Pavel Misiga promises that if she can't, he himself or another colleague will participate.
- Guido Schmidt will check if the Italian EIP Water representative (Task force; Puglia Region) is willing to attend the Dutch Dialogue in Milan: He will check and send contact data to Ine

**Mid-term actions after summer** (September – December 2015)

- Pavel Misiga facilitates the contact with DG Competition
  - to clarify the National Aid proportion for projects where SMEs change status due to acquisition of shares by larges companies
- Pavel Misiga facilitates the contact with Nature Unit DG Environment,
  - to identify the existing and upcoming guidance documents on "precautionary principle", "fish mortality", "acceptable level of evidence"
  - to screen possibility for LIFE funding (to gather research data)
- Pavel Misiga facilitates the contact with EIA Unit DG Environment,

- To foster a process of coordination in assessments (e.g. one-stop-shop)
- To understand if and how positive aspects of renewable energy production can be taken into consideration
- EIP Water AG EWW will identify the Marine Strategy Framework Directive's CIS work programme
  - To look after the incorporation of knowledge and regulatory aspects
- Pavel Misiga and the EIP Water AG EWW will get in contact with DG RTD
  - To explain barriers faced by innovation projects; and to stimulate investment into open issues e.g. underpinning of methodologies
  - Facilitate contact with ETV Pilot on Marine Technologies
  - How to make costs of assessments/monitoring accessible for funding (DG RTD)
- EIP Water AG EWW will organise a workshop for DG ENVI
  - To explain better our technologies to relevant experts
- EIP Water AG EWW will organise a Master class at the end of the year, with a group of companies and a transnational network of universities with research departments on renewable energy technologies

#### Long term action (2016)

- EIP Water AG EWW will organize a follow-up of above Actions during the Annual EIP conference in the Netherlands (Leeuwarden) Feb 2016

#### Peter Scheijgrond points out the work of the EIP AG EWW also closely ties in and builds on existing EC initiatives and projects, such as

- **EC [Ocean Energy Forum in the Environment & Consenting Steering Committee](#)**, with the objective to promote and facilitate planning and regulatory processes across Member States that are fair, appropriate to the sector and with established commonality, to enhance an attractive EU market for ocean energy.
- **H2020 funded [RiCORE project](#)**, with the objective to establish a risk-based approach to consenting where the level of survey requirement is based on the environmental sensitivity of the site, the risk profile of the technology and the scale of the proposed project.

#### **AG 6 : Knowledge Alliance of the Pro-Tide project**

One of the EIP Water AG EWW projects Pro-tide is looking for ways to embed the know-how developed by Pro-tide in a new knowledge exchange platform. Expected role: 1x year a conference/dissemination activity that includes Pro-Tide results.

Various suggestions are made for this new platform or network such as EIP AG, Ocean Energy Europe, DMEC and as an observer to new funded project (e.g. Interreg 2SEAS). Note: make sure that the platform serves an international interest (i.e. not only Dutch partners)

#### **AG 7: the Water Innovation Day at the World Expo Milan (17th September 2015)<sup>i</sup>**

##### **Question**

- Ine Neven (Regional Government PZH) asks Pavel Misiga to participate in a Dutch Dialogue on the governance of innovation: better regulation for better results. This Dialogue takes place on the Water Innovation Day at the World Expo Milan (17th September 2015). She also asks if there is an Italian representative from EIP Water?
- As the EIP Water is set up to initiate and promote public-private partnerships for change and innovation in the water sector, to solve the great societal challenges of the EU 2020 strategy, the dialogue on the governance of innovation, will build on to the work of the EIP Water Action Group working on the Water-Energy-Nexus (test case: better regulation for better results)
- The intent is to find a joint integrated multi-level frame on the governance of innovation in order to speed up the implementation processes of gross-over- projects and demonstration sites" and integrated developments in Deltas. The dialogue will be a first step to further mutual understanding, speaking the same language and finding joint action in dealing with the issues of the governance of innovation and above all, better regulations for better results
- The dialogue in the morning, will be followed by a Dutch dialogue in the afternoon about Water Innovation as the engine for economic developments in the Netherlands and a Dutch Network Event in the evening at the Expo-terrain.

**Answer**

- Pavel Misiga is pleased to be asked to be involved in the water innovation day. He will ask Ms Marianne Wennink (DG Environment: directorate Quality of LIFE, Water & Air) to accept the invitation and take part in the dialogue, as speaker and/or as participant in the dialogue. Mr. Pavel Misiga promises that if she cannot he himself or another colleague will participate.
- Guido Schmidt will check if the Italian EIP Water representative (Task force; Puglia Region) is willing to attend the Dutch Dialogue: He will check and sends the contact data to Ine

CLOSE OF MEETING

## List of Participants

Organisation	Name	EIP member
European Union	Pavel Misiga	European commission
EIP Water	Eef Leeuw	EIP Water
EIP Water Secretariat	Guido Schmidt	EIP Water
Tocado International BV	Hans van Breugel	EIP AG EWW Chairman
EIP Secretariat / MET-support	Peter Scheijgrond	EIP AG EWW secretariat
Province South Holland	Ine Neven	EIP member
Province South Holland	Zjef Ambagts	EIP member
Province South Holland/Resourcefully	Hugo Niesing	EIP member
IMIEU	Frank Neumann	EIP member
Tidal Testing Centre	Pieter Bergmeijer	EIP member
Antea Group	Wim Kloezen	EIP member
REDstackBV	Rik Siebers	EIP member
Province of Zeeland	Ilse Deurwaarder	EIP member
Schottel Hydro	Marnix Mulder	Observer
Price Waterhouse Cooper	Britta Schaffmeister	Observer
BT-projects/DNAC	Ferdinand Dees	Observer
BT Projects	Menno Broers	Observer
Green ID NL BV	Jonathan Ivan Ramirez Gutierrez	Observer
Chamber of Commerce	Matilde Masciulli	Observer
Utrecht University	Sander van Hees	Observer
EIE Bretagne	Stephane Peyhorgue	Observer
De Ruimte Advies	André Oldenkamp	Observer

---

### Background to the Action Group Energy Water Works (EWW)

The Action Group EWW was established early 2014 under the umbrella of the European Innovation Partnership (EIP) Water. Its main goal is to enhance European interest in the innovative crossovers between energy and water in the development of policy, markets and knowledge, and to further the relevant industrial policies. The Action Group envisages joining forces to look at feasible solutions for water challenges by means of innovative multifunctional concepts and exclusive new technologies. The Action Group consists of renowned experts in the field representing over 15 industrial, governmental and academic partners across 5 European member states.

**Members:** European Marine Energy Centre –Provinces of South Holland, North Holland, Zeeland – Council of Orkney – Tidal Testing Centre NL – Arcadis – Tocardo – WavEC - IMIEU – AnteaGroup – Erasmus University of Rotterdam – Deltares – PWC – MET-support — Marine Energies France – Wetsus/RED Stack – Rabobank - IT Power DNV – EnergyValley

---

<sup>i</sup> The World Expo Milano 2015 will be held from May 1 to October 31 2015. It forms the world-décor for 145 countries and a multitude of organizations dealing with the great challenges of [climate change](#), [energy](#), [food-security and water](#). In the week of 14-20 September the Dutch Region Randstad organizes Dutch Dialogues on the themes: Greenport's (14<sup>th</sup>); energy and warmth (15<sup>th</sup>), [WATER](#) (17<sup>th</sup>) and economy/international (18<sup>th</sup>), to show to be a sustainable competitive and liveable European Top Region. Efforts are put into an integrated approach on behalf of speeding up the transition to a Water – and Energy Efficient Society and a New Economy. [SHARE](#), [GROW](#) and [LIVE](#) are the key-messages of the World Expo and the Dutch week as well. During the country weeks several international Matchmaking-meetings will be organized.