

D.2.1 CommitClimate Simulator – External Municipality Feedback Summary

Timeframe: June – July 2025

Countries Covered: Latvia, Estonia, Sweden, Poland

Participants: 20+ municipalities and supporting organizations

The CommitClimate Simulator was evaluated through external feedback collected from municipalities and supporting organizations across Latvia, Estonia, Sweden, and Poland during June – July 2025. In total, 15 feedback forms were received from external representatives, complemented by insights gathered during workshops involving more than 20 municipalities. This feedback played a key role in improving the tool, leading to enhancements in functionality, usability, data integration, and national adaptation. The following section presents a structured summary of this feedback, providing an overview of how municipalities evaluated the simulator in terms of usefulness, data availability, outputs, usability, and training, as well as highlighting country-specific insights and key recommendations for further development.

1. GENERAL USEFULNESS AND PERCEPTION

Overall usefulness ratings:

- **Latvia:** average 7.4/10
- **Estonia:** average 8.25/10
- **Poland:** qualitative positive feedback; tool seen as promising despite usability gaps
- **Sweden:** in-depth critical reflections; tool seen as having long-term potential but needing better contextualization

Main benefit highlighted: ability to model emission scenarios across sectors, useful for SECAP and IEKRP planning.

2. DATA AVAILABILITY

Average scores (0–10):

- **Latvia:** mixed (commonly 6 – 7)
- **Estonia:** 3.75/10
- **Poland:** reported as difficult due to non-public or fragmented sources
- **Sweden:** extensive concerns about definitions, granularity, and clarity in data categories

Common challenges:

- Lack of access to disaggregated local data (e.g., energy use by sector, transport fuel consumption)
- Confusion over data definitions (e.g., 'renovated buildings', energy efficiency policies)
- Seasonal and demographic variations complicating accuracy (e.g., Sweden and Latvia)

Suggestions:

- Clear data definitions and units
- Pre-filled default values as fallback
- Links to national databases or guidance on data sources

3. TOOL OUTPUTS AND POLICY CONTENT

Satisfaction with outputs (graphs, indicators):

- **Latvia:** average 6.8/10
- **Estonia:** 6/10
- **Poland:** graphs seen as 'average' and sometimes unclear
- **Sweden:** critical reflections on assumptions and granularity of results

Satisfaction with GHG mitigation policies:

- **Latvia:** average 6 – 7/10
- **Estonia:** 7/10
- **Poland:** expressed need for more detail and sectoral focus
- **Sweden:** concern about policy assumptions, impact pathways unclear

4. USABILITY AND INTERFACE

Interface/navigation ratings:

- **Latvia:** 4 – 9, average ~6.2
- **Estonia:** 6/10
- **Poland:** interface seen as clear, but the navigation is confusing
- **Sweden:** extensive requests for clarification of structure, terms, and visual hierarchy

Feedback themes:

- The tool is visually rich, but often overwhelming
- Users want a step-by-step workflow
- Navigation and terminology are not always intuitive

5. TRAINING AND SUPPORT

Training ratings:

- **Latvia:** 5 – 9
- **Estonia:** 8/10
- **Poland:** mixed – some features could not be shown due to technical issues
- **Sweden:** requested written and video support, detailed FAQs

Common requests:

- Video walkthroughs (especially appreciated in Latvia and Sweden)
- Contextual tooltips
- Clear guidance on how to interpret results

6. COUNTRY-SPECIFIC OBSERVATIONS

Latvia:

The model was welcomed as a strategic planning tool, with a strong desire for improved navigation and customizability.

Estonia:

Data issues are significant, but municipalities are open to using the tool once fully functional.

Poland:

Workshop revealed interest in applying the tool, especially in the buildings sector, but technical bugs in the Polish version hindered a full demonstration.

Sweden:

Extensive qualitative feedback with a strong emphasis on improving definitions, sector differentiation, and local rural context. Municipalities want guidance on how to apply the simulator in sparsely populated areas.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the feedback indicates that the CommitClimate Simulator is perceived as a valuable and promising tool for supporting climate and energy planning at the municipal level, particularly due to its ability to model cross-sectoral emission scenarios. However, its current application is still limited by challenges related to data availability, clarity of assumptions, and user experience. While municipalities showed strong interest in using the tool, especially for strategic planning processes such as SECAP development, they emphasized the need for clearer data definitions, improved guidance, and a more intuitive workflow. Addressing these aspects will be essential to ensure wider adoption and effective use of the simulator across different national and local contexts.

Key recommendations:

- Clarify data definitions and input formats
- Develop comprehensive training materials
- Improve user interface and workflow
- Adapt tool functionality to country-specific needs
- Facilitate peer learning and ongoing support