

Energy Savings from Ecodesign and **Energy Labelling** in the Nordics

1

Contents

FOREWORD

The Nordic countries share a vision of becoming the most sustainable and integrated region in the world. Achieving this vision relies on energy efficiency, technological advancements, and behavioral change.

Efficient energy use is a key factor in the success of the Nordic countries' energy systems, which have significantly reduced greenhouse gas emissions. Nordic collaboration on energy will continue to prioritise energy efficiency. By leveraging advanced technology and promoting behavioral changes, energy consumption across households, businesses, and various sectors will be minimised, further supporting sustainable practices.

Nordic cooperation on energy is strengthened by joint efforts on EU/EEA regulations for ecodesign and energy labeling. It's vital to ensure Nordic conditions, especially for key products like heat pumps, are considered in EU regulations due to the region's unique climate and industries.

EU regulations are estimated to have reduced primary energy use by around 10%, delivering significant climate and environmental benefits. The total electricity savings are nearly equivalent to the EU's entire hydro or wind energy production. However, these studies lack a breakdown of savings at the member state level, making it challenging for individual countries to conduct cost-benefit analyses of their national implementation of EU policies or to consider additional national energy-efficiency measures.

To address this gap, Nordic Energy Research and Nordsyn (a working group under the Nordic Council of Ministers) commissioned this report, providing updated estimates of energy savings from ecodesign and energy labeling in the Nordic countries.

The results of a survey are offering valuable insights into the sources used for room heating and cooling, as well as the methods employed for water heating.

Enjoy your reading.

Klaus Skytte CEO Nordic Energy Research

1. SUMMARY

In this project, the Nordcrawl tool was updated to calculate the latest savings from ecodesign and energy labelling policies in the Nordic countries, providing a current 'snapshot' calculation. Two calculation methods were used, and both were implemented on the online platform Nordcrawl, where assumptions and input data can be changed to produce alternative calculations.

In the top-down method, the estimated EU savings from the 2023 Ecodesign Impact Accounting (EIA) report were scaled down for the Nordic countries using updated, product-specific scales. In the bottom-up method, savings were calculated using the latest sales data, including from the new, rescaled energy labels introduced in 2021.

The study shows continued large savings from ecodesign and energy labelling in the Nordic countries. The updated top-down calculations estimate yearly primary energy savings in 2030 (with final energy savings in parentheses) of approximately the following:

Denmark: 27.52 TWh/year (16.34) Sweden: 51.01 TWh/year (25.85) Norway: 35.50 TWh/year (17.42) Finland: 41.58 TWh/year (24.07) Iceland: 1.93 TWh/year (0.97)

2. INTRODUCTION

Ecodesign and energy-labelling requirements for energy-related products are crucial components of the EU's energy and resource-efficiency policies. Studies have demonstrated that these policies deliver significant energy savings, with the Ecodesign Impact Accounting (EIA)^[1] reports estimating 10% energy savings across the EU in 2020 compared to a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario and savings of 18% in 2030. However, these EU-level studies do not provide a breakdown of the savings at the member state level, which makes it difficult for countries to conduct cost-benefit analyses of their national implementation of the EU policies or to consider complementary national energy-efficiency measures.

This project, initiated by Nordsyn and funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers, aims to enhance the Nordcrawl tool to provide updated estimates of the energy savings from ecodesign and energy labelling in the Nordic countries. Nordsyn collaborates with the agencies responsible for policy and market surveillance related to ecodesign and energy labelling in the Nordic region. Kasper Mogensen, a consultant at Big2Great ApS, conducted the project.

One new aspect of this project, inspired by the ElmodelBolig survey, was conducting a survey to obtain better data. Nordstat administered the survey in Finland and Norway, and it had 1,025 participants in representative groups. The survey, originally in English, was translated into the local languages and included questions on background information, heating, water heating, and ventilation. The results were weighted to ensure representativeness.

The key updates in this version include the use of the latest 2023 EIA data; conversion to the new, rescaled energy labels; improved downscaling factors; and updated assumptions and results based on the most recent available data, including insights from the survey. The online tool makes it easy to modify the input data and assumptions, enabling future updates as better information becomes available.

This report outlines the updated methods used in the top-down and bottom-up models and provides a current snapshot of the results for each of the five Nordic countries.

^{1.} European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy, Ecodesign Impact Accounting. Overview Report 2023 -Overview and status report, Publications Office of the European Union, 2024, (p12)

3. METHODS

3.1 Method: Scaling of ecodesign savings from EU level to the Nordic countries

The method for calculating the ecodesign savings for each country by scaling down EU savings is quite simple. As shown in the equation below, country savings are calculated by multiplying the EU savings with a country- and product group-specific downscaling factor. All relevant scales, references, and specific assumptions appear in the notes on the scaledown module at Nordcrawl.org.

Country savings = *EU savings* ∗ *downscaling factor*

3.1.1 Top-down: Choosing between scaling factors

When choosing a feasible scaling factor, the question to answer is the following: **How much of the total EU savings does this country account for?** In the following, I explain the factors that must be considered to answer this question.

First, we must examine the generic/basic equation for a scaling factor – the energy share – assuming that the savings are proportional to the energy consumption:

Scaling factor = *EU consumption Country consumption*

where the consumption $^{[2]}$ is calculated by:

Consumption = *standard consumption per appliance in stock* ∗ *stock* ∗ *usage*

This equation shows that the three factors to consider are the stock, usage, and consumption per appliance in the stock. In many cases, at least one of these factors is the same for the EU as for the specific country, and in that case, it should not be considered because it does not add additional information to the scaling.

The stock of products compared to EU/market penetration

The first question concerns a specific country's share of the EU stock. For example, if a country accounts for 5% of the EU stock, and the usage of the product is the same in all countries, then the scaling factor should be 5% (0.05).

^{2.} It should be noted that the "consumption per appliances in stock" may not be the same for the EU stock as in the specific country. If the stock of appliances in a country is newer or more expensive it might use less energy than The EU average and vice versa.

In many cases, we do not know the actual stock. Still, the stock and usage can be substituted with another factor, such as 'number of houses' (like all houses have one unit of this product) or economic factors such as 'GDP', 'energy consumption', or 'electricity consumption'. For those cases, a scaling factor is chosen based on a substitute factor. For instance, transformers are correlated with electricity consumption.

Usage

If a product's usage differs from the EU average, this should be reflected in the scaling factor. For example, the usage of heating products is higher in the Nordic countries than the EU average. This can be corrected by using heating degree days^[3] in the scaling factor.

Consumption per appliance in stock

The real question here is whether the appliances in one country are more efficient than the EU average and, if so, whether their greater efficiency is a result of EU policy or other factors. The 'consumption per appliance in stock' should only be considered when setting the scaling factor when other factors are known to cause the additional efficiency.

3.1.2 Data

EU savings

Data for the ecodesign savings comes from the 2023 EIA annual report, which VHK prepared for the European Commission. The report describes how the impact accounting is calculated as follows:

The projections in EIA are taken from the impact assessment reports, integrated with data from preparatory- and review-studies where necessary. These projections are the result of various years of study and have been discussed with stakeholders (see inputdata verification above). They consider e.g. the historical and ongoing trends, the expectations from manufacturers, boundary conditions from EU policy, climate change effects, changes in EU population and households, trends in new-building and renovation, changes in user-demand (more comfort, larger displays and fridges, more light sources, rebound effects), and expected energy efficiency developments. Where the projection in the underlying studies does not cover the entire accounting period up to 2050, EIA extrapolates the existing trends without assuming any new measures, i.e. it is not in the scope of EIA to develop new policies. Projections use two scenarios:

- A 'business-as-usual' (BAU) scenario, which represents what was perceived to be the baseline without measures at the time of the (first) decision making, and
- An ECO scenario that is derived from the policy scenario in the studies which comes closest to the most recent measures taken, adapted to the final published regulation where necessary and possible.

^{3.} Heating degree days (HDD) are a measure of how cold the temperature was on a given day or during a period of days.

The differences in outcomes between the two scenarios are presented in EIA as 'savings' due to the policy measures. EIA takes into account product interactions, e.g. between ventilation units and space heating, the comments from the European Court of Auditors [12], and corrects for double counting in ^a transparent manner [13]. The EIA methodology is explained in detail in chapter 2 of the Status report.^[4]

Scaling factor input

Input for the scaling factor highly depends on the data sources available for a specific country. The most common data sources are the following:

- Eurostat
- Odyssee-Mure database \bullet
- National statistics ϵ
- National report (such as a report on data centres in Norway)
- Stock calculated in the bottom-up model \bullet
- Stock from the EIA report

^{4.} European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy, Ecodesign Impact Accounting Overview Report 2023 – Overview and status report, Publications Office of the European Union, 2024, (p. 11)

Table 1: Sources

Preferably, the data for the scaling should be from between 2010 and 2020.

^{5.} https://statice.is/ 6. Energibruk fra datasentre i Norge – NVE 2019 - Energiavdelingen - Jarand Hole og Hallgeir Horne http://publikasjoner.nve.no/faktaark/2019/faktaark2019_13.pdf

3.1.3 Survey

To improve the accuracy of the downscaling factors used in the top-down model, a survey inspired by the Danish ElmodelBolig survey was conducted in households in Finland and Norway. This survey aimed to gather more representative data on heating, water heating, and ventilation systems in these countries. Denmark was not included because data from previous surveys already existed; Iceland was too small to include, and Sweden had another approach and data sources.

Nordstat administered the survey, targeting a representative sample of 1025 respondents in each country. The questionnaire, originally in English, was translated into the local languages to ensure better understanding and response quality. The survey covered background information and specific questions related to heating, water heating, and ventilation systems in households.

The results were weighted to ensure that they accurately represented the population in each country. The data collected from this survey provided valuable insights into the primary heating sources, water-heating methods, and the use of heat pumps for cooling during summer. This information was then used to refine the downscaling factors in the top-down model, leading to more precise estimations of energy savings from ecodesign and energy-labelling policies in the Nordic countries.

The table below presents a comparison of the survey results for Finland and Norway, data from Denmark from the Danish ElmodelBolig Survey, and data for Iceland obtained from other sources.

Table 3: Primary water heating

3.1.4 Energy types

The model considers the following 'types' of energy:

Primary energy

Primary energy is determined as follows: ' only electricity' * primary energy factor for electricity ⁺ 'only fuel'. The primary energy factor for electricity was 2.5 and was adjusted to 2.1 in 2018 through the Energy Efficiency Directive (2018/2002). The primary energy factor can be changed for each country in the system.

Only electricity \bullet

The savings in electricity.

Only fuel \bullet

Savings in fuels such as oil, gas, and wood.

Final energy The total savings in the final energy is 'only electricity' + 'only fuel'.

In some cases, it might be necessary to exclude 'only electricity' or 'only fuel' if there are no savings in the energy type in the country. For example, if the water is always heated by electricity and never by fuel, then 'only fuel' should be excluded.

9. ElmodelBolig DK 2022, Elmodelbolig.dk

10. Assumed based on: Sveinbjorn Bjornsson, Geothermal Development and Research in Iceland (Ed. Helga Bardadottir. Reykjavik: Gudjon O, 2006)

3.2 Bottom-up method

The bottom-up models require sales data and the distribution of sales across energy classes. The model was used for product groups for which these data were available: refrigerator, refrigerator/freezer, freezer (chest), freezer (upright), washing machine, dishwasher, and tumble dryer.

3.2.1 Background

The bottom-up method is based on an Excel bottom-up model developed for Sweden and Denmark. The new model was developed as an online tool on the NordCrawl platform and is based on the old model's method, which was updated to accommodate all Nordic countries and new requirements, such as rescaling energy labels (in March 2021).

The bottom-up tool's methodological basis is the Danish bottom-up stock model ELMODEL – domestic (Fjordbak Larsen et al. 2003).

The tool's basic equation is as follows:

Figure 1: ElmodelBolig – domestic equation

The energy savings of the ecodesign and energy-labelling regulations were estimated by comparing the energy use of a product group in a baseline scenario (without regulations, or BAU) with the energy use of the product group in a policy scenario (with the effect of the regulations).

Figure 2: Example of baseline and scenario consumption

3.2.2 The two scenarios

Ideally, the estimations would be based on data for the stock of appliances in the households by energy class, as shown in Figure 3. Detailed data of this kind are not collected in any Nordic country for any product groups. Attempts have been made to use surveys to collect this type of data in Denmark^[11] and Norway, but respondents have been unsure about the energy class to which their products belong. Instead, the model uses sales data by energy class and simulates the stock using a normal-distribution assumption for the lifetime of the appliances. Multiple years of sales will then make up the total stock.

The next step in the model is to calculate a projection of the sales and the stock. For the baseline scenario, this is done as a simple forecast of the total sales (e.g., linear trend) and an assumed natural development in the sales distribution on energy classes.

With these inputs, the stock per energy class in a given year can be calculated as the sum of all sales until then that survived according to the lifespan distribution; see Figure 3. The figure illustrates how the lower energy classes are phased out, while the higher energy classes comprise larger shares of the stock.

A policy scenario parallel to the baseline scenario is used to estimate the effects of ecodesign (minimum energy performance standards [MEPS]), limiting the sales to the allowed energy-efficiency classes according to the legislation stages that successively come into effect. If a particular energy class is banned through an ecodesign MEPS criteria, the sales are simulated at the next energy class level. This is illustrated in Figure 3, where sales of banned energy classes are assumed to be zero in the years after the ecodesign requirements enter into force, which, in this example, occurs in two stages in 2022 and 2025.

The estimated savings caused by the ecodesign requirements (MEPS) are the difference between the baseline scenario curve and the policy scenario curve. Note that the natural development of the sales distribution remains active in the ecodesign scenario, preventing the ecodesign scheme from accounting fully for the efficiency improvements in sales.

The tool also provides a means to estimate the effects of energy labelling. This process is similar to natural development simulation, that is, setting an assumed annual change in percent towards more sales in higher energy classes. This shift in sales is illustrated in Figure 3. The energy labelling affects the sales in all energy classes every year. The effects of labelling are calculated in parallel to the ecodesign effects, ensuring that any effect in sales that MEPS already simulates are not accounted for when simulating the effects of labelling. This also ensures that no measures are double counted.

Table 5: Example of banned energy class

* Class "F" banned

As mentioned above, the savings from the ecodesign and energy-labelling regulations are estimated as the difference between the base-case scenario and the policy scenarios for ecodesign and energy labelling.

3.2.3. Assumptions

Table 6: Table with assumptions (washing machine example)

The modelling is based on several other assumptions, including the following:

- A normally distributed lifetime of products typically has mean value between 8–16 years for white goods.
- The energy consumption per year reference was calculated using an assumed average size (or sizes) and the equations for the annual consumption per unit from the regulations. Some cases, such as that of refrigerators, have many options for different compartment types, etc. In those cases, we simplified the product to the most common types where data are available.
- Each energy class can be characterised by a mean annual energy consumption \bullet value. For example, on the old label for washing machines, class A++ has an EEI between 46 and 52, and the mean is EEI 49.
- The baseline is defined by a natural development in the market, which is 2% per \bullet year of the sales in the specific energy class are assumed to move one energyefficient class up. This number can be adjusted because the market's development can differ for different types of products.
- Non-compliant sales, (below MEPS) move the sale to the nearest available energy class.
- The effect of labelling is simulated by shifting X% of the sale in each energy class to the next most efficient labelling class every year, where X is assumed to be high (~25%) for the first several years after the requirements come into force, after which it is lower (~5%). This assumption is based on knowledge from the introduction of energy labelling for white goods in the late 90s.

All assumptions can be modified for each simulated product group.

3.2.4 Data

The following data sources were used for the modelling:

- Sales data from APPLiA Danmark and Sweden (the Association for Suppliers of Electrical Domestic Appliances); the association collects sales figures for white goods from its members
- Elektronikkbransjen Norge, the Consumer Electronics Trade Foundation; members are suppliers, dealer chains, independent dealers, and workshops
- National energy statistics
- ElmodelBolig, a bi-annual Danish survey of about 2,000 households performed by Energistyrelsen
- Other product-specific reports, such as JRC for data centres; see footnotes \bullet
- NordCrawl

3.2.5 Data-sharing and sales-scaling

The sales data used to estimate the savings from ecodesign and the energy labelling of white goods are from APPLiA in Demark and Sweden (for only select years); this group collects sales data for white goods from their members. Likewise, Elektronikkbransjen in Norway collects sales data (the number of products and energy classes) from their members. It has been assumed that the Nordic consumers have approximately the same energy-efficiency preferences when buying white goods, which means that we can use the sales distribution of energy classes from Denmark, Norway, or Sweden in Iceland and Finland. The country that is the best match can be determined by examining factors such as housing type distribution and the economy. An argument for this assumption is the fact that online shops such as Elgiganten (known as Elkjøp Norway, Gigantti Finland) have similar websites and selections. The sales figures (the number of models sold per year) were scaled to adjust to different household stock. Sales data from Norway and Sweden cover fewer years than data from Denmark, so Danish sales data were used to extend those time series.

Table 7: Sales data-sharing and data-scaling

Rescaled energy labels

During the last project, the energy labels for the appliances in this project were rescaled. The rescaling came into force on 1 March 2021. Therefore, no sales data for the new, rescaled energy class distributions were available at that time, and we thus had to create a conversion from the old energy label to the new. For this project, sales data for the new energy label are available, so we did not have to convert them.

At the same time, new, more stringent MEPS were introduced. To handle the new MEPS and the new label with the new thresholds for the energy-labelling classes, we decided to treat appliances with a new label as a new product, replacing the models with the old label. When calculating the savings, we added the savings from the old label to the savings from the new one. Over time, appliances with the old label will be replaced with appliances with the new label in the stock. The figure below shows how appliances with the new label replace those with the old label over time.

Figure 4: Example of how the stock changes from the old to the new energy label

The bottom-up modelling is data demanding, and the quality of the results naturally depends on the quality of the input data; especially detailed sales data can improve the quality. Since these data can be difficult to obtain, assumptions must be introduced to establish sales data at the needed granularity, which adds to the uncertainty.

3.2.6 Uncertainty

The long-term projections of the model are also uncertain, since many of the assumptions made to establish the bottom-up basis are not valid over a long period. The model should only be used for projections of five to 15 years, which is equal to one generation of most white goods. Otherwise, the model should be developed further to incorporate top-down elements to guide some assumed developments (or statistics). An example of long-term uncertainty in a bottom-up model is that it is difficult to predict when a new technology is introduced for an appliance (often called technology leaps; e.g., the use of heap pumps in tumble dryers). Another example is consumer preference changes. In some Nordic countries, we observed a change from chest freezers to upright freezers. If the model is used to project too far into the future, such changes will not be adequately reflected.

In summary, the model can estimate the composition of the stock in any given year in terms of energy parameters using data for how the actual annual sales are distributed over energy classes. This enables us to calculate the total energy consumption for a baseline situation, as well as the energy consumption for policy scenarios. The difference between the baseline scenario and the policy scenario constitutes the savings at the national level that is attributable to the policies.

3.2.7 Quality assurance of assumptions

The following quality controls were performed to ensure the robustness of the assumptions.

Product penetration

We analysed the product penetration, which is the quantity of a product in a household (stock/households). Surveys in Denmark and Norway clarify the approximate expected penetration, and by comparing the calculated with the expected penetration, we can evaluate the assumptions. For example, the general penetration of a refrigerator is around one refrigerator per household. If the calculated penetration is 0.5 refrigerators per household, there could be a problem with the scaling of sales data (in most cases, the Danish APPLiA data) or the assumed lifetime.

Comparison between countries

We compared the assumptions and results between Nordic countries. Some variations are expected due to different lifestyles, such as the popularity of dryers or housing types; many apartments have fewer washing machines and have shared washing machines, typically in the basement. However, the central assumption is that the results should be comparable, and we should be able to explain the variations logically.

3.3 Combining scale-down and bottom-up results

For product groups where bottom-up results are available, they are preferable to those from the scale-down method, as the bottom-up approach provides more accurate estimates. In these cases, rather than applying a scale-down factor to the EU savings, we directly replaced the EU savings with the country-specific savings calculated using the bottom-up method. This effectively meant using a scale-down factor of 100% for these product groups.

In Sweden, some savings for heating products were also calculated separately, and the results were added in the same way as for the bottom-up results. This further enhances the accuracy of the savings estimates for these specific product groups in Sweden.

This approach allowed us to combine the two methods into one comprehensive result, ensuring that we used the most accurate data available for each product group. By prioritising the bottom-up results where possible, incorporating separately calculated savings for certain product groups in Sweden, and relying on the scale-down method for product groups without detailed data, we generated a more precise overall estimate of the energy savings from ecodesign and energy-labelling policies in the Nordic countries.

4. RESULTS

The results are presented for each country. First, the scale-down result with an explanation of the scaling factors appears. Subsequently, the bottom-up results are presented, and the results of the bottom-up and the scale-down models are then compared for each country. Finally, all results are summarised.

5. DENMARK

Table 8: Danish results CO2

5.1 Denmark: Scale-down results

Scaling factors

Below is a list of available scales. Not all scales are used, but they can be used to indicate the country population, GDP size, etc. The description column explains the data in the scale, the source, and the year. The scale represents the country's percentage of the total EU consumption.

Table 9: Danish scaling factors

Top-down results

The scale-down results are in TWh/year. Most products only have electricity savings, but several heating-related products have both electricity and fuel savings. Savings for tyres are only calculated for fuel and not for electric vehicles. [12]

Table 10: Danish top-down results

12. The Impact Accounting report only calculate savings for fuel.

5.2 Denmark: Bottom-up results

Below are the bottom-up results for 2030. The table also shows the main assumptions for sizes in litres, kilograms, place settings, and lifetime in years. All results are for households (not commercial or service sectors).

Table 11: Danish bottom-up results

13. Lifetime is the number of years a product is used. It's not necessarily the same as technical life (until the product dies)

6. SWEDEN

Table 12: Swedish results CO2

6.1 Sweden: Scale-down results

Scaling factors

Below is a list of available scales. Not all scales are used but can be used to indicate the country population/GDP size etc. The description column explains the data in the scale, source, and year. The scale represents the country's percentage of the total EU consumption.

Table 13: Swedish scaling factors

Top-down results

The scale-down results are in TWh/year. Most products only have electricity savings, but some heating-related products have both electricity and fuel savings. Savings for tyres are only calculated for fuel and not for electric vehicles.^[14]

^{14.} The Impact Accounting report only calculate savings for fuel.

Table 14: Swedish top-down results

6.2 Sweden: Bottom-up results

Below are the bottom-up results for 2030. The table also shows the main assumption for sizes in litres, kilograms, place settings, and lifetime in years. All results are for households (not commercial or service).

Table 15: Swedish bottom-up results

7. NORWAY

Table 16: Norwegian results CO2

7.1 Norway: Scale-down results

Scaling factors

Below is a list of available scales. Not all scales are used but can be used to indicate the country population/GDP size etc. The description column explains the data in the scale, the source, and the year. The scale represents the country's percentage of the total EU consumption.

Table 17: Norwegian scaling factors

Top-down results

The scale-down results are in TWh/year. Most products only have electricity savings, but several heating-related products have both electricity and fuel savings. Savings for tyres are only calculated for fuel and not for electric vehicles. [15]

Table 18: Norwegian top-down results

15. The Impact Accounting report only calculate savings for fuel.

7.2 Norwegian: Bottom-up results

Below are the bottom-up results for 2030. The table also shows the main assumptions for sizes in litres, kilograms, place settings, and lifetime in years. All results are for households (not commercial or service uses).

Table 19: Norwegian bottom-up results

8. FINLAND

Table 20: Finnish results CO2

8.1 Finland: Scale-down results

Scaling factors

Below is a list of available scales. Not all scales are used but can be used to indicate the country population/GDP size etc. The description column explains the data in terms of scale, source, and year. The scale represents the country's percentage of the total EU consumption.

Table 21: Finnish scaling factors

Top-down results

The scale-down results are in TWh/year. Most products only have electricity savings, but several heating-related products have both electricity and fuel savings. Savings for tyres are only calculated for fuel and not for electric vehicles. [16]

Table 22: Finnish top-down results

16. The Impact Accounting report only calculate savings for fuel.

8.2 Finnish: Bottom-up results

Below are the bottom-up results for 2030. The table also shows the main assumptions for sizes in litres, kilograms, place settings, and lifetime in years. All results are for households (not commercial or service).

Table 23: Finnish bottom-up results

9. ICELAND

Table 24: Icelandic results CO2

9.1 Iceland: Scale-down results

Scaling factors

Below is a list of available scales. Not all scales are used but can be used to indicate the country's population/GDP size etc. The description column explains the data in terms of scale, source, and year. The scale represents the country's percentage of the total EU consumption.

Table 25: Icelandic scaling factors

Top-down results

The scale-down results are in GWh/year (other countries are reported in TWh/year, but Iceland is too small to use TWh/year). Most products only have electricity savings, but several heating-related products have both electricity and fuel savings. Savings for tyres are only calculated for fuel and not for electric vehicles.^[17]

^{17.} The Impact Accounting report only calculate savings for fuel.

Table 26: Icelandic top-down results

9.2 Icelandic: Bottom-up results

Below are the bottom-up results for 2030. The table also shows the main assumptions for sizes in litres, kilograms, place settings, and lifetime in years. All results are for households (not commercial or service).

Table 27: Icelandic bottom-up results

10. SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND SENSITIVITY

10.1 Total savings: Top-down model

The table below shows the results from the top-down model in total savings per year. These calculations are based on the EU numbers from the EIA report. $^{\text{[18]}}$ For each product group in each country, a specific scale was assigned in an iterative process with representatives from Nordsyn authorities in each country. The total savings from the topdown model are in TWh/year.

Table 28: Total savings from the top-down model

10.2 Total savings: Bottom-up

The table below shows the total savings from the bottom-up model in GWh/year in 2030 for the products for which this calculation was performed. Note that bottom-up calculations were not possible for all products due to the lack of data, and this table thus does not show total savings in each country from the market surveillance of ecodesign and energy labelling.

^{- 18.} European Commission, Directorate-General for Energy, *Ecodesign impact accounting annual report 2021*
O*verview and status report*, Publications Office of the European Union,
2022, <u>https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2833</u>

10.3 Sensitivity of the bottom-up model

Robustness of the bottom-up model. To examine the model's robustness, a sensitivity test was performed for refrigerators/freezers in Sweden. The results show that increasing the lifetime of products leads to higher savings due to a higher stock.

The table below shows the consequences of changing the assumptions. This is an example for refrigerators/freezers in Sweden. The first line shows the standard assumption. In this example, the sales numbers do not change. The first example is a decrease in the lifetime from 12 to 10 years, which causes the stock to decrease, and the savings thus decrease by 15%. In the second example, the lifetime is increased from 12 to 14 years. This causes the stuck to increase, and the savings then also increase by 14%. In the third example, the size of the refrigerator/freezer is increased by 10%, which increases the savings by 6%. In the last example, the volume is decreased by 10%, which causes the savings to fall by 5%.

Table 30: Sensibility of assumptions in the bottom-up model

11. DISCUSSION

This project aimed to enhance the Nordcrawl tool by providing updated calculations of energy savings from ecodesign and energy-labelling policies in the Nordic countries. The study employs two complementary methodologies – a top-down approach and a bottomup approach – implemented on the Nordcrawl online platform. This dual approach, combined with conservative assumptions throughout, aims to provide robust and reliable estimates of energy savings.

The top-down method, which scales down EU-level savings data from the latest EIA report, was significantly improved in this iteration. By utilising a range of country-specific scaling factors tailored to each product group, we enhanced the accuracy of these calculations. It is important to note that the EIA projections already account for various factors, including rebound effects, changes in user demand, and expected efficiency developments. Our approach of using conservative scaling factors further mitigates the risk of overestimation.

The bottom-up method, while more data-intensive, allows for a more nuanced consideration of country-specific factors. By incorporating local sales data and usage patterns, this approach provides a valuable cross-check to the top-down estimates. In cases where detailed data were available, the bottom-up method likely provides the most accurate estimates. The consistency between the two methods in cases where both could be applied lends credence to the overall results.

A key strength of this study is the incorporation of new data sources, particularly the survey conducted in Finland and Norway. This primary data collection of household energy use patterns, especially in heating, water heating, and ventilation, allowed for more precise estimations in these areas. The inclusion of data for the new, rescaled energy labels introduced in 2021 ensures that the calculations reflect the current regulatory environment.

While we sought accuracy and used conservative estimates, it is important to acknowledge areas of uncertainty and opportunities for future refinement:

- 1. Data limitations: For some product groups and countries (particularly Iceland), data availability was limited. Future studies could benefit from more comprehensive data-collection efforts.
- 2. Long-term projections: Estimates extending to 2030 inherently involve uncertainties. Regular updates to the model with the latest market data and regulatory changes will be crucial to maintain its accuracy.
- 3. Country-specific factors: While we attempted to account for national differences, there may be additional country-specific factors (e.g., variations in product usage patterns or compliance levels) that could also be incorporated into the model.
- 4. Technological changes: Rapid advancements in technology could alter the energy efficiency landscape faster than anticipated. The model would benefit from regular reviews to ensure that it captures such changes.

5. Policy interactions: The interplay between ecodesign/energy-labelling policies and other energy-efficiency initiatives could be explored more deeply in future iterations.

The Nordcrawl tool's flexibility, which easily allows modifications to assumptions and input data, is a significant asset. It ensures that the tool can evolve as new information becomes available, making the current results a conservative baseline that can be refined over time.

In conclusion, this enhanced Nordcrawl tool provides a valuable, conservative estimate of energy savings achieved through ecodesign and energy-labelling policies in the Nordic countries. The use of both top-down and bottom-up calculation methods allows for a comprehensive understanding of these savings. The tool's design for easy updates ensures its continued relevance as new data become available and policies evolve. While there are always areas for potential improvement, the current model provides a robust foundation for policy-makers and researchers to assess the impact of these important energyefficiency policies.

ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

Energy Savings from Ecodesign and Energy Labelling in the Nordics

Kasper Schäfer Mogensen, Big2Great

© Nordic Energy Research 2024 http://dx.doi.org/10.6027/NER2024-03

Layout: Mette Agger Tang Coverphoto: Dan_darius / Freepik Proofreading: Scribbr

Published: August 2024

This publication was funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers. Nordic Energy Research, which operates the Secretariat of the Nordsyn, a working group under the Nordic Council of Ministers, coordinated this report. Maj Dang Trong at Nordic Energy Research was the coordinator of the project.

The study was supervised and guided by representatives from Nordsyn, including Kirsti Hind Fagerlund and Terje Sagen Adsen from The Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE), Carlos Lopes from the Swedish Energy Agency, and Thore Stenfeldt from the Danish Energy Agency.

Nordic Energy Research

Nordic Energy Research is an institution under the Nordic Council of Ministers which manages and finances international research programs and projects that add value to national work in the Nordic countries. In addition, we perform certain secretariat and analytical functions in the energy policy cooperation under the Nordic Council of Ministers.