# Roadshow: Build your financial capacity

**Co-organized with** 



# FINANCIAL CASE STUDY - 'FINANCIAL CASE STUDY - Quantifying multiple benefits: Exploring how to improve decision-making by considering long-term impact investment' 1st Training session ONLINE, 5 July 2024



#### LEGAL NOTICE

This document has been prepared for the European Commission. It reflects the views only of the authors, contracted by the Scalable Cities Secretariat. The Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

# **Table of contents**

1.	Introduction
1.1.	What is Scalable Cities
1.2.	What is the Roadshow: Build your financial capacity?
1.3.	Agenda 4
2.	Glossary
3.	Financial data from Gnice District: A comparison between BAU and SPEN approach7
4. SPEN app	Financial data from Gnice District using the MBx.tool: A comparison between BAU and proach
5.	Guiding questions for the Training session

# 1. Introduction

By harnessing digital technology, data analytics, and connectivity, <u>cities</u> can optimize resource use, enhance energy efficiency, reduce emissions, and foster sustainable practices. Smart infrastructure, from energy-efficient buildings to efficient transportation networks, enables local administrations to meet their green goals.

A Smart City empowers local governments to utilize data-driven decision-making, engage citizens through co-creation processes, comprehend financial needs for implementing innovative financing models, nurture a collaborative stakeholders' ecosystem, and include vulnerable groups and deprived areas to align with EU sustainability goals. In this context, financial insights are indispensable within the local administration, playing a vital role in transforming cities into sustainable, green hubs of the future. It represents a wholehearted commitment to the journey towards a climate-neutral Europe by 2050.

Local administrations are crucial for the success of the <u>EU Taxonomy</u>, and the <u>New Green Deal</u> due to their role in implementing green initiatives at the city and regional levels. They require financial skills to secure funds, manage budgets, attract investments, ensure compliance, foster innovation, and drive local economic growth in alignment with the <u>EU's sustainability objectives</u>. Local governments are the bridge between <u>European sustainability policies</u> and tangible projects, making their financial expertise vital for translating these initiatives into actionable, green solutions that benefit both the community and the environment.

# **1.1. What is Scalable Cities**

<u>Scalable Cities</u> is a community of communities. Since 2014, a total of 20 European projects have been funded in which lighthouse cities and fellow cities have committed to developing innovative projects to achieve climate neutrality. The key idea has been to develop innovative energy solutions and business models that can be scaled up and replicated across Europe and lead to measurable results. In this sense, public administrations have been invited to take an active part in the energy transition by taking a proactive role in both designing innovative services and addressing the local market.



Scalable Cities has a Secretariat that supports all these Smart Cities communities to collect and document all the knowledge and experiences developed, as well as to provide support through different services.



**Some of the technical solutions** developed by the cities that are part of Scalable Cities are the following:

- Computing and cognitive solutions, providing applications or services enabling behavioural changes for citizens.
- Data-Driven business models enableing cities or operators to manage energy efficiency better.
- Deployment of charging infrastructure for electric vehicles.
- District heating.
- Electric/hybrid public vehicle purchases.
- Energy management (district/blocks/ buildings/Demand/response) using technologies such as AI, microgrid, blockchain or others.
- Energy storage.
- Frugal solutions: it is an approach that involves using ingenuity to innovate thr most simply and effectively possible using the least amount of resources.
- Industrial heat production.
- Infrastructure physical and digital.
- Mobility stations.
- New buildings.
- New public transport infrastructures.
- Park & ride facilities.
- Positive Energy Blocks or Positive Energy Districts.
- Private buildings retrofitting.
- Public buildings retrofitting.
- Public lighting.
- Renewable energy production.
- Renewable energy thermal production.
- Vehicle Sharing Platforms (carpooling, sharing).
- Bundling services, grouping a set of actions in a coherent and global business model. E.g. combining retrofitting with renewables and EV charging stations.
- Others.

# 1.2. What is the Roadshow: Build your financial capacity?

The <u>Roadshow is a service offered by the Scalable Cities Secretariat</u>to support cities in the field of financial design of projects such as business model, financial schemes and everything that unfolds from it. With this objective, a series of activities will be carried out through which basic and advanced skills on finance will be acquired, to have resources with which to think and design economically sustainable and scalable urban projects to achieve climate neutrality.



# 1.3. Agenda

### 1st training session 'FINANCIAL CASE STUDY - Quantifying multiple benefits: Exploring how to improve decision-making by considering long-term impact investment'

Introduction	
9:00 - 9:05	Introduction of Scalable Cities and Smart Cities and Comunities projects. Paula Ferrando, GNE Finance.
9:05 - 9:15	Introduction of The Synkia project. Niki Gaitani, NTNU
9:15 – 9:45	Explanation of the pilot SPEN project in the Gnice District in Salzburg. Understanding the business model and financial structure developed under the Synikia project. Abel Magyar ABUD.
9:45 - 10:15	Introduction to the MBx Web Tool, developed within the Synikia project, which can quantify multiple benefits using the SCBA (Social Cost-Benefit Analysis) methodology. Victoria Taranu, BPIE. You will be able to use the tool!
5 minutes break!	
10:20 - 10:30	Explanation of the exercise: How the Business Model is influenced and modified by incorporating economic data and the methodology provided by the MBx tool? Paula Ferrando and Victoria Taranu.
10:30 - 11:15	Breakout sessions: Groups will work on the Financial Model and Business Model of the Gnice District using calculations from the MBx tool. Participants will reflect on and discuss how the model changes, what is affected, and who is impacted. Discussion on the feasibility of adopting this tool and perspective in our financial models.
11:15 - 11:30	Summary of discussions from each group, highlighting common points and diferences.
11:30 - 12:00	Q&A and open discussion (if needed)

Synikia web site: <a href="https://www.synikia.eu/">https://www.synikia.eu/</a>

Direct link to the Technical reports: https://www.synikia.eu/resource-types/technical-reports/

#### Atention!

This document serves as supporting material for the Training Session segment. To fully understand the content, participation in the session is required, as the Case Study will be explained in detail along with the data gathered in this document.

# 2. Glossary

**Sustainable Positive Energy Neigbourhood (SPEN):** As defined in the syn.ikia's evaluation framework, a Sustainable Plus Energy Neighbourhood is a highly energy efficient and energy flexible neighbourhood with a surplus of energy from renewable sources (Salom et al., 2021). The syn.ikia definition of a SPEN is similar to that for a positive energy building, but the geographical boundary is physically or digitally expanded to take in the entire neighbourhood, including local storage and energy supply units. Users, buildings and technical systems are all connected via a digital cloud hub and/or common energy infrastructures. The SPEN framework includes a strong focus on cost efficiency, indoor environmental quality, spatial qualities, sustainable behaviour, occupant satisfaction, social factors (co-use, shared services and infrastructure, and community engagement), power performance (peak shaving, flexibility and self-consumption), and greenhouse gas emissions. To know more please read de deliverable "*Mainstreaming the neighbourhood approach into EU building policies*"

**Multiple-Benefits:** The EPBD includes an explicit mention of 'integrated district or neighbourhood approaches'. Multiple benefits of this approach are listed, such as cost-effectiveness and integration with the energy, mobility, green infrastructure, waste and water treatment and other aspects of urban planning which take into account local and regional resources, circularity and sufficiency. For a comprehensive appraisal of the multiple benefits of SPENs, they should be identified, quantified and monetised. For this it is necessary go further thought three steps: : 1) identifying the key benefits and the stakeholders who will accrue these benefits; 2) quantifying the identified benefits; and 3) translating the quantified benefits into monetary values. To know more please read de deliverable "*Multiple benefits of sustainable plus energy neighbourhoods and their potential impact on policy and investment decisions*"

**Social Cost Benefiit Analysis (S-CBA):** S-CBA is an application of welfare economics principles to normative questions around investment choices. It is based on the assessment of changes in welfare benefits and costs, expressing them all in the common currency of monetary values to calculate the net effect on the total economic wellbeing of society. Welfare effects are changes in health and wellbeing, which, measured in economic terms as producer surplus (increases in the profitability of production) and consumer surplus resulting from the expansion of people's consumption possibilities. This includes their access to services, publicly provided non-market goods and natural environment services, such as the air and water quality, access to nature and general amenity infrastructure. 'The broad purpose of S-CBA is to help social decision-making and to increase the social value or, more technically, to improve allocative efficiency'. To know more please read de deliverable "A methodology report on the required calculations for the quantification and monetisation of multiple benefits" (attached with the email)

**Project costs present value:** This refers to the current value of all costs associated with a project, adjusted for the time value of money. It calculates what all future costs would be worth in today's dollars. Units: Currency (e.g., dollars, euros).

**Government impacts:** Effects of a project on government finances, such as tax revenues, subsidies, or costs incurred by government agencies. Units: Currency (e.g., dollars, euros).

**Wider monetized societal impacts:** This refers to the broader societal impacts of a project that can be quantified and expressed in monetary terms. These may include economic benefits or costs that affect society at large beyond direct project participants. Units: Currency (e.g., dollars, euros).

**Net present value (NPV):** The difference between the present value of cash inflows and outflows over a project's life. It indicates the project's profitability. The present value is calculated by estimating the timing and amount of future cash flows to be discounted at a rate reflecting project cost of capital or the returns available on alternative investments of comparable risk. If the NPV of a project or investment is positive, it means its rate of return is higher than the discount rate. Units: Currency (e.g., dollars, euros).

**Un-monetized impacts:** Impacts of a project that are difficult to quantify in monetary terms, such as biodiversity loss, cultural heritage preservation, etc. Units: Often non-monetary (e.g., species diversity indices, cultural significance scales).

**Benefit cost ratio:** A ratio of the present value of project benefits to the present value of its costs. It indicates the project's efficiency and profitability. A BCR greater than 1 indicates that the benefits outweigh the costs, making the project financially viable . Units: Dimensionless (ratio).

**Return on Investment (ROI):** A measure of the gain or loss generated relative to the amount invested. It is typically expressed as a percentage. Units: Percentage (%).

**Marginal Impact of intervention:** The additional impact on outcomes (e.g., economic, social) caused by a specific intervention or project. Units: Varies depending on the specific outcome being measured (e.g., units of GDP growth, percentage change in employment).

# 3. Financial data from Gnice District: A comparison between BAU and SPEN approach.

Scenario: Business	Scenario: SPEN								
(situation if the in									
The neighbourhood has	Neighbourhood approach in community aiming to								
design and planning wit	th no or vei	ry limite	d	optimize energy use through renovation and work					
shared facilities or serv	ices to the	comm	unity	together with residents to set up a self-sufficient					
				energy community. The premises will also include					
	facilities such as a kindergarten, clinic, café, co-								
				working spaces, common rooms and special					
				assistance rooms. Provide outdoor green spaces with					
				walking and cycling infrastructure.					
SCENARIO TO BE ENTE	RED IN TO	OL		SCENARIO AL	READY E	NTERED A	AS USE CA	SE	
			INITIAT	IVE DETAILS					
Country: Austria				Country: Aust	ria				
Initiative title: 250 socia	al housing o	dwelling	gs	Initiative title:	SPEN wit	h 250 soc	ial housir	ng dwellin	gs
Initiative description: D	evelopmen	t 250		Initiative desc	ription: D	evelopme	nt of new l	ouilt 250	
independent social housing dwellings (new built)				social housing	dwellings	with share	ed facilities	and	
				infrastructure.					
		Т	IME-PERI	OD FOR S-CBA	١				
Discount rate: 4%			Discount rate	: 4%					
Timeline: apply same discount rate to complete			Timeline: app	ly same d	iscount ra	ate to com	nplete		
timeline				timeline					
Time period of multiple benefits calculation: 50				Time period o	f multiple	benefits	calculatio	on: 50 yea	rs
years	· · · ·								
Output units for financi	al calculat	tion: €m	illions	Output units f	or financi	al calcula	ation: €mi	llions	
First Grandin Langer of in			IIVE IN H	ERVENTION GF	OUP		0004		
First financial year of in	vestment:	2024		First financial	year of in	vestment	: 2024		
Analysis unit (beneficia	ries): Dwel	lling uni	ts	Analysis unit (beneficiaries): Dwelling units					
Dwelling size is assumed	a to nave a	SIZE OT 4	4	Dwelling size is assumed to nave a size of 4 members.					
members. Inerefore, a t	otal of 100	u innabi	tants	intererore, a total of 1000 minapitants (30% senior					
(30% senior citizens, 40	% adults al	na 30%		chizens, 40% adults and 30% Children)					
children)		Internetice descriptions by the State of							
intervention description: improve energy			achievention description: improve community living of						
Enciency and indoor air quality of buildings			Financial year and ing 21.02.2004						
Timeline, heneficieries intervened annually			Timeline, beneficierize intervened enquelly:						
mineune- perienciaries		annua		Timeune- Den	enciaries		a annuali	y.	
2024	2025	2026	2027		2024	2025	2026	2027	

No. of households	-	80	80	90	No. of households	-	80	80	90		
				00							
Canital exper	nditure: 😭	73 5 millio	over	Canital expen	diture: 😭	75million	(spent ov	or first 3			
first 3 years)				Capital expenditure: €/5million (spent over first 3							
Operating expenditure: £80,000 per appum					Operating expenditure: £40,000 per ensure						
Consumer Pr	ice Index.	country c	lefault		Consumer Pri	ce Index:	country (	hefault			
Gross Domes	stic Produ	ct. countr	v default		Gross Domes	tic Produe	ct: countr	v default			
		ot. oounti	y dorada	•			ot. oound	y dolddad			
There are like	ly to he lir	mited imn	acts fron	n this	There are likel	v to he m	anv imna	cts result	ing from		
project:		intou inip			this project, m	nore for se	nciety and	d the gove	ernment		
projecti					widely.		o oroty and				
1.Increase ir	n health a	nd well-b	eing (red	luced							
inpatient hos	pital visits	s. reduced	I GP visit	s)-	1.Increase in	health a	nd well-b	eing (red	uced		
apply impact	s based o	n age grou	q	,	inpatient hosp	oital visits	, reduced	d GP visits	s, improve	ed	
		00			quality of life,	physical	health ga	in from w	alking and	t	
Reduced inpa	atient hos	pital visits	<u>}</u>		cycling)- apply	y impacts	based or	n age grou	ıp –		
Senior citize	n-										
pre-intervent	ion level:4	4			Reduced inpatient hospital visits						
post-interver	ntion level	:2			Senior citizen-						
Evidence qua	ality: High				pre-intervention level:4						
Timelag: 1					post-intervention level:2						
Length of imp	pact: 20				Evidence qua	lity: High					
Segment of in	nterventio	n group: 3	<b>80</b> %		Timelag: 1						
Success rate	: 90%				Length of imp	act: 20					
					Segment of in	terventio	n group: 3	30%			
Adults-					Success rate:	90%					
pre-intervent	ion level:4	4									
post-interver	ition level:	:2			Adults-						
Evidence qua	ality: High				pre-interventi	on level:4					
Timetag: 1	t. 10				post-intervent	lion level:	:2				
Length of Imp	Dact: 40	n group. A	004		Timelag: 1						
Segment of Ir		n group: 4	U%0		Length of impact: 10						
Successifate	. 90%				Segment of intervention group: 40%						
Children-					Suggestion of Intervention group: 40%						
pre-intervent	ion level.	1			Success face.	3070					
nost-interven	tion level	+ •?			Children-						
Evidence qua	ality: High	••			pre-intervention level:4						
Timelag 1					post-intervention level:2						
Length of impact: 50					Evidence quality: High						
Segment of intervention group: 30%					Timelag: 1						
Success rate: 90%				Length of imp	act: 50						
				Segment of intervention group: 30%							
Reduced GP	<u>visits</u>				Success rate:	90%	-				
GP visits (go	vernment	t contribu	tion)								
pre-intervention level:5					Reduced GP v	<u>visits</u>					
post-interver	ntion level:	:4			GP visits (government contribution)						

Evidence quality: Medium	pre-intervention level:5
Timelag: 1	post-intervention level:4
Length of impact: 25	Evidence quality: Medium
Segment of intervention group: 80%	Timelag: 1
Success rate: 90%	Length of impact: 25
	Segment of intervention group: 80%
GP visits (patient-copayment)	Success rate: 90%
pre-intervention level:5	
post-intervention level:4	GP visits (patient-copayment)
Evidence quality: Medium	pre-intervention level:5
Timelag: 1	post-intervention level:4
Length of impact: 25	Evidence quality: Medium
Segment of intervention group: 80%	Timelag: 1
Success rate: 90%	Length of impact: 25
	Segment of intervention group: 80%
2.Reduction in energy poverty (increase in	Success rate: 90%
disposable income due to energy efficiency)	
	Physical health gain from walking
All residents-	All residents-
pre-intervention level:0	pre-intervention level:0
post-intervention level:1	post-intervention level:1
Evidence quality: Medium	Evidence quality: High
Timelag: 1	Timelag: 1
Length of impact: 50	Length of impact: 50
Segment of intervention group: 70%	Segment of intervention group: 90%
Success rate: 60%	Success rate: 90%
	Physical health gain from cycling
	All residents-
	pre-intervention level:0
	post-intervention level:1
	Evidence quality: High
	Timelag: 1
	Length of impact: 50
	Segment of intervention group: 80%
	Success rate: 90%
	Health and quality life gain (Quality-adjusted life year)
	Adults-
	pre-intervention level:0
	post-intervention level:0.03
	Evidence quality: High
	Timelag: 1
	Length of impact: 40
	Segment of intervention group: 50%
	Success rate: 95%
	Children-



	pre-intervention level:0				
	post-intervention level:0.09				
	Evidence quality: High				
	Timelag: 1				
	Length of impact: 50				
	Segment of intervention group: 30%				
	Success rate: 95%				
	2 Reduction in energy poverty (increase in				
	disposable income due to energy efficiency)				
	disposable income due to energy enciency)				
	All residents-				
	pre-intervention level:0				
	post-intervention level:1				
	Evidence quality: Medium				
	Timelag: 1				
	Length of impact: 50				
	Segment of intervention group: 70%				
	Success rate: 90%				
OUTPL	JT RESULTS				
Check results and compare	Check results and compare				
Benefit- cost ratio	Benefit- cost ratio				
Return-on-investment	Return-on-investment				

# 4. Financial data from Gnice District using the MBx.tool: A comparison between BAU and SPEN approach.

Description of case / scenario

Base	Gnice Pilot project. Scenario: Business-as-usual.
Best case	Gnice Pilot project. Scenario: SPEN.

# Return on Investment on 50 years

	Base	Best case
Project costs present value i.e. Investment *	-69.7	-68.87
Government impacts *	26.58	26.04
Wider societal impacts *	1.23	47.87
Total societal impacts, net present value *	-41.9	5.04
Un-monetized impacts		
Benefit cost ratio, Wider-societal Total	0.4	1.07
Return on Investment, Wider-societal Total	0.4	1.07
Benefit cost ratio, Wider-societal only	0.02	0.7
Benefit cost ratio, Government only	0.38	0.38

\* €million



## **Impacts Summary**

	Base	Best case
Inpatient hospital visit reduce	8.98	8.98
Inpatient hospital visit reduce (2)	9.53	9.3
Inpatient hospital visit reduce (3)	7.92	7.61
GP visits - Publicly funded (institution contribution) reduce	0.15	0.14
GP visits - Privately funded (patient co-payment) reduce	0.12	0.11
Increase in disposable income due to energy efficiency (reduction in energy poverty)	1.11	1.07
Health and Quality life gains (Quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained)	0	5.79
Health and Quality life gains (Quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained) (1)	0	2.95
Physical health gain from cycling	0	4.14
Physical health gain from walking	0	31.67
Health and Quality life gains (Quality-adjusted life year (QALY) gained) (2)	0	2.16





# 5. Guiding questions for the Training session

#### **Specific Financial Analysis Questions**

#### 1. Costs and Benefits:

- a) How do the investment costs compare between BAU and SPEN?
- b) How do the operation and maintenance costs compare between BAU and SPEN?
- c) What types of long-term benefits are expected under the SPEN approach that would not be considered under the BAU?

#### **Impact and Sustainability Questions**

### 2. Social Impact:

a) How does SPEN compare to BAU scenario in terms of social impacts?

### **Comparison and Conclusion Questions**

### 3. Final Comparison:

- a) What are the key differences in financial outcomes between BAU and SPEN?
- b) Which approach provides a greater long-term economic return and why?
- c) How do we use social cost benefit analysis to compare BAU and SPENs? What lessons can be learned from this comparison for future projects?

#### 4. Recommendations:

- a) Which approach would you recommend for similar future projects and why?
- b) What changes or improvements do you suggest to maximize economic benefits in future projects?
- c) Who are the potential users of the MBx tool?
- d) What is your feedback on using the tool?