# Background paper on Technology Roadmaps

## Summary

➤        This background paper reports on the use of technology roadmaps related to climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies.

➤        The objective of this background paper is to facilitate the work of the Technology Executive Committee on how to further conduct its function of catalysing the development and use of technology roadmaps and action plans at the international, regional and national levels through cooperation between relevant stakeholders, particularly governments and relevant organizations or bodies, including the development of best practice guidelines as facilitative tools for action on mitigation and adaptation, in accordance with 1/CP.16, paragraph 121(g).

➤        The background paper presents (i) an overview of different technology roadmap methods, (ii) an initial analysis of gaps and barriers in existing technology roadmaps, and (iii) a review of current technology roadmap good practices.

➤        The analysis and literature review revealed that:

(a)        The roadmapping process is at least as important as the resulting roadmap;

(b)        There is a clear gap in technology roadmaps relating to adaptation technologies;

(c)        The majority of technology roadmaps are produced in Annex I countries or by international organisations, with very few authored by or targeted at non-Annex I countries;

(d)        The vast majority of technology roadmaps have a national or international scope;

(e)        There is a clear need for guidance in order to improve the quality of technology roadmaps.

➤        The Technology Executive Committee may wish to consider the information contained in this paper with a view to catalysing the development and use of technology roadmaps, in accordance with its workplan and mandated function.

# Background paper on
# Technology Roadmaps (TRMs)

FINAL DRAFT

Londo, H.M. (ECN)
More, E. (IfM)
Phaal, R. (IfM)
Würtenberger, L. (ECN)
Cameron, L. (ECN)

# Executive Summary

This background paper reports on the use of technology roadmaps (TRMs) related to climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies. The study is motivated by the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties (CoP) request to the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) to catalyse the development and use of TRMs as facilitative tools for action on mitigation and adaptation.

Having originated in industry, TRMs are now used extensively in policy settings too, however their widespread use across sectors and by different stakeholders has resulted in a lack of understanding of their real value to help catalyse cooperation towards technological solutions to the problems presented by climate change. Consequently this background paper presents (i) an overview of different TRM methods, (ii) an initial analysis of gaps and barriers in existing TRMs, and (iii) a review of current TRM good practices.

## Approach

The methodological approach taken in the preparation of this background paper follows these three deliverables. Firstly a literature review of academic and industry documents was carried out. Secondly over 150 publicly available TRMs related to climate change technologies were reviewed to determine technological, geographical, time gaps in existing TRMS. Finally, based on the analysis and literature review, quality documents and methods were identified and summarised as good practices.

## Main Findings

(i) The literature review revealed there are many TRM methods currently in use, however some fundamental elements are key:

- The roadmapping process is at least as important as the resulting roadmap and visualisation because the process itself has been found to increase communication between essential stakeholders and assists in consensus building.

- TRMs differ fundamentally from scenarios and forecasts, which are descriptive. TRMs are normative in nature, building a desired future state and describing actions and milestones required to reach it.

(ii) The analysis of public domain TRMs revealed the following headline conclusions:

- The set is dominated by mitigation technologies, showing a clear gap in TRMs relating to adaptation technologies.

- The majority of TRMs are produced in Annex-1 countries or by international organisations with very few authored by or targeted at Non-Annex I countries.

- The vast majority of TRMs have a national or international scope.

- TRMs relating to renewable energy technologies are typically more recent than those for other technologies and many of these renewable TRMs set their maximum time horizon to the year 2020.

- Intergovernmental Organisations, Governmental Organisations or Industry author the majority of TRMs, with few from academic or Non-Governmental Organisations.

- Very few of the TRMs analysed could be described as quality TRMs, based on six substantive elements that were identified as important for good practice.

(iii) The last finding highlights the clear need for guidance in order to improve the quality of TRMs. The International Energy Agency's standard TRM format is found to contain many good elements, which are described in the paper. A selection from other TRMs provides additional good examples for specific elements of a TRM and its process.

**Recommendations**
The following key recommendations, based on the analysed conducted for this background paper, are:
- Guidance and good practice should be disseminated in order to improve the quality and consequent contribution of TRMs to climate change mitigation and adaptation technology development' and transfer.
- The TEC should further explore the perspectives for promoting TRMs for adaptation technologies.
- The TEC should promote the use of TRMs in developing countries; to this end, it could work towards developing cost effective TRM methods and guidance to improve the use of TRMs in and for Non-Annex I countries, and provide training or capacity building on TRMs.
- The role of TRMs in integrating with other existing technology transfer efforts should be further explored by the TEC. This includes Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and Technology Action Plans (TAPs), and National adaptation Plans of Action (NAPAs) and Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs).

# Table of Contents

# 1. Background

1.    The Conference of the Parties (COP), by its decision 1/CP.16, requested the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), as one of its functions, to catalyse the development and use of technology roadmaps or action plans at the international, regional and national levels through cooperation between relevant stakeholders, particularly governments and relevant organizations or bodies, including the development of best practice guidelines as facilitative tools for action on mitigation and adaptation.

2.    The COP, by its decision 4/CP.17, adopted the following modalities for the TEC in carrying out the function related to catalyse the development and use of technology road maps or action plans:

    (a)    Promoting and collaborating with relevant organizations, resources permitting, in organizing workshops and forums to increase the opportunities for sharing experience with experts in developing and implementing technology road maps and action plans as well as other technology-related activities;

    (b)    Making recommendations on best practices and relevant tools to develop technology road maps and action plans;

    (c)    Establishing an inventory of technology road maps and action plans;

    (d)    Making recommendations on concrete actions, such as an international process for the development of technology road maps and action plans as well as support required to enhance the development of these items, and in particular capacity-building programmes that may be appropriate.

3.    The TEC, in its rolling workplan for 2012-2013, included preparation of an inventory of existing technology road maps as one of the tasks to be completed by end of 2012 and also review of the inventory of technology road maps to be carried out in 2013.

4.    The TEC, at its third meeting held in May 2012 in Bonn, Germany, agreed to prepare a background paper which aims to present an overview of the technology road mapping exercises, an initial analysis on gaps and associated barriers or difficulties, and good practices of technology road mapping exercise.

## 2. Objective

5.     The objective of this background paper on technology road maps for the TEC is to facilitate its consideration on how to further carry out  its work on catalyse the development and use of technology roadmaps or action plans at the international, regional and national levels through cooperation between relevant stakeholders, particularly governments and relevant organizations or bodies, including the development of best practice guidelines as facilitative tools for action on mitigation and adaptation . Specific questions are:

- How are TRMs defined, how do they relate to other strategic tools, such as scenarios, forecasts, backcasts, what differences exist between TRMs used at different levels (e.g. corporate, sectorial, (inter)national), and why or when are TRMs needed?

- What Technology Roadmaps (TRMs) do currently exist, what are their key characteristics, and which gaps may be identified?

- What methods and guidelines are available for the development and use of TRMs?

- What can be learnt from good practice examples of TRMs?

- On the basis of this review, what can be recommended for the work of the TEC regarding TRMs?

6.     The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 3 presents a definition of TRMs, specific for the TEC context, and why and when a TRM would be needed. Section 4 presents an overview of TRMs related to climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies. Section 5 provides an overview of methods for the development of TRMs. In section 6 we provide a number of good practice examples. Section 7 discusses some specific issues related to TRMs for adaptation technologies. In section 8 we present our key findings. Finally, section 9 contains our suggestions and recommendations regarding the work of the TEC on technology road maps.

## 3. Defining Technology Roadmaps

7.    Technology Roadmaps (TRMs) are used at business and policy levels to support technology strategy development and implementation. While TRMs originated from the private sector, the term TRM is frequently used today in the context of technology research and development as well as in technology policy.

8.    The widespread usage of the method means no single definition exists, and common definitions vary considerably (see e.g. Technology Roadmap Network, Phaal et al. 2004, IEA 2009). For the purpose of this study, the following working definition of a TRM is proposed in the TEC context:

> *A Technology Roadmap (TRM) serves as a coherent basis for specific technology development and transfer activities, providing a common (preferably quantifiable) objective, time-specific milestones and a consistent set of concrete actions; developed jointly with relevant stakeholders, who commit to their roles in the TRM implementation.*

9.    A TRM bundles three perspectives relevant to the development of a technology. A good TRM deals with:

- Trends and drivers affecting development of applications and technologies

- Applications, products, services and other tangible systems developed in response to trends and drivers, or enabled by technological breakthroughs

- Technologies and other capabilities and resources developed in response to application and market needs

10.    A key feature of the TRM method is that the roadmapping process is at least equally important as the resulting roadmap document and structured visualisation. A roadmapping process can increase communication between essential stakeholders for technology development, assist in consensus building, create investors' appetite, and be a basis for future commitment (Garcia and Bray 1997; IEA, 2010).

11.    Roadmaps differ fundamentally from scenarios and forecasts, two tools also used in R&D policy. In principle, scenarios and forecasts are descriptive (McDowell and Eames 2006): They explore possible futures without judging whether these futures are desirable or not, assuming that the user of the scenario does not have decisive influence in which scenario will materialise in the end. For example, a company can develop various scenarios for our future energy economy, and then develop a hedging strategy so that it can survive in any of the scenarios. TRMs differ from scenarios and forecasts because they have a normative nature and are more action-oriented: they provide a view of a desirable future, and a pathway with actions towards it. The term 'Scenario' however is probably one of the most versatile terms in policy and strategy contexts. It is sometimes also used in a more normative setting, analysing questions such as 'what will happen if we implement a certain policy'[1].

---

[1]    For example, in Metz et al. (2007), various regional and national climate change mitigation scenarios are discussed; these provide insights in our future energy economy under active climate policy. Such policies can be an emission cap or other climate mitigation measures and instruments. As such, these scenarios are normative. But also in these applications, scenarios remain less focused on concrete actions and stakeholder engagement than most TRMs are (Metz et al., 2007).

12.     TRMs share their normative character as well with visions and backcasting studies (McDowell and Eames 2006). Visions however usually focus only on outlining a desirable future for e.g. a specific technology, not the path towards it. As such, they can serve as a starting point for a TRM. Backcasting studies also start with defining a clear end point, providing a more complete storyline for the future, and subsequently explore possible routes towards it[2]. More than backcasts, but comparable with visions, TRMs often also have an advocacy purpose, and bring key stakeholders together in a shared vision and in a commitment to actions.

13.     TRMs are used in corporate settings, but also for sectorial R&D efforts or for governmental policy. A review on TRMs for the renewable energy sector (Amer and Daim 2010) concluded that TRMs differ in their goals and objectives, which they identified as follows. On national level, the prime objective is to aid policy formulation. At sector level, TRMs serve to identify vision, common needs and barriers relevant for the industry, in technical, political and commercial terms. TRMs within an organisation evaluate and prioritise R&D projects to achieve business goals. On all these levels, TRMs seem to have in common that they provide a common ambition, and a basis for action. At corporate level, the TRM can be very exact and binding, as it deals with internal resources over which there is extensive control, and implementation is relatively straightforward. When used for (inter)national policy, TRMs have to deal with more complexity: the innovation system is broader and more complex, resources from various (types of) independent stakeholders need to be aligned, and implementation is more difficult. As a consequence, TRMs for policy usually have an objective that is more broadly defined (sometimes more vague) than in private sector TRMs, and also the required actions are more generic.

14.     At corporate level, their purpose is clear when R&D activities need to be prioritised, and activities from various groups within the organisation need to be aligned (Garcia and Bray 1997). At sectorial level, TRMs not only provide alignment to actions of sectorial stakeholders, an inspiring TRM can also be a strong tool for technology advocacy (McDowall and Eames 2006).

15.     On national and international level, the policy dimension seems to be leading. In this a context, we identified seven purposes a TRM can have that we consider particularly relevant for the TEC:

1.  TRMs can provide a coherent basis for (inter)national technology RD&D policy, setting common objectives, identifying key barriers and milestones, and specifying key actions needed from different types of stakeholders to address barriers and reach milestones.

2.  TRMs can be used as a basis for national policy to support the diffusion of climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies

3.  TRMs can also be used to catalyse innovations that allow existing technologies to adapt to new markets and settings. Particularly for developing countries, this can be a relevant function, as many technologies are originally with a 'developed world' setting in mind.

---

[2]   McDowell and Eames (2006) argue that TRMs usually start from a relatively vague vision, making less explicit assumptions on the future than backcasts do, and focus on barriers and actions to be taken.

4. TRMs can mobilise private and public sector parties' interest in technologies through their participation in the roadmapping process, and can connect them with relevant counterparts in developed countries.

5. TRMs can provide a common platform to mobilise international support. Foreign financial flows for actions like supported NAMAs and NAPAs may be more significant and more effective when they are backed by a roadmap.

6. TRMs can also link to Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs) and Technology Action Plans (TAPs), two relevant approaches under the Technology Mechanism (UNFCCC 2012). While TNAs are executed according to a well-developed structure (see e.g. UNDP 2010), it is still less clear what TAPs should entail, although some tentative structuring is available (Agbemabiese and Painuly 2011). A TRM could provide a structure for transferring the results of a TNA and TAP into action.

7. More broadly, developing countries face the challenge of having to align various technology-related projects from different funders, often working with different ministries within a country. An underlying TRM can serve as a common platform, integrating such projects into a coherent strategy supported by all ministries and donors engaged.

# 4. Methods used for development and use of technology roadmaps

16.     Roadmapping is a flexible method that can support diverse strategic goals, with both the roadmap and roadmapping process adapted to suit the particular context. Time scales, cost pressures, objective and stakeholders all play an important part in shaping the final roadmap. Consequently, there are many different examples of methods used in developing roadmaps. These differences are evident in the TRMs seen in the analysis conducted for this study, which found few consistent elements; even aspects such as clear visions/targets were lacking in almost half of the TRMs reviewed.

17.     At a very general level, roadmapping – the process of making roadmaps – has been described as a "disciplined process for identifying the activities and schedules necessary to manage technical (and other) risks and uncertainties associated with solving complex problems." (Bennett, 2005; in Yan et al., 2011). How this process and management changes, depending on the developer of the roadmap is considered here for two broad categories; first, the private sector and, second, the public sector at the national or international scale.

18.     It is important to note that private and public sector TRMs generally have different focuses and aims. Private sector TRMs are primarily focused on R&D - technology development, while public sector TRMs are predominantly concerned with technology diffusion (implementation, deployment). Sometimes public TRMs refer to R&D as well, but quite often the term 'development' is used to denote implementation (or adaptation of specific technologies to local conditions) rather than real, fully-fledged technological innovation. Looking at this from another perspective - private TRMs focus on product innovations (achieving new functionality and performance of technologies), whereas public TRMs focus on organizational innovations (implementing technologies new to a specific field, organization, country etc. to achieve desirable societal, economic and technical outcomes). Table 1 gives further distinctions in terms of process type, technology scope and resources and stakeholder involvement.

Table 1: Private sector versus public sector TRMs

|  | Private sector TRM | Public sector TRM |
|---|---|---|
| **Process type** | technical task;<br><br>with focus on specific technology performance parameters, technical project milestones etc. | social process;<br><br>involving technology diffusion, involvement of multiple parties, adoption/implementation decisions rather than improving technical parameters of specific technologies |
| **Technology scope** | focus on one technology type;<br><br>linked to financial commitments and budgets for in-house development of specific company-controlled technologies and not the broad set of comparable, competing technologies in the market | focused on generic class of technologies;<br><br>not differentiating between products from various vendors/suppliers |
| **Resources & stakeholders** | implemented within the company and can be directly linked to project schedules, with all or most of the necessary resources under the control of corporate planners | stakeholder support needs to be orchestrated |

### 4.1 Private sector TRMs

19. The concept of technology roadmaps originated in the private sector where they have a long history of use in understanding and communicating future relationships between markets, products, and technologies (Lee and Park, 2005). Despite the extensive experience with technology roadmaps in the private sector, there are few comprehensive studies of private sector roadmap development processes or practical guidelines for building technology roadmaps[3].

20. A paper by Sandia National Laboratories, drawn from their own roadmap development experiences, is one of the most commonly cited descriptions of a general process for developing a roadmap in the private sector (Garcia and Bray, 1997). For their proposed process they focus on product technology roadmaps, which are used by many firms, while defining two additional types of roadmaps, an issues-oriented roadmap, and an emerging technology roadmap. Sandia's process is described in three phases — preliminary activity, development of the technology roadmap, and follow-up activity – with a number of self-explanatory steps within each phase (**Error! Reference source not found.**).

**Phase I: Preliminary activity**
1. Satisfy essential conditions.
2. Provide leadership/sponsorship.
3. Define the scope and boundaries for the technology roadmap.

**Phase II. Development of the Technology Roadmap**
1. Identify the "product" that will be the focus of the roadmap.
2. Identify the critical system requirements and their targets.
3. Specify the major technology areas.
4. Specify the technology drivers and their targets.
5. Identify technology alternatives and their time lines.
6. Recommend the technology alternatives that should be pursued.
7. Create the technology roadmap report.

**Phase III. Follow-up activity**
1. Critique and validate the roadmap.
2. Develop an implementation plan.
3. Review and update.

Figure 1: The three phases in the private sector technology roadmapping process
*(source: Garcia and Bray, 1997)*

21. Garcia and Bray (1997) also stress the importance of involving the right mix of participants in the process, including some that understand the roadmapping process itself, and some that can identify needs, technology drivers and technology alternatives

---

[3] There are a number of case studies available which can offer observations of process and methods, but these are for individual firm and relate their own experiences in developing a roadmap and, therefore, generally don't provide general guidance or practical help (Lee and Park, 2005; Lee et al., 2007).

and paths. They also note that interpersonal skills are a key criterion for a successful process. Finally, they recognise that in some instances experience with roadmaps and/or team exercises may be missing and a roadmapping consultant or facilitator can be used to provide process guidance and assistance.

22.     In terms of using the created technology roadmap, a number of steps that relate to use are built into the process, including the development of an implementation plan, as well as the subsequent monitoring of progress and objectives in order to regularly update the roadmap. The idea that technology roadmaps are 'living documents' that require regular revision is a common theme across the literature, although the analysis performed in section 4 shows that many technology roadmaps lack an update plan.

23.     The above, along with other relevant case studies, can provide a strong starting point for developing a technology roadmap in the private sector. However, it is important to reiterate that the roadmapping process is tailored to the specific needs of an individual firm. The must be sufficient flexibility to customise the process to the specific objectives and organizational context (Lee and Park, 2005; Yan et al., 2011).


## 4.2   National and international TRMs

24.     Although TRMs were originally an instrument used in the private sector, they have increasingly been used as a tool by governments and industry bodies over the last decade to assist in structuring technology and innovation policy or create a common understanding of sectorial goals. In this context, TRMs must typically consider longer timeframes, as well as social and political aspects in addition to those technical aspects more commonly associated with technology roadmapping (McDowall, 2012).

25.     Furthermore, the need to build consensus for roadmaps at the national or international level, means that they are almost always collaborative, or at least consultative, in an effort to account for the views as many different stakeholders as possible (McDowall, 2012). This participation of stakeholders is vital in order to improve the chance that target-users of the roadmap will agree on its outcomes and work towards its implementation (IEA, 2010).

26.     The IEA (2010) describe a general roadmapping process that focuses on the need for common targets and includes concrete actions. The process includes two types of activities and four phases. The activities are i) expert judgement and consensus, and ii) data and analysis. The four phases, illustrated in Figure 2, are i) planning and preparation, ii) visioning, iii) roadmap development, iv) implementation and revision. The IEA suggest organisations allow 6 to 14 months to successfully develop a roadmap in this context.

Figure 2:	National or international roadmap process, described for energy technologies
		*(source: IEA, 2010)*

27.	The IEA (2010) guide suggests that, "expert workshops and consensus-building activities form the core of an effective technology roadmapping process". They go on to define the work to include target setting, identifying technology needs and assigning actions. This should be conducted by experts that represent not only the different stakeholders, but also the different disciplines that relate to technology development, including technical experts, policy, economics, finance and social sciences.

28.	The second type of activity, data and analysis, is used to provide a strong, more quantitative basis for decision-making and to inform the expert workshops. Figure 2 shows a number of optional steps depending on how readily the technology and available data lend themselves to further analysis, as well as the needs of the expert groups.

29.	Similar to the roadmapping process described for the private sector, the final phase of national or international roadmapping involves launching the roadmap and communicating it to the target audience. This should be followed by monitoring progress and objectives in order to regularly update the roadmap.

30.	As with TRMs in the private sector, roadmapping at the national or international levels should be seen as an on-going and iterative process that involves monitoring and updating as necessary. Ideally, some form of roadmap implementation body – often the same working group or steering committee that was involved in the roadmapping process – monitors progress and actions of stakeholders. Given the large scope of many high-level roadmaps, these responsibilities may also be given to a number of more focussed stakeholder groups, as is done in the IEA technology roadmaps (IEA, 2010).

31.     International roadmapping is more likely to require new governance structures to be formed, for example new international committees or associations, while in many instances it may be possible for government agencies or domestic industry associations to convene national roadmapping exercises.

## 4.3   Improving technology roadmaps

32.     One of the key challenges with TRMs is to successfully communicate their usefulness to users. A lack of awareness by users of the usefulness of a certain TRM is often the cause for it not being followed (Yi et al., 2009 in Lee et al., 2012).

33.     Lee et al. (2012) show that perceived TRM credibility – i.e. do users feel that it is useful and appropriate – affects TRM utilization. This has important repercussions for the way in which those working in a roadmapping process communicate with the eventual users of a TRM. Strong communication between these two groups will generally improve the credibility of a TRM and therefore the likelihood of successful implementation. Those findings, from research in the context of private sector roadmapping activities, are still relevant and provide valuable lessons on the need to improve communication and interaction between national or international roadmapping teams and domestic or international private sector actors respectively.

Table 2:  Summary table of criteria for transition roadmap evaluation
            *(source: McDowall, 2012)*

| Criteria | Key questions |
| --- | --- |
| **Credibility** | Is the roadmap based on sound analysis? |
| | Does the roadmap draw on the right breadth of expertise? |
| | Has the roadmap secured the participation and commitment of key actors in the innovation system? |
| | Does the roadmap adequately address the political, social and economic aspects of the transition? |
| **Desirability** | Does the transition meet social goals established through democratic institutions? |
| | Does the roadmap give a clear account of the justification for the proposed pathway, with transparency in aims, process and who took part? |
| | Is the roadmap process inclusive and participatory? |
| **Utility** | Does the roadmap effectively articulate a path forwards that can enable alignment around common goals? |
| | Is the roadmapping approach appropriate for the stage of innovation system maturity? |
| **Adaptability** | Does the roadmapping process involve periodic reviews, updates and learning? |
| | Is the roadmapping process embedded in a broader institutional structure that enables reflexivity and learning? |

34.     On a related note, it is important that roadmapping teams strike the right balance for how narrowly a TRM is defined. On the one hand, more prescriptive TRMs have been shown to be most effective in driving action, yet they tend to reflect dominant stakeholder interests and neglect alternative futures. On the other, less narrow TRM outcomes run the risk of inaction from users due to uncertainty. This is particularly

relevant when considering major socio-technical systems changes, or technological transitions. In these instances the most appropriate view of the future or timing for such a transition may not be particularly clear. McDowall (2012) proposes a set of criteria to address how roadmapping for technology transitions can balance these objectives (Table 2).

35.    In particular, McDowall (2012) notes that for technology transitions it is important to foster common expectations of the future amongst stakeholders that are conducive to the development of a new socio-technical system. For this reason, TRM processes that consider technology transitions should be transparent, as well as an inclusive participation process that involves open debate on the direction of socio-technical change.

# 5.  Technology Roadmap Analysis

36.   This section sets out the analysis of existing technology roadmaps related to climate change adaptation and mitigation technologies. The process of sourcing, filtering and analysing relevant TRMs is described (5.1 and 5.2), before the results of the analysis are presented in a selection of tables and matrices (5.3). Section 5.4 contains our main findings. A full set of all TRMs reviewed, an overview table with all information, and the full matrices and tables produced in the analysis are available in Annexes 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

## 5.1   Sourcing and Filtering TRMs

37.   The development of TRMs has been increasing for a number of years, and there are now many TRMs available in the public domain. These TRMs range from industry TRMs to technology specific TRMs in a wide variety of sectors and by various types of authors. In order to meet the needs of this review, TRMs were selected based on the following criteria:

1. They are available in the public domain

2. They deal with one or more climate change mitigation and/or adaptation technologies as interpreted under the UNFCCC

3. They aim at technology development, transfer and/or implementation

4. They show engagement of public and/or private stakeholders

5. They have some methodological foundations

6. They were published in English language

38.   For this review, we attempted to include TRMs from as many different authors as possible. We collected TRMs through different sources:

- The UNFCCC secretariat and several members of the TEC Task Force on TRMs gathered slightly over 120 TRM documents and references to them
- Cambridge University has a TRM database of over 2000 entries, from which we selected TRMs that met the six criteria above (~40 TRMs)
- Some additional TRMs were added because they were known to the consultants (~20)

39.   This process, in which we only tentatively checked the information on the selection criteria above, resulted in a set of 192 TRM entries, collected in an Excel database (see Annex 1).

40.   In the next round of analysis, we checked more closely whether the documents met the selection criteria, which caused 33 entries to be excluded:

- 6 appeared not to be available in the public domain,

- 1 was not on climate technologies,

- 9 did not aim at technology development, transfer and/or implementation

- 13 did not show any engagement of stakeholders,

- 4 entries appeared double in the list.

41.    After this pruning process, we finally ended up with a set of 159 TRMs documents for analysis.

## 5.2 Classification

42. The following section summarises the key findings from the analysis. One of the aims of this analysis is to identify gaps in existing TRMs. These gaps can be geographical, technological, and time based. Each of the 159 TRMs was analysed in detail to extract information relating to a set of characteristics, in order to enable us to identify these gaps in different dimensions. The following characteristics were extracted from each TRM:

- Technologies
  - The Standard IPCC list of climate related technologies (A-G), in which the energy sector technologies (A) and adaptation technologies were subdivided up to the third level of this classification (e.g. category A.1.2)
  - The other sectors were expanded to their second level (e.g. B.3)
- Geographical source of TRM Author, divided into
  - International
  - Annex I Country
  - Non-Annex I Country
- Geographical coverage of the TRM
  - International Coverage
  - Region Specific (e.g. European, African)
  - Nation Specific
  - Locally Specific (within a nation, e.g. North West USA)
- Year of publication
- Maximum Time Horizon of the TRM, divided into
  - Up to 2018
  - From 2018 to 2022
  - From 2022 to 2031
  - Past 2032
- Authoring Organisation
  - Intergovernmental Organisation (IGO)
  - Governmental Organisation (GO)
  - Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO)
  - Academic
  - Industry
- Substantive elements
  As outlined in Section 3, there are some key elements to a TRM. Each of the TRMs reviewed was checked for the presence of six substantive elements. These were:

  - Process Description
    Is the roadmapping process and methodology described in enough detail to be sure of the roadmaps validity and reliability?

  - Stakeholders Specified
    Are the stakeholders (participants in workshops, experts consulted etc.) specified explicitly?

  - Quantifiable Targets
    Are targets quantified and developed in a vision, and are they measurable?

  - Actions Assigned
    Are actions assigned to specific individuals or organisations?

- o Visual Representation

  Does the TRM contain a visual representation containing the three TRM perspectives (see Section 3) along a timeline?

  - ▪ Perspective 1 – Trends and drivers affecting development of applications and technologies
  - ▪ Perspective 2 – Applications, products, services and other tangible systems developed in response to trends and drivers, or enabled by technological breakthroughs
  - ▪ Perspective 3 – Technologies and other capabilities and resources developed in response to application and market needs

- o Plan for Update

  Does the TRM set out a plan for a future update, or show any evidence of being updated?

## 5.3 TRM distribution

Table 3 shows the distribution of the 159 TRMs.

Table 3: Distribution of the 159 TRMs over the various geographical, author and time horizon categories.

| | International | Regional | National | Local |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Geographical Coverage | 41 | 25 | 84 | 9 |

| | International | Annex I | Non Annex I |
|---|---|---|---|
| Geographical Source | 28 | 118 | 13 |

| | IGO | GO | Academia | NGO | Industry |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Author | 36 | 48 | 11 | 4 | 58 |

| | <2018 | 2018-2022 | 2023-2032 | >2032 | Unspecified |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Time Horizon | 19 | 32 | 23 | 43 | 43 |

## 5.4 Findings of the TRM analysis

43. The following section summarises the key findings by presenting key matrices to demonstrate the gaps identified in this study. The first matrix summarises the number of TRMs analysed referring to each technology. Subsequent matrices deepen the analysis by presenting the TRM's technologies against the characteristics as described in Section 5.2. Grey scale colours are used to indicate relative densities between cells. Darker shades of grey indicate more populated sections of the matrices.

44. It should be noted at this stage that the numbers in the matrices refer to the amount of TRMs that mention a technology, not to unique TRMs. For example, the numbers in the main technology categories (such as A1) are not by definition equal to the sum of the numbers for the underlying subgroups (A11, A12, etc.). This is because some TRMs deal with an entire cluster of technologies (such as Renewables as a whole), and are therefore only categorized as an A1 TRM. Other TRMs provide detailed information about several technologies, and are therefore counted for each of

these technologies, but these documents count only as one TRM in the aggregated group.  Full details of the analysis are included in Annexes 2 and 3.

**Technologies**

45.    Table 4 shows the technologies found in the TRM documents reviewed. The main finding from this table is that the TRMs analysed in this study are clearly dominated by mitigation technology TRMs.

To a less clear extent, a number of other findings can be distilled from Table 4. First, TRMs dealing with adaptation technologies (G) are comparatively under-represented. Second, within renewable energy technologies (A1), three technologies dominate: wind, biomass and solar-PV. Third, of all the other energy technologies (A2), hydrogen and CCS, and to a lesser extent nuclear and smart grids, feature strongly. Fourth, within transport technologies (B), alternative fuels (including biofuels, electricity and hydrogen) are most represented. Fifth, there are few TRMs related to energy efficiency technologies outside from HVAC, BES and Transport technologies (C). Finally, in the industrial sector (D), we did find some TRMs Iron and steel (D1), Chemicals (D2), and Cement (D7), but hardly any for other industrial sectors. Agricultural (E), waste (F) and geoengineering (H) TRMs were also scarce.

Table 4:    Overview of technologies found in the TRM documents reviewed

| Technology | |
|---|---:|
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | 55 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | 5 |
| A1.2. wind energy | 15 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 21 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | 8 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | 10 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 18 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | 5 |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | 10 |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | 64 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switching from coal to gas | 4 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | 14 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | 11 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | 5 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | 3 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 21 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | 12 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | 4 |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 35 |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | 5 |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 23 |
| B3. optimize transport operations | 2 |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | 16 |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) | 6 |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | 4 |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | 5 |
| **D. INDUSTRY** | 14 |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | 5 |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | 5 |
| D3. petroleum refining | 1 |
| D4. minerals | |
| D5. pulp and paper | 1 |
| D6. food industry | |
| D7. cement industry | 3 |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | 3 |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | 1 |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | 11 |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | 1 |
| G1.2 Water resources | 8 |
| G1.3 Agriculture | |
| G1.4 Public Health | 1 |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | 1 |
| **Total** | 436 |

**Geographical Source**

46.　Matrix 1 (full details see Annex 3) breaks down the previous findings by adding an additional dimension to the analysis. The matrix shows the number of TRMs analysed in each technology along with where geographically the TRM was authored.

47.　The main finding here is that the vast majority of TRMs are produced from Annex I countries (339 out of 436 mentions), and to a lesser extent from international authors such as IEA, UN bodies and the Major Economies Forum (MEF) (70 out of 436 mentions). Only a handful of Non-Annex I countries feature, and these focus particularly on water technologies.

Summary of Matrix 1 - Geographical Source (full details see Annex 3)

| Matrix 1 Summary | Geographical Source | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | International | Annex I | Non Annex I | Total |
| A1. Renewable Energy | 12 | 39 | 4 | 55 |
| A2. Other Energy | 6 | 53 | 5 | 64 |
| B. Transportation | 6 | 29 | | 35 |
| C. Buildings | 3 | 13 | | 16 |
| D. Industry | 2 | 12 | | 14 |
| E. Agriculture | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| F. Waste Management | | 1 | | 1 |
| G. Adaptation | 1 | 5 | 5 | 11 |
| H. Geoengineering | | 1 | | 1 |
| Total | 70 | 339 | 27 | 436 |

**Geographical Scope**

48.　Matrix 2 identifies the geographical scope of the TRMs analysed against each technology. Scope in this context refers to the geographical area to which the TRM's contents refer.

49.　For the TRMs analysed in this review, the main finding is that the majority (55%) have a national scope, across all technology categories. A smaller group have an international scope, while the limited number of regional TRMs is mostly EU specific.

50.　Where the TRMs have national scope, the majority of the TRMs (30) refer to US, as shown in Table 5. The UK (12), Canada (8), and Australia (7) also feature strongly. This may be caused by our selection criterion of the TRMs being available in the English language.

Summary of Matrix 2 – Geographical Scope (full details see Annex 3).

| Matrix 2 Summary | Geographical Scope | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Interna-tional | Regional | National | Local | |
| A1. Renewable Energy | 15 | 11 | 27 | 3 | 56 |
| A2. Other Energy | 13 | 10 | 38 | 4 | 65 |
| B. Transportation | 7 | 10 | 16 | 2 | 35 |
| C. Buildings | 3 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 16 |
| D. Industry | 3 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 14 |
| E. Agriculture | | 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| F. Waste Management | | 1 | | | 1 |
| G. Adaptation | 2 | | 9 | | 11 |
| H. Geoengineering | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Total | 98 | 91 | 219 | 32 | 440 |

Table 5:          Geographical Scope Details

| Regions | | TRMs |
|---|---|---|
| | Australasia | 1 |
| | EU | 23 |
| | EU & N-Africa | 1 |
| Countries | | |
| | Australia | 7 |
| | Bangladesh | 1 |
| | Cambodia | 1 |
| | Canada | 8 |
| | China | 1 |
| | Finland | 1 |
| | Hungary | 1 |
| | Iceland | 1 |
| | India | 1 |
| | Ireland | 6 |
| | Japan | 5 |
| | Netherlands | 1 |
| | Pakistan | 1 |
| | Philippines | 1 |
| | Poland | 1 |
| | Romania | 1 |
| | Spain | 1 |
| | Tonga | 1 |
| | UK | 12 |
| | USA | 30 |
| | Vietnam | 2 |

## Publication Year

51. Matrix 3 identifies the year in which each of the TRMs was published for every technology category.

52. The main findings from this analysis are that on average Renewable TRMs (A1) are more recent than other energy TRMs (A2). The latter show a relatively constant stream of publications since 2002, while the number of A1 TRMs has grown over the last decade.

53. Two patterns relating to specific technologies are also clear. First, the largest number of TRMs related to hydrogen was published in 2009. Second, there is recent trend in TRMs published in CCS technologies. This may relate to peaks in general attention to these technologies: hydrogen for example experienced quite strong public attention during the late '00s, which toned down relatively in later years.

54. Due to the lack of TRMs in other technologies, the identification of any meaningful patterns was impossible.

Summary of Matrix 3 – Publication Year (full details see Annex 3).

| Matrix 3 Summary | TRM Publication Year | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 | 12 | — |
| **A1. Renewable energy** | | | | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 57 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 5 |
| A1.2. wind energy | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | | 16 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 21 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | 10 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 18 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| **A2. Other energy-related** | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 64 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switching from coal to gas | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 4 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | | | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | | 2 | 4 | 1 | | | 14 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | 11 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3 | | | | 4 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 3 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 22 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 4 |
| **Full table in Annex 3** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

## Time Horizon

55. Matrix 4 denotes the maximum time horizon used in each TRM for every technology category.

56. The majority of renewable energy TRMs uses time horizons that either end between 2018-2022 (15 of 43), or extend beyond 2033 (18 of 43). The two most

common specific time horizons are 2020, which may be explained by the EU policy objectives for that year, and 2050, which coincides with an often-used reference year in many climate scenarios and projections. Of the other energy technologies, the time horizon is more evenly distributed.

57.   TRMs related to transport, industry, and adaptation on average feature shorter time horizons.

Summary of Matrix 4 – Time Horizon (full details see Annex 3).

| Matrix 4 Summary | Time Horizon | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | <2018 | 2018-2022 | 2023-2032 | 2033-2050+ | To-tal |
| A1. Renewable Energy | 3 | 15 | 7 | 18 | 43 |
| A2. Other Energy | 6 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 48 |
| B. Transportation | 7 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 25 |
| C. Buildings | | 5 | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| D. Industry | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 12 |
| E. Agriculture | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 |
| F. Waste Management | | 1 | | | 1 |
| G. Adaptation | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| H. Geoengineering | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 47 | 126 | 45 | 116 | 334 |

**Authoring Organisation**

58.   In authorships of TRMs, there is a strong dominance of Intergovernmental Organisations (IGOs), Governmental Organisations (GOs), and Industry over Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Academia.

59.   IGOs are relatively more active in renewable technologies (A1) than in other energy technologies (A2).

Summary of Matrix 5 – Authoring Organisation (full details see Annex 3)

| Technology | Authoring Organisation | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | IGO | GO | Academic | NGO | Industry | |
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | 16 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 16 | 40 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | 3 | 1 | | | 1 | 2 |
| A1.2. wind energy | 6 | 6 | | | 3 | 9 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | 4 | 4 | | | 1 | 5 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | 6 | 2 | | | 1 | 3 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 6 | 6 | | 1 | 6 | 13 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | 5 | | | | | 0 |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | 3 | 4 | 2 | | 1 | 7 |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | 10 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 23 | 54 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switching from coal to gas | | 2 | | | 2 | 4 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | 1 | 5 | 1 | | 6 | 12 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | 2 | 5 | 1 | | 2 | 8 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | | 1 | | | 2 | 3 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 16 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | 3 | 3 | | | 6 | 9 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | | 2 | | | 2 | 4 |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 8 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 26 |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 13 |
| **D. INDUSTRY** | 3 | 3 | | 1 | 6 | 10 |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| **Total** | 114 | 147 | 22 | 15 | 132 | 316 |

**Quality Elements**

60.     Matrix 6 indicates how many TRMs meet the six substantive elements we defined in Section 4.2: the presence of a process description, a specification of stakeholders, clear (quantitative) targets, clear actions, a structured visual and a plan for updating of the TRM. The main finding resulting from the analysis of quality elements is that the majority of TRMs do not satisfy several of these elements, and very few meet 5 or more of them.

61.     Even in the best performing categories (see Annex 3), clear visions, targets and actions are missing in almost half of the TRMs analysed. The other elements, process description, stakeholders specification, and visual representation, appear even less frequently. The least-present element is a plan for updating the TRM.

Matrix 6 – TRM Substantive elements (full details see Annex 3)

| Technology | Substantive Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Process | Stakeholders | Targets | Actions | Visual | Update |
| **All TRMs** | **32%** | **36%** | **60%** | **54%** | **40%** | **9%** |
| A1. Renewable Energy | 23% | 14% | 61% | 55% | 43% | 9% |
| A2. Other Energy | 31% | 40% | 55% | 46% | 45% | 6% |
| B. Transportation | 37% | 49% | 66% | 51% | 31% | 9% |
| C. Buildings | 44% | 56% | 44% | 38% | 56% | 0% |
| D. Industry | 64% | 64% | 71% | 64% | 57% | 7% |
| E. Agriculture | 100% | 67% | 0% | 33% | 33% | 0% |
| F. Waste Management | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| G. Adaptation | 36% | 55% | 82% | 55% | 9% | 27% |
| H. Geoengineering | 100% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

## 5.5 Key findings

62.    The key findings of our TRM analysis are:

- The set is dominated by mitigation technologies; there exists a clear gap in adaptation technology TRMs in the set analysed

- Most TRMs are produced in Annex-1 countries or by international organisations. There is a clear lack of TRMs authored or relevant to Non-Annex I countries.

- Most TRMs have a national scope, TRMs with an international scope having the second-largest share. TRMs for the USA, UK, Canada and Australia are most present in our analysis, possibly because we limited ourselves to TRMs in the English language.

- TRMs on renewable energy technologies are on average more recent than those for other technologies. Many of the renewables TRMs have a 2020 horizon.

- Authors of the TRMs reviewed are mainly Intergovernmental Organisations, Governmental Organisations and Industry.

- Of the six substantive elements we identified as important for a TRM, hardly any TRM included all of them, and none of these elements was present in 50% or more of all TRMs reviewed.

63.    The latter finding implies that there is a clear need for guidance on the production of good quality TRMs, even when the guidelines and methodologies discussed in Section 4 are publicly available. Therefore, Section 6 goes into a number of good practice examples, both related to climate change technologies and elsewhere.

# 6. Good practice guidance

64.    This section describes a selection of good practices in order to strengthen the understanding of technology roadmaps, and provide a basis for improving TRM practices. To this end, we selected a representative set of TRMs from our 159-document set in terms of types of technologies, developer, time frame and geographical coverage of the roadmap; see Table 6. Additionally, we have analysed two TRMs on technologies not related to climate change that provide useful good practice examples. Annex 4 provides short summaries of the objectives, methodology and structure of these TRMs.

65.    It should be noted, however, that we did not find any 'perfect' TRMs in our review. None of the TRMs, for example, covers all six substantive elements we defined in Section 5.

Table 6: Overview of good practice TRMs in this section

| Climate Change Mitigation or Adaptation Technology TRMs | Unique TRM ID | Renewable | Other Energy | Transport | Building | Industry | Agriculture | Waste | Adaptation | Geo-Engineering | International | Continental | National | Regional | Corporate | <2018 | 2018-2022 | 2023-2032 | >2032 | IGO | GO | Academia | NGO | Industry | Process | Stakeholders | Targets | Actions | Visual | Update Plan |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Energy efficiency - Bonneville Power Admin | 9 | | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | x | | | x | | | | x | | | | | | x | | x | |
| Wind energy - IEA | 42 | x | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | x | x | | | | | | | | x | x | |
| TRM for PV - PV Group | 59 | x | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | x | | | | x | | | | x | | | | | |
| Electric vehicles roadmap - SEAI | 61 | | | x | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | x | | x | | | | | | | x | x | |
| Development and Deployment - Fuel Cells UK | 109 | | x | x | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | |
| Green Chemical Technology - Crystal Faraday | 179 | | | | | x | | | | | | | x | | | | | x | | | | | | x | x | | | x | | |
| Water Vietnam - ADB | 191 | | | | | | | | x | | | | x | | | x | | | | x | | | | | | | | x | | |
| **TRMs included as good practice, but not related to Climate Change** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ITRS TRM on semiconductors | 996 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| TRM on power grids -DoE | 998 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | |

66.    Within this selection of good practice TRMs, we consider the IEA TRM structure a 'best practice' standard, which we present and discuss in section 6.1, using some concrete examples from the IEA Wind TRM. However, the other selected TRMs show specific strengths that are complementary to the IEA structure, or are particularly useful in specific contexts. These specific features are presented and discussed in Section 6.2, in which examples are discussed both from the other selected TRMs related to climate technologies, and from the TRMs non related to climate technologies.

## 6.1    The IEA TRM format

67.    The IEA TRMs aim to identify the primary tasks that must be addressed in order to reach the IEA vision for specific energy technologies, such as wind, solar-PV and CSP, bioenergy, electric vehicles, and others. In their descriptions of current status and future vision, they make ample use of statistics and models available within the IEA, which gives the TRMs a strong quantitative basis. In the IEA TRMs, concrete tasks and milestones are defined on the basis of the vision, and they are allocated to specific actors. By strong involvement of stakeholders in the TRM process, stakeholder buy-in is aimed for. Not all IEA TRMs specifically mention the names and/or affiliations of the stakeholders who were involved in their production.

*IEA TRM Structure:*

68.    A typical IEA TRM has the following structure:

1.  A *Technology status of today* chapter, describing deployment of the technology in the past decades, its performance and costs. Depending on the technology, other elements in this section can be market trends, specific technological and R&D issues, system integration and public acceptance issues.
2.  A *Vision for deployment*, which discusses the foreseen future capacity of the technology, its share in the future energy mix, and projected cost reductions. Also aspects such as investment needs, grid linkages, and non-technical challenges are discussed in this section.
3.  Several *Actions and Milestones* sections go into actions and milestones related to various issues identified in earlier sections. For example, the Wind TRM has Actions and Milestones sections on:
    *   Wind Technology Development and Deployment:
    *   Delivery and System Integration
    *   Policy Frameworks
    *   International Collaboration
4.  *Finally there is a Roadmap action plan and next steps,* in which the actions and milestones are allocated to specific actors, such as industry, government, universities and intergovernmental organisations. The wind TRM has these for the energy industry, governments and the power sector.

*Specific strong features: Targets*

69.    All IEA TRMs are based on extensive modelling results from earlier IEA studies (IEA 2008), and provide quantitative information on projected market shares, costs and investments. Figure 3 gives an example of this, showing projected wind power production levels in different regions in the world. Also targeted future cost reductions and required investment levels in wind power are projected, providing a broad and quantitative basis for the remainder of the TRM.

Source: IEA (2008a).

KEY POINT: Leading markets over the period are China, OECD Europe and the United States. OECD Pacific countries gain importance after 2020, and Central and South America after 2030.

Figure 3:    Regional production of wind energy projection, as part of the vision section of the IEA wind energy TRM (IEA 2009)

*Specific strong features: Actions*

70.    The IEA TRM format for actions and milestones is comprehensive, structured but simple, time-specific and actor-specific. While it does not link the actions visually back to key challenges coming from the targets section, the accompanying texts in the TRM do provide this link. The table format it is a good way of structuring the key outcomes of the TRM. Figure 4 shows a part of the actions to be led by governments from the wind TRM (IEA 2009).

31

| R&D Finance | Milestones and actors |
|---|---|
| 1. Identify and provide a suitable level of public funding for wind energy R&D, proportionate to the potential of the technology in terms of electricity production and $CO_2$ abatement. | From 2010. Iterate over 2010-2050 period.<br><br>Governments, research institutions and industry. |
| **Education and employment** | |
| 2. Develop internationally standard education and training strategies for the complete range of skills needed, from design to deployment. | Complete by 2015.<br><br>Governments, universities, and industry. |
| **Deployment incentives** | |
| 3. Where not already in place, establish long-term targets for renewable energy deployment, including short-term milestones. | Complete by 2015.<br><br>Governments with input from industry. |
| 4. Implement support mechanisms that provide sufficient incentive to investors; develop effective systems to internalise the external costs of all forms of electricity production into market prices for electricity. | Complete by 2015.<br><br>Governments with input from investors and financiers, research institutions and regulators. |
| **Transmission development** | **Milestones and actors** |
| 5. Provide incentives for accelerated construction of transmission capacity to link wind energy resources to demand centres (using new latest proven technology); establish mechanisms for cost recovery and allocation. | Complete by 2015.<br><br>Governments, wind developers, transmission companies and system operators; regulators. |

Figure 4: Actions and milestones to be led by governments in the IEA wind TRM
*(IEA 2009, detail)*


## 6.2 Good practice examples from other TRMs

71. While the IEA format provides an excellent TRM standard, inspiration for specific elements can also be found in the other good practice examples we analysed. Here, we show some good examples of specific methodologies, ways of target setting, structuring of actions and visual representation. Short descriptions of these TRMs can be found in Annex 4.


*Elaborate methodology: The Crystal Faraday Partnership TRM on Green Chemistry*

72. Sometimes it is not clear what direction the development of a certain technology should take, and how this development should link to fundamental societal developments. In such cases it is important to have a trend analysis as starting point of the TRM. The Crystal Faraday Partnership TRM on Green Chemical Technology (document no. 179 see Table 6) provides a good example of such an exercise. This TRM used an elaborate method, starting with an identification of basic (societal, technical, environmental and other) trends and drivers. It then links these trends and drivers to consequent future requirements to chemical products and processes, identifying key technology characteristics. It ends with a review of key R&D challenges and corresponding gaps in current R&D. See also Figure 5. The strength of such an outside-in approach is that it contributes to the societal relevance and value added of a TRM.

*Setting targets when extensive modelling tools are not available: the PV TRM for China*

73.   It is not always possible to generate such extensive quantitative analysis as in the IEA TRMs, particularly in non-Annex 1 countries. The PV Power TRM on PV in China (doc. no. 59) uses a practical approach on this: the projections of global and regional development of PV (from an IEA study) are translated into specific national objectives for China. Although such translations will need to be done with careful attention for the specific characteristics of a country, they can be a pragmatic way of generating some quantitative basis.

*Well-structured actions table: the UK TRM on Fuel Cells*

74.   Overviews of actions in a TRM are most valuable when they clearly link to the issues that need to be addressed, and the strategies to be applied. The UK TRM on Fuel Cells (doc. no. 109) is a good example of this linkage: the document contains comprehensive tables translating challenges to strategies and actions, also pointing out champions for each action and required timing. This was done for four areas: (i) Regulation and policy, (ii) market development, (iii) education, training and awareness, and (iv) technology development. This provide a well-structured basis for concrete actions at a specific level, and also for more the more generic recommendations in the TRM. Figure 6 shows an example part of these tables.

*From targets to actions: the SEAI TRM on Electric Vehicles*

75.   Another way of strengthening internal consistency in a TRM is by integrating targets and actions into one figure with a shared timeline. The Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland (SEAI) TRM on Electric Vehicles (doc. no. 61) provides a good example for this. The core of this TRM is a comprehensive and complex deployment scenario scheme that integrates market projections with required actions.

76.   Figure 7 shows an excerpt from this scheme, with the scenario graph and the actions for policy and technology (actions on charging infrastructure and grid& wind infrastructure not shown in this excerpt).

*Linking drivers and actions in one illustration: the Bonneville Power Administration TRM on efficiency technologies*

77.   Linking actions to essential trends and drivers can also be done through a visual scheme. The Bonneville Power Administration TRM on efficiency technologies (doc. no. 9) contains such visuals. They show how basic societal drivers are translated into desired product features. These are then translated into technology challenges, which lead to R&D challenges. This structured way of thinking is important for TRMs, and provided a good basis for the final step, not shown in the visual: the identification of concrete actions for BPA. Figure 8 shows and example scheme from this TRM.

*A concise approach in case capacity is a limiting factor: the Viet Nam Water TRM*

78.   Of all TRMs reviewed, only a few relate to non-Annex 1 countries. Of these, the Viet Nam TRM on Water (doc. no. 191) is one of the better examples. It is a concise document (15 page total) in which the tabular material is well structured (see also Figure 9). Three tables cover the major part of a TRM flow:

1. *Sector Outcomes*, specified for three subthemes, with indications of the developments in the past 5 years, the current situation, and indicators for success in 5 and 10 years.
2. A S*ector Outputs* table, in which the desired outcomes are transferred in more practical ambitions.
3. An *Issues and Constraints* table, discussing regulatory, institutional, infrastructural and other barriers.
4. An *Actions, Milestones and Investments* table, including a time schedule and an identification of the role of ADB and other parties.

*The importance of well-structured workshops as part of the TRM process: The DoE TRM on Power Grids*

79. Particularly when stakeholders with different interests need to be united in a TRM with a clear common interest, workshops will be an important part of the TRM process, and they need to be well prepared. In order to develop a shared vision and set of actions on modernizing the power grid in north America, the US Department of Energy convened a series of two one-day workshops bringing together over 250 industry professional to generate an 'action agenda'. They did this in two steps:

- The first workshop brought together senior executives and policy makers to develop a 'vision' of the future.

- The aim of a second workshop attended by technical experts was on building a consensus on how to achieve the vision.

80. This resulted in a TRM that was backed by industry both in terms of its desirability and in its achievability (see doc. no. 998 for more information).

*The importance of updating: The International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS)*

81. A TRM provides an outline and framework for action in technology development and deployment. However, as this framework covers time periods of sometimes more than three decades, and the world changes, regular updating is a valuable thing to do: it safeguards that the TRM remains up to date and relevant as a guiding document.

82. A clear example of this is the International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS, doc. no. 996). The ITRS has been updated annually since 1991. Having started as a US initiative, the scope was broadened to include other nations owing to the global nature of the industry. It is the most authoritative source on the industry's research and development needs over a 15-year horizon. Schaller (2004) demonstrated the benefits of this initiative, in terms of standards setting and enhanced rates of innovation, in a detailed account of the evolution of the ITRS. The updates are well traceable: in each update document there is a specification of the specific elements that were changed in comparison to the earlier version of the document.

| Step 1 | *Identify key industry trends and drivers* |
|--------|-------------------------------------------|
|        | Key industry trends and drivers were identified using the STEEP model (social, technical, economic, environmental and political forces). This was done for general trends and drivers and those specific to a particular sector. Four time periods were considered: <br> • History: 1998-2002 <br> • Short term: 2003-2007 <br> • Medium term: 2008-2012 <br> • Long term: 2013-2023+ |
| Step 2 | *Identify goals plus features and attributes by sector* <br> For each of the four sectors in the chemical industry, list the specific sustainability goals of the sector in response to the trends and drivers. Identify the features and attributes required in products, services and manufacturing processes to meet the sector goals. Group these into the three future time horizons. |
| Step 3 | *Group the features and attributes across the sectors* <br> Group the features and attributes identified in Step 2 into a smaller number of product and manufacturing key goals that apply across all sectors. |
| Step 4 | *Map technology areas to key goals and attributes* <br> For each of the eight technology areas rate the impact on the key goals and attributes. |
| Step 5 | *Identify the key technology clusters for each sector* <br> Using the analysis in Step 4 we can identify which technology clusters are most important for each sector of the industry. |
| Step 6 | *Build technology roadmaps for each technology area* <br> For each technology area now identify the technologies that can be implemented in the short term with immediate benefits, and those key technologies that need further development. Dependencies and constraints are recorded for each roadmap. |
| Step 7 | *Identify gaps and priorities* <br> The key technology requirements to meet future industry needs are in the roadmaps. Compare these to existing programmes to identify gaps in the existing portfolio, leading to recommendations for focus and investment. |
| Step 8 | *Key messages for audiences* <br> What are the key messages for the target audiences? <br> • industry; <br> • academia; <br> • government. |

Figure 5: Methodology of the Crystal Faraday partnership (2004) TRM on Green chemistry

| Challenge | Desired outcome | Strategy | Actions | Champion | Timing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **7. Insufficient access to market-based mechanisms** | Portfolio of complementary market mechanisms to provide long term support for the development and deployment of fuel cells | Adapt market mechanisms to reflect benefits which fuel cells bring. | i) Explore options for extending the Renewable Obligation Certificate scheme to allow a small proportion of highly innovative electricity generation (beyond renewables), with significant potential to deliver benefit, to receive a greater incentive (e.g. 20p/kW).<br><br>ii) Ensure that fuel cell installations benefit from Levy Exemption Certificates (LECs).<br><br>iii) Factor the role of fuel cells into renewable energy systems eligible for Renewable Energy Guarantees of Origin (REGOs) (e.g. biofuels-fuelled systems) as well the potential for emissions trading of bundled installations. | i) Defra<br><br>ii) Fuel Cells UK<br><br>iii) ENCG with support from Fuel Cell Coordination Group (see Challenge 3) | i – ii) Short term<br><br>iii) Short to medium term |
| **8. Ensuring policy develops in line with evolving market conditions** | Flexible and responsive policy framework | Introduce mechanisms to integrate lessons from national and international experience into the evolving policy framework. | i) Where appropriate adopt international best practice in removing regulatory barriers to fuel cell development and deployment, including fuel infrastructure aspects.<br><br>ii) Support UK learning from international activity (e.g. demonstrations and procurement initiatives) by funding International Missions etc.<br><br>iii) Ensure that lessons from trials, demonstrations and research are fully understood and reflected in evolving policy framework through periodic briefings and updates to Departments, Ministries and Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology.<br><br>iv) Undertake periodic and systemized review of general and specific policy. | i – ii) Central Government, led by Fuel Cell Coordination Group (see Challenge 3)<br><br>iii) Fuel Cells UK<br><br>iv) Central Government (led by Fuel Cell Coordination Group) | i – iv) Ongoing |

Figure 6:     Sample Table from the UK Fuel Cells TRM *(Fuel Cells UK 2005)*

Figure 7:       Excerpt from the EV deployment scenario and actions in the SEAI Electric vehicles TRM *(SEAI 2011)*

Figure 8:    Visual element from the Bonneville TRM on energy efficiency technologies
            *(Bonneville 2006)*

| D. Actions, Milestones, Investments | By Issue | Schedule | ADB | Others/ External |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| D.1.Viet Nam Actions, Milestones and Investments | | | | |
| D.1.a. Water Resources Management | | | | |
| TA3528-VIE Component 1: National Water Resources Coordination Project | ▪ Policy and Legislation<br>▪ Institutional Arrangements | 2001 - 2004 | Technical Assistance | |
| TA3528-VIE Component 3: Dong Nai River Basin Water Resources Management | ▪ Institutional Arrangements<br>▪ Deteriorating Water Quality<br>▪ Increasing Competition for Water<br>▪ Watershed Degradation | 2003 - 2004 | Technical Assistance | |
| Vietnam Water Resources Management Assistance Project | ▪ Institutional Arrangements<br>▪ Information Management | 2001 - 2004 | | AusAID |
| Water Sector Program Support | ▪ Policy and Legislation<br>▪ Institutional Arrangements<br>▪ Increasing Competition for Water<br>▪ Deteriorating Water Quality | 2001 - 2005 | | Danida |
| Study on Nation-Wide Water Resource Development and Management | ▪ Increasing Competition for Water<br>▪ Infrastructure | ongoing | | JICA |
| National Hydropower Plan Study | ▪ Increasing Competition for Water<br>▪ Infrastructure | First phase completed in 2002; second phase to start in 2003 | | Funded by Sweden and Norway |

Figure 9:    Excerpt from the Actions, Milestones and Investments table in the ADB Water TRM
            for Viet Nam *(ADB 2003)*

38

# 7. Technology road maps in the area of adaptation

83.　The characteristics of technologies for adaptation are to some extent different from technologies for mitigation. Many adaptation technologies are termed 'soft' technologies, e.g. practices, management strategies and behavioural patterns, potentially in combination with hard technologies, such as dams and other infrastructure investments. In least-developed countries especially, adaptation measures (and their related technologies) can be closely linked to development strategies. The secure provision of basic services such as water, food, health care, education and access to energy for example tends to increase climate resilience in these areas, particularly for the poor. The technical paper "Application of environmentally sound technologies for adaptation to climate change" (UNFCCC 2006) demonstrates that a need for adaptation cannot be considered in isolation; typically, adaptation is closely linked to other needs and policy issues, such as spatial planning, food security and public health.

84.　The choice for adaption technologies is generally based on an assessment of a country's vulnerability to climate change. There are many uncertainties around most methodological steps of these vulnerability assessments, three examples are summarise here. Firstly, debate exists around global temperature increases, and the resulting effects (sea level rise, more extreme weather events such as hurricanes, melting of glaciers). Secondly even higher uncertainties exist around the local climate impacts that stem from the global changes (e.g. rain fall distribution patterns, local temperature changes and distribution). Finally, uncertainty exists around the impact of local climatic changes on local eco-systems, agricultural productivity etc. This distinguishes any adaptation assessment and strategies from mitigation related actions where it can be more reasonably assumed that any reduction in GHG emissions will have a positive impact on the global climate. Due to the large uncertainties around local climate impacts it has even been suggested to only undertake large-scale investments into adaptation technologies now, if the technologies are not only justified by consideration of future climate change, but are also needed to meet today's needs (Smith, 2006).

85.　The technical paper "Application of environmentally sound technologies for adaptation to climate change" (UNFCCC 2006) describes the challenges of technology transfer for adaptation, and stresses that there are several important distinctions between the processes of mitigation and adaptation, e.g. adaptation is not new in the way that mitigation is new, the sectors that need technology for adaptation are ubiquitous, and many (though not all) technologies for adaptation are already readily available in developing countries. These distinctions imply that TRMs should play a different role in adaptation than they do in mitigation.

86.　Our review of TRMs for adaptation has the following results: Firstly, a very limited number of TRMs on adaptation was found (only 11 of the 159 TRMs analysed; 8 of these 11 focus on water resource management). The reasons behind this are uncertain. It is possible that planning efforts related to adaptation are limited at present, and therefore technology needs have been less clearly specified. Moreover, it may point to the fact that globally fewer resources have been spent with the primary focus on adaptation than on mitigation to date, and that consequently there are, amongst others, less specialist knowledge and skills, and a lack of good practices guidance. Finally, the difference may originate from adaptation being less focused on "hard" technologies than mitigation.

87.　Secondly, in the identified TRMs, the attention for technology R&D is generally limited: in TRMs related to water for example, a central focus is on policy and resource

management approaches. The only TRM with a clear technology R&D focus is the Australian TRM on water desalination.

88.    Because of the limited set of adaptation TRMs, only relatively tentative conclusions can be drawn. Within the selection of adaptation documents analysed, there is a dominance of TRMs related to water. However, there were too few TRMs to draw a definite conclusion that this sector is specifically suitable for TRMs.

89.    On the basis of the more common insights on TRMs generated in this study, some more general observations on TRMs and adaptation technologies can be made.

- TRMs are a useful tool when development and transfer of technology plays an important role, and when stakeholders from different backgrounds need to be activated. In the field of adaptation, TRM therefore seem most suitable for so called "hard" technologies rather than for practices, management strategies and behavioural patterns.

- Adaptation interrelates with other policy themes more strongly than mitigation and can have a strong link to development. Therefore, the diversity of stakeholders to be engaged will be greater than for mitigation options. TRMs will require most careful attention for this engagement process.

- Adaptation technology roadmaps must deal with the inherent element of uncertainty related to the assessment of a country's vulnerability to climate change. This can be addressed by regularly updating not just the technology roadmap itself, but also the underlying scenarios for expected climatic changes and their consequences in a country.

- Adaptation TRMs are most relevant at the national level, a conclusion tentatively confirmed by the limited set in this review. TRMs are supposed to be prepared in order to accomplish specific (quantifiable) goals; clearer objectives usually lead to more impact of the TRM. Ideally, countries envisaging potential negative impacts of climate change plan the relevant adaptation efforts, define the expectations regarding technologies to support these efforts, and develop TRMs accordingly. Specific technology needs would vary between countries and thus adaptation technology roadmapping efforts are probably most effective at country level. These efforts could be linked to TNAs and TAPs.

90.    Due to the few adaptation TRMs analysed in this study, limited new insights on adaptation TRMs are presented in this background paper. This would suggest that an additional activity should be considered to address specific questions regarding adaptation TRMs. A dedicated workshop with a selection of invited adaptation experts would strengthen these conclusions and recommendations.

# 8. Key conclusions

91.  In our key conclusions, we discuss general advantages and limitations of using TRMs (8.1), the gaps and other challenges in TRMs found in the review (8.2), and other key findings (8.3).

## 8.1 Advantages of using TRMs

92.  Based on the literature review undertaken in this study, the review of TRMs and the common insights of the authors, the following presents some of the key advantages and limitations of using TRMs. Advantages include the following:

93.  The key distinguishing feature of technology roadmapping is the structured depiction of trends, objectives and actions. This can take many forms ranging from tables to pictorial representations. Such depictions provide a highly synthesised view of strategy that is beneficial for supporting dialogue and communication between stakeholders. These benefits occur both during the roadmap development process and subsequently for dissemination of strategy and policy.

94.  The origins of technology roadmapping lie at the firm level, for aligning technology and product strategy, although the method has subsequently been extended to general business strategy. The roots of the method as practical 'tool' for supporting technology and innovation management make it particularly suited to supporting technology management, and to link technological considerations to policy.

95.  In contrast with many traditional methods (see also Section 3), technology roadmapping has been identified as being pro-active (de Laat & McKibbin, 2003), "starting from the idea that the future can and should be created – therefore it is not lead by technological determinism".

96.  The roadmapping method is typically characterised by a strong consensus-building process, led by a shared vision and agreed actions. The action-oriented nature of the method is reinforced by the most common visual representation of a multi-layered time-based diagram, somewhat similar in architecture to project planning tables, such as Gantt charts.

97.  The strong consensus-building element of roadmaps could make them a useful tool for the work of the Climate Technology Centre as well. With respect to facilitating the Climate Technology Network to enhance cooperation with national, regional and international technology centres and relevant national institution, facilitate international partnerships among public and private stakeholders to accelerate the innovation and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing country Parties and provide technical assistance and training to support identified technology actions in developing country Parties.

98.  Roadmapping is a flexible approach, underpinned by the generic systems-based roadmap architecture. This enables the method to be applied in many different circumstances, with both the roadmap structure and roadmapping process adapted to suit the particular context, with the capability of integrating the method with other methods, such as scenario planning and portfolio management The advantage of this flexibility also represents challenges, as there is no standardised and generally accepted approach, so skills and experience are needed for effective application. There has been a proliferation of activity, including many examples of good and bad practice. The flexibility of the road mapping approach may make it especially suitable in the context of the work of the Technology Mechanism, which addresses technology

development and transfer in a large variety of different country contexts and for very different types of technologies.

## 8.2 Limitations of using TRMs

99. There are also a few limitations of the TRM approach. A TRM process aims at reaching consensus on a vision of the future. This creates a risk for a 'lock-in' or tunnel vision: overly focusing "in the direction of one single collective future vision", reducing the attention for uncertainties, variety and diversity, which are healthy aspects of many strategic initiatives (de Laat & McKibbin, 2003). This needs to be guarded against as part of the TRM process design and governance. For this, De Laat & McKibbin (2003) highlight a number of such 'key success factors' associated with the initiation, implementation and follow-up process phases:

1. Initiation: establishing a clear need; visioning and goal setting; integration with broader policy strategy; commitment and support from decision makers; engagement with the appropriate network of stakeholders.

2. Implementation: the need to customise the method and to retain flexibility through the process; maintaining momentum; a culture of openness; and adequate levels of programme funding.

3. Follow-up: iteration, to refine and update the roadmap; monitoring outcomes, uptake and impacts.

100. Another limitation, or important precondition, is that a TRM will only be successful in implementation if it aligns well with existing (governmental) plans and strategies. For the feasibility of the identified actions in a TRM, this is an essential element.

## 8.3 Gaps in existing TRMs and possible challenges

101. This section summarises the key findings from the analysis of climate change mitigation and adaptation technology related TRMs. Three conclusions stand out from the analysis, and set the most significant challenges for the TEC. The first conclusion lies in the clear gap in TRMs developed by or for Non-Annex I countries. The second is the low representation of adaptation technologies. Third, excluding some good practice examples, there is room for improvement with respect to the methodological approach and process in the analysed TRMs.

- The vast majority of TRMs are authored by Annex I countries with a national focus. There are to a lesser extent TRMs from international authors that are geographically unspecific, and could be relevant in non-Annex 1 countries, however the Non-Annex I specific TRMs are limited to only 5% of the total.[4]

- Of the TRMs analysed, mitigation technologies dominate. Within the set, mentions of adaptation technologies (G) make up only 5% of the total[5]. This

---

[4] See Matrix 1, available in the Annex. There are 21 technology mentions from TRMs authored or sourced from Non-Annex I countries.
[5] See Matrix 1, available in the Annex. There are 21 mentions of adaptation technologies (G) out of a total of 436 mentions of technologies.

sits in stark contrast to over 30% for renewable technologies (A1) and 30% for other energy technologies (A2).

- The majority of TRMs analysed lacked key elements considered essential for successful TRMs. A lack of clear vision, quantifiable targets and actions hampers the potential for even the best-intentioned TRMs to deliver meaningful beneficial change.

## 8.4 Other conclusions

102. The discussion on TRMs vis-à-vis other strategy tools shows that technology roadmapping partly overlaps with several of them, but has its unique features. TRMs are more action-oriented than scenarios and forecasts. Backcasts resemble TRMs more closely, but backcasts usually sketch a more storyline-like vision of the future, while TRMs usually focus on the future of a specific technology. National (policy) TRMs differ from industry TRMs in the level of complexity they have to address; as a consequence, TRMs for policy usually have an objective that is more broadly defined than in private sector TRMs, and also the required actions are more generic.

103. TRMs can serve several purposes. We have identified six purposes potentially relevant to the TEC: (i) provide coherent input to (inter)national technology R&D policy, (ii) provide a basis for national policy supporting diffusion of climate technologies, (iii) be a catalyst for existing technologies to adapt to new markets, (iv) mobilise private sector interest in climate technologies, (v) provide a common platform for international support, and (vi) generally aligning actions by different funders and ministries.

104. Methods and guidelines for TRM processes and documents are available, both for application at corporate and (inter)national level. For the latter, the IEA guidelines are particularly illustrative.

105. Also, good practice examples can give guidance to TRM developers. The IEA format is a typical reference, but other TRMs show useful examples for cases in which e.g. underlying societal trends need to be analysed in more detail, quantitative analysis for deriving a target are not available, or when financial resources are very limited.

106. Regarding adaptation, we found only a limited number of TRMs on this matter, mainly on water. Our impression is that technology plays a different role in adaptation than in mitigation; adaptation more often making use of existing technologies. Also adaptation measures interrelate more strongly with other policy themes than mitigation options do.

## 8.5 Limitations of this study

107. There are some essential limitations to this study, particularly to the review of TRMs.

- We have used a limited set of TRMs. Given the wide application of TRMs, our list is definitely not exhaustive.

- Only TRMs in the English language were reviewed, which is illustrated by the absence of e.g. German and French TRMs. This leads to a bias towards English speaking countries in our list.

- The analysis has a strong focus on TRMs for climate technologies. While we have introduced some examples from other types of technologies, more guidelines and good practices are certainly available.

- Certain (climate-related) technologies might be included in TRMs with more general names, concealing the climate-related aspects in them. We have not been able to identify such TRMs.

- Some TRMs might be not be available on the Internet but only in printed form

- Some TRMs may are not available in the public domain; this particularly applies to industry TRMs.

Our study focused mostly on quantity of TRMs. Of course, the impacts of specific TRMs are incommensurable, e.g. one good TRM could have far more reaching outcomes than several poor TRMs (in terms of structure and/or process). As our analysis indicates that most of the TRMs reviewed are rather far from the ideal, their counts are not good predictors of actual implementation-related activities all over the world.

# 9. Recommendations for TEC activities on TRMs

108. The literature reviewed and analysis conducted highlight many areas that must be addressed. The following section lays out recommendations. We structured the recommendations to address three questions:

1. What are the specific needs or areas regarding development and use of TRMs in the context of addressing climate change?
2. How could the TRM approach be integrated into current efforts for enhancing technology transfer and actions for mitigating and adapting to climate change, such as TNAs, NAPAs and NAMAs?
3. What role could the TEC play as the policy arm of the Technology Mechanism? How could the work of the TEC be conducted in a more efficient and meaningful manner including by taking advantage of existing efforts and cooperating with relevant organizations and institutional arrangement under the Convention?

Actions are further summarised in the table at the end of this section

## 9.1 Specific needs regarding TRM development and use in the context of addressing climate change

109. Despite the wealth of TRMs available, it is clear from the review in Sections 4 and 8.2 that important gaps exist in (i) technology areas, (ii) time horizons, and (iii) the geographical scope of existing TRMs. Of particular note, few TRMs deal with the specific context of non-Annex I countries, and with technologies to adapt to the predicted consequences of climate change. Given the importance of developing countries and of adaptation, there seems to be a need to fill these gaps.

110. The absence of several relevant elements in many existing TRMs hinders their potential contribution to climate change adaptation and mitigation technology transfer. In order to improve a TRM's impact and success, there seems to be a need for more guidance on good-practice TRMs and TRM processes.

111. The analysis shows that good practices are possible within various constraints in terms of time, available data and budget. But as good practice guidelines mainly focus on developed countries, there seems to be a need for a good practice guideline on producing a TRM in a developing country.

112. However it must be recognised that simply providing guidance may not be suitable in certain circumstances. The TRM process is complex and requires a facilitator to achieve the best results. There might be a need for more practical coordination in the running of structured workshops or training sessions in order to build capacity for TRM development, before any future TRMs are conducted.

113. Generally, for developed and developing countries, budgets can be a constraining factor for TRMs. Therefore, there seems to be a general need for a process and guidelines to meet the needs of small scale cost efficient TRMs.

## 9.2 Integrating TRMs in other technology transfer efforts

114. TRMs are only one of several tools supporting actions for mitigating and adapting to climate change, and related technology transfer. So it is important to know how these tools interlink and integrated. Here we focus on TNAs and NAPAs/NAMAs

115. The Technology Action Plans developed as part of the latest round of Technology Needs Assessments under the UNFCCC deploy a method very similar to a

TRM approach, as the Technology Action Plans intend to clarify priorities, set milestones, identify barriers to technology development and transfer and develop measures to overcome these barriers. However, TAPs from different countries still vary widely in scope, degree of detail and readiness for implementation (partly because the implementation success of TAPs depends on the (uncertain) availability of finance). TAPs are also prepared for multiple technologies, while TRMs are mostly concentrated on individual technology areas. TRMs could help translate TNAs and TAPs into action, by defining timelines and milestones. Besides, a well-prepared and realistic TRM could show potential investors or international donors that the authors and stakeholders understand the complexity of a technology development process and commit to their role in it. An important question is also how roadmaps can be integrated into other climate instruments like Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs). As our findings on adaptation technology TRMs are very limited, we here focus on the integration with NAMAs.

116. NAMAs, introduced in Bali in 2007, have received increasing attention in the past years (Van Tilburg et al. 2012). There is however still not much information available on definitions of NAMAs, and they can take the form of a strategy, policy or concrete project (Van Tilburg et al. 2012). That also makes it difficult to define how NAMAs and TRMs can be linked. But some suggestions can be made:

- If NAMAs take the form of policies or projects, TRMs can provide an overarching framework for development and/or transfer of a specific technology in which different NAMAs play a role. In such a case, a TRM and its process can align various NAMAs and other activities needed to allow a technology to reach implementation. National governments could use TRMs in this function, the TEC could support this.

- If NAMAs take the form of more generic strategies, they might be overlapping (if the NAMA focuses on a specific (set of) technologies or complementary (if the NAMA focuses on cross-cutting issues). In both cases, strong interlinking will be needed.


## 9.3 Potential roles of the TEC in promoting technology roadmaps

117. On the basis of our review, we can provide some broad topics or priorities for the TEC to promote further improvement and use of TRMs. On the basis of sections 9.1 and 9.2 we recommend:

- Given the gap identified with respect to TRMs focusing on non-Annex I countries, there is a role for the TEC to promote the use of TRMs in these countries.
- Comparably, the TEC could further investigate the perspectives for promoting TRMs on adaptation technologies
- As many TRMs reviewed can still greatly improve their quality, disseminating best practices and guidelines would also be a valuable role for the TEC.
- For TRMs in developing countries, the TEC could also initiate the development of a specific guidance document that takes into account circumstances and constraints in developing countries, e.g. the fact that the detailed technology modelling which forms the basis for IEA roadmaps may not be available.
- Where relevant the TEC could consider coordinating the running of structured workshops or training sessions in order to build capacity for TRM development before any future TRMs are conducted.

- The TEC could generally consider initiating the production of TRM guidance for small-scale low-budget TRMs
- TRMs and TNA/TAPs are approaches that seem to be relatively comparable. Therefore it is important that the TEC interacts with the parties supporting and producing and TNA/TAPs in order to mutually learn from experiences and share good practices.
- Depending on the direction that the further development of NAMAs will take, there will be either overlap between NAMAs and TRMs or TRMs could act as overarching frameworks for NAMAs. It seems recommendable for the TEC to stay on top of developments in the NAMA community, and search for synergies, e.g. by organising a dedicated activity on the links between NAMAs and TRMs.

118. Additionally, we have formulated some other recommendations on the basis of the analysis in this paper.

- The TEC, or other institutions under the UNFCCC could provide support to developing countries on how to include elements of technology roadmapping exercises in existing national planning processes in order to avoid undue strain on government capacity and the proliferation of a large number of strategy documents.
- As for the various potential purposes of a TRM in the context of technology development and transfer, the TEC or other institutions under the UNFCCC might pay specific attention to the TRM purpose of aligning activities of various donors and ministries in the development and implementation of a technology. The TEC could add value by supporting TRMs with this purpose, or by supporting the development of specific guidelines for TRMs.

## 9.4    Summary of Recommendations

119. Table 7 sets out a summary of the recommendations made in section 9 detailing the issue identified (in the literature and/or analysis), and the recommended action and actor.

Table 7:        Summary of recommendations

| Issue | Recommended action |
|---|---|
| Need for TRMs developed for or by Non-Annex I countries | Promote the use of TRMs in developing countries |
| Lack of TRMs developed on climate change adaptation technologies | Explore the perspectives for promoting adaptation TRMs |
| Various substantive elements essential for TRM missing | Disseminate guidance on good practice TRM development |
| Need for specific guidance for TRMs in developing countries | Initiate the development of a TRM guidance document specific for developing countries |
| Lack of capacity in organising TRM workshops | Training and capacity building for organising TRM workshops and other activities |
| Lack of guidance on Low Cost (relative) TRM development processes | Initiate good practice guidelines for small-scale low-cost TRMs |
| Comparability between TRMs and TNA/TAPs | Interaction between TEC and TNA/TAP supporters for mutual exchange of experiences and learning |
| NAMAs could be comparable with TRMs or TRMs could become frameworks for NAMAs | Organise specific activity on exploring the potential synergies and overlaps between NAMAs and TRMs |
| Need for harmonising TRM outcomes with national planning processes | Provide support on harmonising TRM outcomes with national planning processes |
| Use of TRMs for harmonising activities by various donors and ministries within one country could be improved | Provide support on the use of TRMs for harmonising activities by various donors and ministries within one country |

# References

Amer, M. and U. Daim (2010): Application of technology roadmaps for renewable energy sector. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 77, 1355–1370.

Agbemabiese, L. and J.P. Painuly (2011): Technology Needs Assessments. Presentation at the UNFCCC side event on Technology Needs Assessments, Bonn, Germany, 9 June 2011. UNEP-DTIE and UNEP-Risoe.

De Laat, B. and S. McKibbin (s.d.): The Effectiveness of Technology Road Mapping; Building a strategic vision. Technopolis for the Dutch ministry of Economic Affairs, The Hague.

Department of Industry, Science and Resources Technology Planning for Business Competitiveness (2001): A guideline for developing technology roadmaps. Commonwealth of Australia.

European Biofuels Technology Platform (2008): Strategic Research Agenda & Strategy Deployment Document. Web address: http://www.biofuelstp.eu/srasdd/080111_sra_sdd_web_res.pdf

European Commission Joint Research Centre (2004): European Roadmap for Photovoltaic Research and Development. Brussels.

Garcia, M.L. and O.H. Bray (1997): Fundamentals of Technology Roadmapping. Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque.

IEA (2009): Energy Technology Roadmaps; Status Report. International Energy agency, Paris 2009.

IEA (2010): Energy Technology Roadmaps; a guide to development and implementation. International Energy Agency, Paris.

IEA (2011) (2011): Technology Roadmap Biofuels for Transport. International Energy Agency, Paris

IEA/WBCSD (2009): Cement Technology Roadmap. International Energy Agency and World Business Council for Sustainable Development, Paris/Geneva.

Industry Canada (s.d.): Technology Roadmapping in Canada: A Development Guide. http://ic.gc.ca/trm

Lee, S., Park, Y., (2005): Customization of technology roadmaps according to roadmapping purposes: Overall process and detailed modules. Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 72(5), 567–583.

Lee, S., Kang, S., Park, Y., and Park, Y. (2007): Technology roadmapping for R&D planning: The case of the Korean parts and materials industry. Technovation, 27(8), 433-445.

Lee, J.H., Kim, H., and Phaal, R. (2012): An analysis of factors improving technology roadmap credibility: A communications theory assessment of road mapping processes. Technological Forecasting & Social Change, 79, pp. 263–280

Metz, B., Davidson, O.R., Bosch, P.R., Dave, R., Meyer, L.A. (eds.) (2007): Climate Change 2007: Mitigation. Subchapter 3.3.6: Characteristics of regional and national mitigation scenarios. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, page 214-217.

McDowell, W. and M. Eames (2006): Forecasts, scenarios, vision, backcasts and roadmaps to the hydrogen economy: A review of the hydrogen futures literature. Energy Policy 34, 1236-1250.

McDowall (2012): Technology roadmaps for transition management: The case of hydrogen energy. Technological Forecasting & Social Change 79, 530–542.

USDA Forest Service (2010): National Roadmap for Responding to Climate Change. Washington DC.

Australian Rail Supply Industry (2012): On Track to 2040: Preparing the Australian Rail Supply industry for Challenges and Growth. ANU Edge, Acton.

Phaal, R., C.J.P. Farrukh, and D.R. Probert (2004): Technology roadmapping – A planning framework for evolution and revolution. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 71, 5-26.

Phaal, R. and G. Muller (2009): An architectural framework for roadmapping: Towards visual strategy. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 76, 39-49.

Phaal, R. (2011): Public-Domain Roadmaps. Centre for Technology Management, University of Cambridge

Schaller, R.R. (2004): Technological innovation in the semiconductor industry: a case study of the international technology roadmap for semiconductors (ITRS) PhD thesis, George Mason University, Washington DC.

Smith, J. (2006): Overview of technologies for adaptation. Presentation at the UNFCCC, 2007. Best practices in technology needs assessments, Technical paper, FCCC/TP/2007/3 15 November 2007.

Technology Roadmap Network (s.d.): Technology Roadmap definitions. http://technologyroadmap.net/technology-roadmap-definition/

UNDP (2010): Handbook for Conducting Technology Needs Assessments for Climate Change.

UNFCCC (2006): Application of environmentally sound technologies for adaptation to climate change. FCCC/TP/2006/2, UNFCCC, Geneva.

UNFCCC (2012): Web information on Technology Needs Assessments. http://unfccc.int/ttclear/jsp/TNA.jsp; downloaded October 23-10-2012.

Van Tilburg, X., F. Röser, G. Hänsel, L. Cameron and D. Escalante (2012): Status Report on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs); Mid-year update. ECN/Ecofys, Amsterdam.

Willems & Van den Wildenberg (2005): Roadmap Report on Nanoparticles. Willems & Van den Wildenberg, Barcelona

Yan, J., Ma, T. and Nakamori, Y. (2011): Exploring the Triple Helix of Academia-Industry-Government for Supporting Roadmapping in Academia. International Journal of Management and Decision Making, 11(3), pp.249-267

Yasunaga, Y., M. Watanabe, and M. Korenaga (2009): Application of technology roadmaps to governmental innovation policy for promoting technology convergence. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 76, 61-79.

Yi, S.M., Shin, D.Y., and Lee, W.I. (2009): Utilizing adopted organizational practices: the actual utilization of technology road map in R&D organizations. [Korean] Korean Journal of Strategic Management, 12(2), pp. 53–81

# Annex

## Annex 1 - **List of TRMs analysed**

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|-----|--------------------|--------|------|------------|--------|---------|
| 1 | Realization of global-scale thorium breeding fuel cycle by single molten-fluoride flow | International Conference on Emerging Nuclear Energy Systems | 2007 | Nuclear | International | Roadmap for introduction of innovative thorium based nuclear fuel cycles |
| 2 | A technology roadmap for generation IV nuclear energy systems | Generation IV International Forum | 2002 | Nuclear | International | Roadmap for next generation nuclear systems in 2020 |
| 3 | Accelerated and extended Japanese pv technology roadmap PV2030+ | RTS Corporation | 2009 | Photovoltaic | Japan | Roadmap for accelerated development of photovoltaics in Japan |
| 4 | Canada's clean coal technology roadmap | Natural Resources Canada | 2009 | Clean Coal | Canada | Canadian Clean Coal roadmap |
| 5 | Canada's $CO_2$ capture and storage technology roadmap | Natural Resources Canada | 2009 | Carbon Capture & Storage | Canada | Canadian Carbon Capture & Storage roadmap |
| 6 | Cement technology roadmap 2009 | International Energy Agency | 2009 | Cement | International | Roadmap for cement emissions reduction to 2050 |
| 7 | Clean Coal technology roadmap | Department of Energy | 2000 | Clean Coal | USA | Roadmap on Clean Coal in USA |
| 8 | Cool earth - innovation energy technology program | Japanese Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry | 2008 | Energy Supply | Japan | Roadmap for technologies and international cooperation |
| 9 | Energy efficiency technology roadmap | Bonneville Power Administration | 2006 | Energy Supply | USA | Roadmap by Bonneville for energy efficiency technologies |
| 11 | Energy technology vision 2100 | International Energy Agency | 2006 | Renewable | Japan | Vision for a renewable energy future by 2100 |
| 12 | Hydrogen technology roadmap | Department of Resources, Energy and Tourism | 2008 | Hydrogen | Australia | Australian roadmap for hydrogen energy |

52

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | National hydrogen energy roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2002 | Hydrogen | USA | Roadmap for hydrogen energy in response to Bush administration national energy vision |
| 14 | On investing in the development of low carbon technologies: a technology roadmap | European Commission | 2009 | Renewable | EU | Roadmap by European commission for renewable energy until 2020 |
| 15 | Power services roadmap | Bonneville Power Administration | 2008 | Energy Supply | USA | Roadmap by Bonneville for quality of power service |
| 16 | Renewable energies in the 21st century: building a more sustainable future | European Commission | 2007 | Renewable | EU | European commission renewable energy roadmap until 2020 |
| 17 | Renewable energy industry roadmap of Spain | American Public Power Association | 2010 | Energy Supply | Spain | Roadmap on renewables for Spain until 2020 |
| 18 | Renewable energy technology roadmap | Bonneville Power Administration | 2008 | Renewable | USA | Roadmap by Bonneville for wind, wave, solar, and other renewable energies |
| 19 | Renewable energy technology roadmap | European Renewable Energy Council | 2007 | Renewable | EU | Roadmap for renewables in Europe until 2020 |
| 20 | Renewable energy technology roadmap 20% by 2020 | European Renewable Energy Council | 2008 | Renewable | EU | Roadmap for meeting 20% by 2020 European renewable energy targets |
| 21 | Research and development and demonstration roadmap | PIER Group | 2007 | Renewable | USA | Roadmap for public interest energy research program |
| 22 | Roadmap on regulations and standards for the electrification of cars | United Nations Economic Commission for Europe | 2010 | Transport | EU | Roadmap on regulations and standards for electric vehicles |
| 23 | Solar electric power | Photovoltaic Industry | 2003 | Photovoltaic | USA | Roadmap developed collaboratively by Photovoltaic Industry |
| 24 | Technology action plan: advanced vehicles | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Transport | International | Roadmap of steps needed to promote advanced vehicle technology |
| 25 | Technology action plan: bioenergy | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Biofuels | International | Roadmap for technology to extract energy from all forms of |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | biological matter |
| 26 | Technology action plan: buildings sector | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Built Environment | International | Roadmap for advanced building technology |
| 27 | Technology action plan: carbon capture, use, and storage | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Carbon Capture & Storage | International | Roadmap for carbon capture, use and storage technology |
| 28 | Technology action plan: high-efficiency, low emissions coal | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Clean Coal | International | Roadmap for developing cleaner coal burning technologies |
| 29 | Technology action plan: industrial sector energy efficiency | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Manufacturing | International | Roadmap for developing efficient technologies for industry e.g. manufacturing and logistics |
| 30 | Technology action plan: marine energy | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Ocean Energy | International | Roadmap for developing wave, tidal, and tidal stream electricity generation |
| 31 | Technology action plan: smart grids | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Energy Supply | International | Roadmap for developing smart electricity grids |
| 32 | Technology action plan: solar energy | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Solar | International | Roadmap for developing solar energy through Photovoltaic and CSP |
| 33 | Technology action plan: wind energy | Major Economies Forum | 2009 | Wind | International | Roadmap for developing wind energy technology |
| 34 | Technology development roadmap | Cool Earth | 2009 | Renewable | Japan | Summary roadmaps for all low carbon technologies until 2050 |
| 35 | Technology roadmap carbon capture and storage | International Energy Agency | 2010 | Carbon Capture & Storage | International | Roadmap by IEA for carbon capture and storage until 2050 |
| 36 | Technology roadmap concentrating solar power | International Energy Agency | 2009 | Solar | International | Roadmap by IEA on concentrating solar power until 2050 |
| 37 | Technology roadmap electric and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles | International Energy Agency | 2009 | Transport | International | Roadmap for electric and plug in hybrid vehicle technology |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38 | Technology roadmap for biofixation of $CO_2$ and greenhouse gas abatement with microalgae | US Department of Energy | 2003 | Carbon Capture & Storage | USA | Roadmap for micro algae use for capturing carbon dioxide |
| 39 | Technology roadmap for plant/crop based renewable resources 2020 | Renewables Vision 2020 | 1998 | Biofuels | USA | Roadmap for use of plant feedstock for chemical industry |
| 40 | Technology roadmap nuclear energy | International Energy Agency | 2009 | Nuclear | International | Roadmap for nuclear energy technology |
| 41 | Technology roadmap photovoltaic power | International Energy Agency | 2009 | Photovoltaic | International | Roadmap by IEA for photovoltaic power until 2050 |
| 42 | Technology roadmap wind power | International Energy Agency | 2009 | Wind | International | Roadmap by IEA for wind power until 2050 |
| 44 | Transmission technology roadmap | Bonneville Power Administration | 2006 | Energy Supply | USA | Roadmap by Bonneville for transmission technology |
| 45 | UKERC marine (wave and tidal current) renewable energy technology roadmap | UK Energy Research Centre | 2009 | Ocean Energy | UK | Roadmap for mobilizing wave and tidal power in the UK |
| 46 | Wind technology roadmap | Industry Canada | 2009 | Wind | Canada | Roadmap for Canada for wind energy technologies and solutions |
| 47 | Driving Transformation to Energy Efficient Buildings, Version 2.0 | Johnson Controls et al. | 2012 | Built Environment | North America | Roadmap on policy for accelerating energy efficiency technology development |
| 48 | National Carbon Mapping and Infrastructure Plan - Australia | Carbon Storage Taskforce | 2009 | Carbon Capture & Storage | Australia | Roadmap for carbon capture & storage and pipeline infrastructure |
| 49 | National Low Emissions Coal Strategy | National Low Emissions Coal Council | 2009 | Carbon Capture & Storage | Australia | Roadmap for the carbon capture & storage and advice demonstrations |
| 50 | Refrigeration, air conditioning and foam blowing sectors technology roadmap | GIZ Proklima | 2012 | Built Environment | Germany | Roadmap for the built environment sector on alternative technologies |
| 51 | IPCC Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change | 2011 | Renewable | International | Special Report by IPCC on renewable energy sources and |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | climate change mitigation |
| 53 | Sustainable use of resources roadmap for Europe | European Steel Technology Platform | 2009 | Steel Industry | EU | Roadmap for sustainable use of resources in the steel industry |
| 54 | Technology Roadmap - Carbon Capture and Storage in Industrial Applications | International Energy Agency & United Nations Industrial Development Organization | 2011 | Carbon Capture & Storage | International | Roadmap for carbon capture & storage in industrial applications |
| 55 | Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum Technology Roadmap | Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum | 2011 | Carbon Capture & Storage | International | Roadmap for carbon sequestration |
| 56 | Carbon Sequestration Technology Roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2007 | Carbon Capture & Storage | USA | Roadmap for fossil energy use with carbon capture & storage |
| 57 | UK Carbon Capture & Storage Roadmap | UK Dept. of Energy & Climate Change | 2012 | Carbon Capture & Storage | UK | Roadmap on carbon capture & storage, UK |
| 58 | International Technology Roadmap for PV | Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International & PV Group | 2012 | Photovoltaic | International | Roadmap by industry for photovoltaic technology |
| 59 | China's Solar Future. A Recommended China PV Policy Roadmap 2.0 | PV Group | 2011 | Photovoltaic | China | Roadmap for photovoltaic technology in China |
| 61 | Electric vehicles roadmap | Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland | 2011 | Transport | Ireland | Roadmap for electric vehicle technology in Ireland |
| 62 | European Green Cars Initiative PPP | European Green Cars Initiative | 2010 | Transport | EU | Roadmap for electric and plug in hybrid vehicle technology in European Union |
| 65 | Distributed generation and cogeneration policy roadmap for California | California Energy Commission | 2007 | Energy | California | Roadmap for distributed generation and cogeneration |
| 66 | Materials Roadmap Enabling Low Carbon Energy Technologies | European Commission | 2011 | Energy | EU | Roadmap for materials in low carbon energy technologies |
| 67 | EU's white paper on transport | European Commission | 2011 | Transport | EU | Roadmap for a competitive and resource efficient transport |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | system in Europe |
| 68 | CURC-EPRI Clean Coal Technology Roadmap | Coal Utilization Research Council & Electric Power Research Institute | 2008 | Carbon Capture & Storage | USA | Roadmap for clean coal technologies |
| 69 | Cleaner Power in India: Towards a Clean-Coal-Technology Roadmap (Discussion Paper) | Harvard University | 2007 | Carbon Capture & Storage | India | Roadmap for clean coal technologies in India |
| 70 | Technology Roadmap: Energy Efficient Equipment | International Energy Agency | 2011 | Built Environment | International | Roadmap for energy efficient heating and cooling technologies |
| 71 | Oak Ridge National Laboratory, R&D Roadmap for Water Heating Technologies | Oak Ridge National Laboratory | 2011 | Built Environment | International | Roadmap for water heating technologies |
| 72 | Building a roadmap for heat. 2050 scenarios and heat delivery in the UK | Surrey University & Imperial College London | 2010 | Energy | UK | Roadmap for heating technologies in UK |
| 73 | Power Tower Technology Roadmap and Cost Reduction Plan | Sandia Corp | 2011 | Energy | USA | Roadmap for concentrated solar power technology and cost reduction plan |
| 74 | Space Power and Energy Storage Roadmap | National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 2011 | Energy | USA | Roadmap for space power and energy storage technologies |
| 75 | Mapping & Gap Analysis of current European Smart Grids Projects | ERA-Net | 2012 | Energy | EU | Roadmap for smart grid technologies |
| 76 | The European Electricity Grid Initiative | European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity & European Distribution System Operators | 2010 | Energy | EU | Roadmap for electricity grid technologies |
| 77 | Strategic Technology Roadmap (Energy Field) | Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry | 2005 | Energy | Japan | Roadmap for energy technologies in Japan |
| 78 | Rechargeable energy storage system onboard electric drive buses | US Dept. of Transport | 2010 | Transport | USA | Roadmap for rechargeable energy storage technologies for transport in USA |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|-----|---------------------|--------|------|------------|--------|---------|
| 80 | HyWays: The European Hydrogen Roadmap | European Commission | 2008 | Hydrogen | EU | Roadmap for hydrogen technology in Europe |
| 81 | Hydrogen Storage Technologies Roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2005 | Hydrogen | USA | Roadmap for hydrogen technology in USA |
| 82 | Hydrogen Production Roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2009 | Hydrogen | USA | Roadmap for hydrogen production technologies |
| 83 | Roadmap for Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Vehicles in California | University of California, Davis | 2009 | Hydrogen | USA | Roadmap for hydrogen technology for transport in USA |
| 84 | Roadmap on Manufacturing R&D for the Hydrogen Economy | US Department of Energy | 2005 | Hydrogen | USA | Roadmap for manufacturing technologies in hydrogen industry |
| 85 | Sustainable aviation fuel roadmap | Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation | 2011 | Aviation | Aus. & NZ | Roadmap for sustainable aviation in Australia and New Zealand |
| 86 | IATA Technology Roadmap | International Air Transport Association | 2009 | Aviation | International | Roadmap for aviation technology |
| 88 | Eurogas Roadmap 2050, The European Union of Natural Gas industry | Eurogas | 2011 | Natural Gas | EU | Roadmap for natural gas technology in Europe |
| 89 | Sustainable Aviation CO2 Road-map | Sustainable Aviation | 2012 | Aviation | UK | Roadmap for sustainable aviation in UK |
| 91 | National Algal Biofuels Technology Roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2010 | Biofuels | USA | Roadmap for algal biofuel technology |
| 95 | Northwest Energy Efficiency Technology Roadmap | Bonneville Power Administration | 2011 | Energy Efficiency | USA | Roadmap for energy efficiency technologies in Northwest USA |
| 96 | Technology Roadmap for Intelligent Buildings | Continental Automated Buildings Association | 2002 | Built Environment | Canada | Roadmap for intelligent buildings in Canada |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 97 | High-performance commercial buildings: Technology roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2001 | Built Environment | USA | Roadmap for high performance commercial building technologies |
| 98 | Solid-state Lighting R&D Manufacturing Roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2011 | Lighting | USA | Roadmap for solid state lighting technologies |
| 99 | Future Road Vehicle Research, R&D Technology Roadmap | European Automotive Research Partners Association | 2005 | Transport | EU | Roadmap for future transport technologies |
| 100 | A Roadmap for 21st Century Chemical Engineering | UK Institution of Chemical Engineers | 2007 | Chemical | International | Roadmap for chemical engineering |
| 101 | Technology Roadmap for Environmentally Sustainable Food Manufacturing | Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation | 2011 | Food | Australia | Roadmap for sustainable food manufacturing |
| 102 | Roadmap 2050, Technical analysis | European Commission | 2010 | Technology | EU | Roadmap for a prosperous and low carbon Europe |
| 104 | Strategy and Road Map for Agricultural Science and Technology in Vietnam | Asian Development Bank | 2003 | Agriculture | Vietnam | Roadmap for agricultural technologies in Vietnam |
| 107 | Hydrogen Energy and Fuel Cells: A Vision of Our Future | European Commission | 2003 | Hydrogen | EU | Roadmap for hydrogen and fuel cell technology in Europe |
| 108 | The Icelandic Hydrogen Energy Roadmap | Icelandic Ministry of Industry and Commerce | 2009 | Hydrogen | Iceland | Roadmap for hydrogen energy technology in Iceland |
| 109 | UK Fuel Cell Development and Deployment Roadmap | Fuel Cells UK | 2005 | Hydrogen | UK | Roadmap for fuel cell technology in UK |
| 111 | UK Renewable Energy Roadmap | Department of Energy and Climate Change | 2011 | Renewable | UK | Roadmap for renewable energy technology in UK |
| 112 | Our future is carbon negative: A Carbon Capture & Storage roadmap for Romania | Bellona | 2012 | Carbon Capture & Storage | Romania | Roadmap by Bellona for carbon capture & storage in Romania |
| 113 | The Power of Choice - A Carbon Capture & Storage Roadmap for Hungary | Bellona | 2012 | Carbon Capture & Storage | Hungary | Roadmap by Bellona for carbon capture & storage in Hungary |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 114 | Insuring Energy Independence: A Carbon Capture & Storage Roadmap for Poland | Bellona | 2012 | Carbon Capture & Storage | Poland | Roadmap by Bellona for carbon capture & storage in Poland |
| 115 | CSLF Strategic Plan, Second update, 2011-2016 | Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum | 2011 | Carbon Capture & Storage | International | Roadmap for carbon capture & storage technology |
| 116 | Technology Roadmap: Biofuels for Transport | International Energy Agency | 2011 | Biofuels | International | Roadmap for biofuels for transport technologies |
| 117 | A roadmap for carbon capture and storage in the UK | Clair Gough et al. International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control | 2010 | Carbon Capture & Storage | UK | Roadmap for carbon capture & storage technology in UK |
| 119 | National Roadmap for Responding to Climate Change | USDA Forest Service | 2010 | Adaptation | USA | Roadmap for climate change adaptation by Forestry Department in USA |
| 120 | Exploring our Planet for the Benefit of Society | National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 2005 | Technology | International | Roadmap by NASA on applicable technologies |
| 121 | Electricity Technology Roadmap | Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) | 2003 | Energy | International | Roadmap for electricity grid technologies |
| 122 | Implementation Of The Environmental Technologies Action Plan | Finnish Ministry of Trade and Industry | 2005 | Adaptation | Finland | Roadmap for adaptation technologies in Finland |
| 123 | Canadian Fuel Cell Commercialization Roadmap | Industry Canada | 2003 | Hydrogen | Canada | Roadmap for fuel cell technology in Canada |
| 124 | Canadian Fuel Cell Commercialization Roadmap Update: Joint Report of Hydrogen and Fuel Cells | Industry Canada | 2008 | Hydrogen | Canada | Roadmap for hydrogen and fuel cell technology in Canada |
| 125 | A Roadmap for a Secure, Low-Carbon Energy Economy | World Resources Institute & Centre for Strategic & International Studies | 2009 | Energy | International | Roadmap for low carbon energy technologies |
| 126 | Earth-Sun System Applied Sciences Program Coastal Management Program Element | National Aeronautics and Space Administration Science Mission Directorate | 2005 | Adaptation | USA | Roadmap by NASA on coastal adaptation technologies |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 127 | Natural Gas Infrastructure Reliability | US Department of Energy | 2000 | Natural Gas | USA | Roadmap for improving reliability of natural gas technology in USA |
| 128 | A Roadmap to Deploy New Nuclear Power Plants in the United States by 2010 | US Department of Energy | 2001 | Nuclear | USA | Roadmap for deploying nuclear energy in USA |
| 129 | Solar photovoltaic electricity empowering the world | European Photovoltaic Industry Association & Greenpeace | 2011 | Photovoltaic | EU | Roadmap by Greenpeace and industry for photovoltaic technology |
| 130 | Genomics GTL Roadmap | US Department of Energy | 2005 | Energy | USA | Roadmap for harnessing bio-technological solutions for energy in USA |
| 131 | Filling the Gap: Unconventional Gas Technology Roadmap | Petroleum Technology Alliance Canada | 2006 | Natural Gas | Canada | Roadmap for unconventional natural gas technology |
| 132 | Australian Geothermal Roadmap | Australian Government Department | 2008 | Geothermal | Australia | Roadmap for geothermal technology in Australia |
| 133 | Marine Energy Technology Roadmap | UK Energy Research Centre | 2010 | Ocean Energy | UK | Roadmap for ocean energy technology in UK |
| 134 | Nuclear Fission Energy Roadmap | UK Energy Research Centre | 2008 | Nuclear | UK | Roadmap for nuclear fission technology |
| 135 | Accelerated Development of Fusion Power | United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority | 2005 | Nuclear | UK | Roadmap for nuclear fusion technology |
| 136 | Tonga Energy Road Map 2010-2020 | Tonga Government & International Renewable Energy Agency | 2010 | Energy | Tonga | Roadmap for reducing Tonga's vulnerability to oil shocks |
| 137 | Technology Roadmap: Bioenergy for Heat and Power | International Energy Agency | 2012 | Biofuels | International | Roadmap by IEA for bioenergy for heat and power |
| 138 | Technology Roadmap: Geothermal Energy | International Energy Agency | 2011 | Geothermal | International | Roadmap by IEA for geothermal technology |
| 139 | Technology Roadmap: Smart Grids | International Energy Agency | 2011 | Energy | International | Roadmap by IEA for smart gird technology |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 140 | Technology Roadmap: Solar Heating and Cooling | International Energy Agency | 2012 | Solar | International | Roadmap by IEA for solar heating and cooling |
| 141 | Strategic Research Agenda 2010 Agenda | European Biofuels Technology Platform | 2010 | Biofuels | EU | Roadmap for biofuel technology in Europe |
| 142 | Smart Grids | European Technology Platform | 2010 | Energy Supply | EU | Roadmap for electricity networks in Europe |
| 143 | Wind Energy: A Vision for Europe in 2030 | European Wind Energy Technology Platform | 2006 | Wind | EU | Roadmap for wind power technology in Europe |
| 144 | Today's Actions for Tomorrow's PV Technology | Photovoltaic Technology Platform | 2009 | Photovoltaic | EU | Roadmap for photovoltaic technology in Europe |
| 145 | Zero Emission Fossil Fuel Power Plants (ZEP) | European Technology Platform | 2006 | Carbon Capture & Storage | EU | Roadmap for carbon capture & storage technology |
| 146 | Wind Energy Roadmap | Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland | 2011 | Wind | Ireland | Roadmap by SEAI for wind power technology in Ireland |
| 147 | Smartgrid Roadmap | Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland | 2011 | Energy Supply | Ireland | Roadmap by SEAI for smart grid technology in Ireland |
| 148 | BioEnergy Roadmap | Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland | 2010 | Biofuels | Ireland | Roadmap by SEAI for biofuels technology in Ireland |
| 149 | Ocean Energy Roadmap | Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland | 2010 | Ocean Energy | Ireland | Roadmap by SEAI for ocean energy technology in Ireland |
| 150 | Residential Energy Roadmap | Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland | 2010 | Built Environment | Ireland | Roadmap by SEAI for built environment technology in Ireland |
| 151 | 100% renewable electricity | PricewaterhouseCoopers | 2010 | Energy Supply | Europe | Roadmap by PWC for renewable energy systems in Europe |
| 152 | Biofixation of $CO_2$ and GHG Abatement with Microalgae | US Department of Energy | 2003 | Adaptation | USA | Roadmap for micro algae use for greenhouse gas abatement in USA |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 153 | Reducing Air Pollution from Urban Transport | World Bank | 2004 | Transport | International | Roadmap for reducing air pollution from transport sector |
| 154 | Aluminium Industry Technology Roadmap | Aluminium Industry | 2003 | Industry | International | Roadmap for the aluminium industry |
| 155 | Canadian Geothermal Heat Pump Industry | Canadian Geoexchange Coalition | 2012 | Geothermal | Canada | Roadmap for geothermal technology in Canada |
| 156 | Australian Water Industry Roadmap | Water Industry | 2005 | Water | Australia | Roadmap for the water industry in Australia |
| 157 | TRM for Energy Reduction in Automotive Manufacturing | US Department of Energy | 2008 | Transport | USA | Roadmap for energy reduction in automotive sector in USA |
| 158 | Buildings CHP | US Department of Energy | 2000 | Energy Supply | USA | Roadmap for combined heat and power in the built environment in USA |
| 159 | Catalysis, Key to Sustainability | Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs | 2001 | Chemical | Netherlands | Roadmap for chemical catalysis technology in Netherlands |
| 160 | National CHP Roadmap | United States Clean Heat & Power Association | 2001 | Energy Supply | USA | Roadmap for combined heat and power technology in USA |
| 161 | Clean Cities | US Department of Energy | 2004 | Energy | USA | Roadmap for clean energy technologies in the built environment in USA |
| 162 | European Concentrated Solar Thermal Road-Mapping | EcoStar | 2003 | Solar | Europe | Roadmap for concentrated solar thermal power in Europe |
| 164 | Desalination and Water Purification | US Department of Interior | 2003 | Water | USA | Roadmap for desalination and water purification in USA |
| 165 | Distributed Energy Resources | Electric Power Research Institute | 2004 | Energy Supply | USA | Roadmap for distributed energy technology in USA |
| 179 | Green Chemical Technology | Crystal Faraday Partnership | 2004 | Chemical | UK | Roadmap for sustainable chemical technology |

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 180 | Autogas in Europe, The Sustainable Alternative | European LPG Association | 2009 | LPG | Europe | Roadmap for liquefied petroleum gas technology in Europe |
| 181 | Malaria Vaccine Technology Roadmap | Malaria Vaccine Technology Roadmap | 2006 | Medical | International | Roadmap for malaria vaccine technology |
| 182 | Marine Hydrokinetic Renewable Energy | National Renewable Energy Laboratory | 2010 | Ocean Energy | USA | Roadmap for ocean energy technology in USA |
| 183 | Australian Desalination Research Roadmap | National Centre of Excellence in Desalination | 2011 | Water | Australia | Roadmap for desalination in Australia |
| 186 | Report of UK-China workshops on the Future of Energy Storage | Royal Academy of Engineering | 2012 | Energy Supply | UK | Roadmap for future energy storage technology |
| 187 | Philippine Water Supply Sector Roadmap | Philippine Water Sector | 2008 | Water | Philippines | Roadmap for water sector in Philippines |
| 188 | Water Sector Roadmap, Kingdom of Cambodia | Royal Government of Cambodia | 2003 | Water | Cambodia | Roadmap for water sector in Cambodia |
| 189 | Bangladesh Water Sector Review | Asian Development Bank | 2003 | Water | Bangladesh | Roadmap for water sector in Bangladesh |
| 190 | Water Sector Roadmap | Asian Development Bank | 2003 | Water | Pakistan | Roadmap for water sector in Pakistan |
| 191 | Water Sector Roadmap | Asian Development Bank | 2003 | Water | Vietnam | Roadmap for water sector in Vietnam |
| 192 | Replacing Coal with Wind Energy by 2020 | Greenpeace | 2006 | Wind | China | Roadmap for wind power in Hong Kong |

**TRMs reviewed that do not directly relate to climate change mitigation and adaption technologies**

| No. | Technology Roadmap | Author | Year | Technology | Origin | Summary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 996 | International technology roadmap for semiconductors (ITRS) 2010 update overview | International Roadmap Committee | 2010 | Semiconductors | International | Regularly updated TRM for semiconductors, broad author team |
| 997 | The science ahead, The way to discovery; Particle Physics in the 21st Century | US DoE/NSF high-energy physics advisory panel | s.d. | High-energy physics | USA | Roadmap for high-energy physics in the US, long-term vision and actions |
| 998 | National electric delivery technologies roadmap; Transforming the Grid to Revolutionize Electric Power in North America | US DoE, Office of Electric Transmission and Distribution | 2004 | Power transmission Infrastructure | USA | Roadmap for power grid extension and related technologies |
| 999 | On track to 2040; Preparing the Australian rail supply industry for challenges and growth. Roadmap | Australian Rail Supply Industry | 2012 | Rail technologies | Australia | Roadmap for the AUS railway system for freight |

# Annex 2 - **Detailed Overview TRM Matrix**

| MATRIX 0 | International | Region | | | Country | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Australasia | EU | EU & NA | AUS | BGD | KHM | CAN | CHN | FIN | HUN | ISL | IND | IRL | JPN | NLD | PAK | PHL | POL | ROM | ESP | TON | GBR | USA | VNM |
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | | | 2007, 2018-2022, IGO, CqT, AA 2007, 2018-2022, IGO, CqT, AA 2008, 2018-2022, IGO, CqT 2010, >2032, NGO, PD, SoS | | | | | | | | | | | | 2008, 2023-2032, GO, CqT 2006, >2032, GO, CqT, VR 2005, >2032, GO, PD, SoS, CqT, VR | | | | | | 2010, 2018-2022, Industry, CqT, AA | 2010, not spec., GO | 2011, not spec., GO | 2011, 2023-2032, GO, CqT, AA, VR 2009, not spec., Academia | |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | 2011, >2032, IGO, AA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1.2. wind energy | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA 2009, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA, VR | | 2009, 2018-2022, IGO, PD, CqT, AA, VR, PfO 2011, 2018-2022, GO, CqT, AA, VR 2006, 2023-2032, Industry, CqT | | | | | 2009, 2018-2022, Industry, PD, CqT, AA, VR | | | | | | 2011, >2032, GO, CqT, VR | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA 2003, not spec., Academia, AA 2011, >2032, IGO, PD, SoS, CqT 2012, >2032, IGO, AA | | 2010, 2023-2032, Industry | | | | | | | | 2012, not spec., Industry | | | 2010, >2032, GO, CqT, VR | | | | | 2012, not spec., Industry | 2012, not spec., Industry | | | | 2010, not spec., GO, PD, SoS 2005, not spec., GO | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A1.4. geothermal energy | 2011, >2032, IGO, AA, VR, PfO | | 2008, not spec., GO, CqT, AA | 2012, 2018-2022, Industry, PD, CqT, AA | | | | | |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA 2009, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA, VR | 2003, not spec., Industry, PD, CqT | | | | | | | 2011, 2018-2022, CqT, AA |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 2009, >2032, IGO, SoS, CqT, AA, VR 2012, 2018-2022, Industry, CqT, AA, VR, PfO 2011, >2032, NGO | 2009, 2018-2022, Industry, CqT, AA | | | 2011, 2023-2032, GO, CqT, AA, VR | | 2009, >2032, GO, CqT, AA, VR 2009, >2032, AA, VR | | 2003, 2023-2032, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, VR |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | 2012, >2032, IGO, AA, VR | | | | | | | | |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA | | | | | 2010, >2032, GO, CqT, VR | | 2009, 2018-2022, Academia, PD, CqT, AA, VR, PfO 2010, 2023-2032, Industry, CqT, VR | 2010, 2023-2032, Academia, PD, CqT, VR |

| A2. Other energy-related technologies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switching from coal to gas | | 2011, >2032, Industry, PD | | | 2006, not spec., Industry, PD, SoS | | | | | | | | | | | | 2000, not spec., GO, PD, SoS, CqT | |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | | 2003, >2032, IGO, SoS, CqT, VR | 2008, <2018, GO, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, VR | | 2003, <2018, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, PfO 2008, 2023-2032, Industry, PD, SoS | | | 2009, not spec., GO, SoS | | | | | | | | 2005, not spec., Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA | 2002, not spec., GO, PD, SoS 2010, 2018-2022, GO, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, VR 2005, <2018, Industry, CqT 2009, <2018, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, PfO 2005, not spec., GO, PD, SoS 2003, >2032, Industry | |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | 2007, 2018-2022, Academia, CqT, VR 2002, >2032, GO, SoS, CqT, AA, VR 2009, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA, VR | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2008, >2032, Industry, VR 2005, >2032, Industry, VR | 2001, <2018, GO | |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA 2008, 2023-2032, Industry, CqT, AA | | | | 2009, 2023-2032, GO, SoS, CqT, AA, VR | | | 2007, not spec., Academia, AA | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | | | | | | | | | | | | 2011, >2032, GO, CqT, VR | | | | | | | | | 2000, 2018-2022, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA 2004, <2018, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, VR | |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA 2010, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA, VR 2011, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA, VR 2011, 2023-2032, Industry, CqT, AA, VR 2011, <2018, IGO | | 2006, >2032, Industry | | 2009, 2023-2032, GO, AA 2009, 2023-2032, GO, CqT | | 2009, 2023-2032, GO, SoS, CqT, AA, VR | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2012, 2023-2032, GO, AA, VR 2010, >2032, Academia, PD, SoS, VR | | 2000, 2018-2022, GO, CqT 2007, 2018-2022, GO, CqT, AA, VR | |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | 2009, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA 2011, >2032, IGO, AA, VR 2012, not spec., Industry, SoS | | 2012, 2018-2022, Industry, CqT, AA, VR 2010, 2018-2022, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, PfO 2010, >2032, Industry, SoS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Category | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 2004, not spec., IGO | | 2011, 2023-2032, GO, CqT, AA<br>2005, >2032, Industry, PD, CqT | | | | 2004, 2018-2022, GO, CqT, PfO | |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | 2009, 2023-2032, PD, SoS | | | | | | | |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA<br>2009, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA, VR | 2011, 2018-2022, Industry, SoS, AA | 2010, not spec., GO, AA<br>2010, 2018-2022, Industry, CqT, AA, VR<br>2009, 2018-2022, Industry, CqT, AA | | 2011, >2032, GO, CqT, AA, VR | | 1998, 2023-2032, Industry, SoS, CqT, AA, VR | |
| B3. optimize transport operations | | | | | | | 2008, not spec., GO, SoS, CqT | |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA<br>2012, 2023-2032, Industry, SoS, AA | | | 2002, not spec., Industry, PD, SoS | 2010, >2032, GO, CqT, VR | 2010, >2032, Academia, CqT, VR | 2011, 2018-2022, Academia, PD, SoS, AA, VR<br>2001, 2018-2022, Industry, PD, SoS | |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) | 2011, >2032, IGO, CqT, AA, VR | | | | | | | |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | | | | | | | | |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | | | | | | | 2011, <2018, Industry, SoS | |

| Category | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **D. INDUSTRY** | 2009, not spec., IGO, AA | | | | | | |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | | 2009, <2018, Industry, CqT, AA | | | | 2003, 2018-2022, Industry, SoS, CqT | |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | | | | 2001, <2018, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, VR | 2007, <2018, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, VR 2004, 2023-2032, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, VR, PfO | 2001, <2018, Industry, PD, SoS, CqT, VR | |
| D3. petroleum refining | | | | | | | |
| D4. minerals | | | | | | | |
| D5. pulp and paper | | | | | | | |
| D6. food industry | | | | | | | |
| D7. cement industry | 2009, >2032, IGO, PD, CqT, AA | | | | | | |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | | | | | | | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | | | 2011, 2018-2022, Industry, PD, VR | | | | 2003, not spec., IGO, PD, SoS, AA |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | | | | | | | |

| Category | Col2 | | | | Col A | Col B | Col C | | | | | | | | | | Col D | Col E | | | | | Col F | Col G |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **G. ADAPTATION** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2010, not spec., GO, SoS | |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | 2005, <2018, GO, PD, SoS, CqT, AA, VR, PfO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G1.2 Water resources | | | | | 2005, not spec., Industry, PD, SoS, CqT 2011, not spec., Academia, PD, SoS, CqT, AA | 2003, <2018, IGO, CqT, AA | ?, <2018, Industry, CqT, AA | | | | | | | | | | ?, <2018, IGO, CqT, AA | 2008, <2018, Industry, PfO | | | | | 2003, 2018-2022, GO, PD, SoS, CqT, PfO | 2003, <2018, IGO, CqT, AA |
| G1.3 Agriculture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G1.4 Public Health | 2006, 2023-2032, NGO, SoS, CqT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2003, not spec., Industry, PD, SoS | |

Legend: each cell contains the detailed information of the TRMs found:

- **First: the publication year**
- **Second: the time horizon**
- **Third: the authoring organization (legend: see Chapter 5)**
- **Fourth: substantive elements present: PD: process description; SoS: Specification of stakeholders; CqT: Clear (quantified) targets; AA: Actions assigned; VR: Visual representation, PfU: Plan for update**

Table is complex and difficult to read. At request, an Excel file is available, including references of each TRM to the TRM numbers.

# Annex 3 - **Detailed Matrices 1-6**

| Matrix 1 | Geographical Source | | | To-tal |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Interna-tional | Annex I | Non An-nex I | |
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | 12 | 39 | 4 | 55 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | 1 | 4 | | 5 |
| A1.2. wind energy | 2 | 13 | | 15 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 5 | 14 | 2 | 21 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | 2 | 6 | | 8 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | 2 | 8 | | 10 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 4 | 13 | 1 | 18 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | 3 | 2 | | 5 |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | 2 | 8 | | 10 |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | 6 | 53 | 5 | 64 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switch coal → gas | | 4 | | 4 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | | 14 | | 14 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | | 11 | | 11 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | | 3 | | 3 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 3 | 16 | 2 | 21 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (incl. smart grids) | 1 | 10 | 1 | 12 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | | 4 | | 4 |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 6 | 29 | | 35 |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | 1 | 4 | | 5 |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 5 | 18 | | 23 |
| B3. optimize transport operations | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | 3 | 13 | | 16 |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) | 2 | 4 | | 6 |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | 1 | 3 | | 4 |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | 1 | 4 | | 5 |
| **D. INDUSTRY** | 2 | 12 | | 14 |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | | 5 | | 5 |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | | 5 | | 5 |
| D3. petroleum refining | | 1 | | 1 |
| D4. minerals | | | | 0 |
| D5. pulp and paper | | 1 | | 1 |
| D6. food industry | | | | 0 |
| D7. cement industry | 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | | | | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | | 1 | | 1 |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | 1 | 5 | 5 | 11 |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | | 1 | | 1 |
| G1.2 Water resources | | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| G1.3 Agriculture | | | | 0 |
| G1.4 Public Health | 1 | | | 1 |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | | | | 0 |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | | 1 | | 1 |
| **Total** | 70 | 339 | 27 | 436 |

| Matrix 2 | Geographical Scope | | | | To-tal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Interna-tional | Re-gional | Na-tional | Lo-cal | |
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | 15 | 11 | 27 | 3 | 56 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 5 |
| A1.2. wind energy | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 15 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 5 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 21 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | 3 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 5 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 18 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | 3 | 2 | | | 5 |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 10 |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | 13 | 10 | 38 | 4 | 65 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switching from coal to gas | | 1 | 3 | | 4 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | | 1 | 12 | 1 | 14 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | 3 | 2 | 6 | | 11 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | 2 | | 3 | | 5 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | | | 3 | | 3 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 5 | 4 | 13 | | 22 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | 3 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | | | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 7 | 10 | 16 | 2 | 35 |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 5 |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 6 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 23 |
| B3. optimize transport operations | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | 3 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 16 |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| **D. INDUSTRY** | 3 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 14 |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 5 |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | | | 5 | | 5 |
| D3. petroleum refining | 1 | | | | 1 |
| D4. minerals | | | | | 0 |
| D5. pulp and paper | | | 1 | | 1 |
| D6. food industry | | | | | 0 |
| D7. cement industry | 2 | | 1 | | 3 |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | | | | | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | | 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | | 1 | | | 1 |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | 2 | | 9 | | 11 |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | 1 | | | | 1 |
| G1.2 Water resources | | | 8 | | 8 |
| G1.3 Agriculture | | | | | 0 |
| G1.4 Public Health | 1 | | | | 1 |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | | | | | 0 |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | | | 1 | | 1 |
| **Total** | 98 | 91 | 219 | 32 | 440 |

| Matrix 3 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | | | | | | 3 | | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 57 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | | | | | | | | | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 5 |
| A1.2. wind energy | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | | 16 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 21 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | | | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | 10 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 18 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 10 |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 64 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switching from coal to gas | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 4 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | | | | | 1 | 3 | | 3 | | | 2 | 4 | 1 | | | 14 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | | 11 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 3 | | | | 4 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 3 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | | | 1 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 22 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | 4 |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 7 | | 35 |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 2 | 1 | | | 5 |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 1 | | | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 6 | | 23 |
| B3. optimize transport operations | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 16 |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 | | 6 |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | | 1 | | 4 |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 2 | | 2 | | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **D. INDUSTRY** | | | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | 14 |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 2 | | 1 | | | 5 |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | | | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | 5 |
| D3. petroleum refining | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 1 |
| D4. minerals | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D5. pulp and paper | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| D6. food industry | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D7. cement industry | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 3 |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 3 |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | | | | | | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 9 |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| G1.2 Water resources | | | | | | 3 | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | | 6 |
| G1.3 Agriculture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G1.4 Public Health | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| **Total** | 2 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 26 | 7 | 41 | 21 | 31 | 34 | 97 | 52 | 75 | 27 | | 436 |

| Matrix 4 | Time Horizon | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | <2018 | 2018-2022 | 2023-2032 | 2033-2050+ | Total |
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | 3 | 15 | 7 | 18 | 43 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | | 3 | | 2 | 5 |
| A1.2. wind energy | 1 | 7 | | 5 | 13 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 1 | 7 | | 5 | 13 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | | 6 | | 2 | 8 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | | 6 | | 3 | 9 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 1 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 16 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | | 2 | | 2 | 4 |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | 6 | 12 | 13 | 17 | 48 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switch coal → gas | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | 5 | | | 4 | 9 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | | 4 | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | | | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | | 7 | 5 | 5 | 17 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | | 5 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | | 2 | | | 2 |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 7 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 25 |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | | 1 | | 2 | 3 |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 17 |
| B3. optimize transport operations | | 1 | | | 1 |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | | 5 | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | | | | 1 | 1 |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| **D. INDUSTRY** | 4 | 4 | | 4 | 12 |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 4 |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | 2 | 2 | | 1 | 5 |
| D3. petroleum refining | | | | 1 | 1 |
| D4. minerals | | | | | 0 |
| D5. pulp and paper | | 1 | | | 1 |
| D6. food industry | | | | | 0 |
| D7. cement industry | | 1 | | 2 | 3 |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | | | | | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 3 |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | | 1 | | | 1 |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | | | | | 0 |
| G1.2 Water resources | 4 | 1 | 1 | | 6 |
| G1.3 Agriculture | | | | | 0 |
| G1.4 Public Health | | 1 | | | 1 |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | | | | | 0 |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | | | | 1 | 1 |
| **Total** | 46 | 124 | 45 | 114 | 329 |

| Matrix 5 | Authoring Organisation | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | IGO | GO | Acad. | NGO | In-dus. |
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | 16 | 18 | 4 | 2 | 16 |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | 3 | 1 | | | 1 |
| A1.2. wind energy | 6 | 6 | | | 3 |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | 4 | 4 | | | 1 |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | 6 | 2 | | | 1 |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 6 | 6 | | 1 | 6 |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | 5 | | | | |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | 3 | 4 | 2 | | 1 |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | 10 | 25 | 5 | 1 | 23 |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switch coal →gas | | 2 | | | 2 |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | 1 | 5 | 1 | | 6 |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | 2 | 5 | 1 | | 2 |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | | 1 | | | 2 |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 5 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (incl. smart grids) | 3 | 3 | | | 6 |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy syst. (DES) | | 2 | | | 2 |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | | | | | |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | 1 | 2 | | | 1 |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 6 | 9 | 1 | | 6 |
| B3. optimize transport operations | | 1 | | | |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | | | | | |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) | 2 | 1 | | | 2 |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | 1 | | | | 2 |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | 1 | | | | 3 |
| **D. INDUSTRY** | | | | | |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | | 1 | | | 4 |
| D3. petroleum refining | 1 | | | | |
| D4. minerals | | | | | |
| D5. pulp and paper | | 1 | | | |
| D6. food industry | | | | | |
| D7. cement industry | 2 | 1 | | | |
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | | | | | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | | | | 1 | |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | | 1 | | | |
| G1.2 Water resources | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| G1.3 Agriculture | | | | | |
| G1.4 Public Health | | | | 1 | |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | | | | | |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | | | | | 1 |
| **Total** | 100 | 123 | 19 | 10 | 111 |

**Key:**

IGO – International Governmental Organisation

GO – Governmental Organisation

Acad. – Academic Organisation

NGO – Non-Governmental Organisation

Indus. - Industry

| Matrix 6 | Substantive Elements | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pro-cess | Stake-holders | Tar-gets | Ac-tions | Vis-ual | Up-date |
| **Average for all TRMs** | **32%** | **36%** | **60%** | **54%** | **40%** | **9%** |
| | | | | | | |
| **A1. Renewable energy technologies** | 23% | 14% | 61% | 55% | 43% | 9% |
| A1.1. hydroelectricity | 20% | 20% | 80% | 60% | 40% | 20% |
| A1.2. wind energy | 33% | 20% | 73% | 53% | 53% | 13% |
| A1.3. biomass and bioenergy | 29% | 24% | 43% | 38% | 29% | 10% |
| A1.4. geothermal energy | 33% | 22% | 78% | 78% | 44% | 22% |
| A1.5. solar thermal electric energy | 30% | 10% | 80% | 80% | 40% | 20% |
| A1.6. solar photovoltaic energy | 28% | 28% | 72% | 72% | 61% | 17% |
| A1.7. solar heating and cooling | | | 40% | 80% | 20% | |
| A1.8. marine energy (ocean, wave, tidal) | 40% | 20% | 60% | 40% | 50% | 20% |
| **A2. Other energy-related technologies** | 31% | 40% | 55% | 46% | 45% | 6% |
| A2.1. technologies supporting fuel switching from coal to gas | 100% | 75% | 50% | | 25% | |
| A2.2. use of hydrogen as a fuel | 64% | 79% | 57% | 43% | 29% | 14% |
| A2.3. advanced nuclear energy | 18% | 18% | 55% | 45% | 82% | 9% |
| A2.4. clean coal technologies | | 20% | 40% | 100% | 40% | |
| A2.5 combined heat and power (CHP) | 67% | 67% | 100% | 33% | 67% | |
| A2.6. carbon capture and storage (CCS) | 23% | 23% | 50% | 55% | 55% | 5% |
| A2.7. energy storage and distribution (including smart grids) | 33% | 42% | 67% | 58% | 58% | 17% |
| A2.8. decentralized (distributed) energy systems (DES) | 25% | 50% | 75% | 50% | 75% | |
| **B. TRANSPORTATION** | 37% | 49% | 66% | 51% | 31% | 9% |
| B1. improving drive train efficiency | 60% | 100% | 60% | 40% | 40% | |
| B2. supporting the use of alternative fuels | 39% | 48% | 61% | 70% | 35% | 9% |
| B3. optimize transport operations | 50% | 100% | 50% | | | |
| **C. RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS** | 44% | 56% | 44% | 38% | 56% | |
| C1. heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems (HVAC) | 50% | 50% | 33% | 67% | 67% | |
| C2. building energy management systems (BEMS) | 50% | 50% | | 50% | 50% | |
| C3. high-efficiency electric lighting | 40% | 60% | | 40% | 40% | |
| **D. INDUSTRY** | 64% | 64% | 71% | 64% | 57% | 7% |
| D1. iron, steel and non-ferrous metals | 20% | 40% | 80% | 60% | 60% | |
| D2. chemicals and fertilizers | 100% | 100% | 100% | 60% | 100% | 20% |
| D3. petroleum refining | | | 100% | 100% | 100% | |
| D4. minerals | | | | | | |
| D5. pulp and paper | 100% | 100% | 100% | | 100% | |
| D6. food industry | | | | | | |
| D7. cement industry | 67% | 33% | 100% | 67% | 67% | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **E. AGRICULTURE** | | | | | | |
| E1. technologies for agriculture | 100% | 67% | | 33% | 33% | |
| **F. WASTE MANAGEMENT** | | | | | | |
| F1. technologies for waste management | 100% | 100% | | | | |
| **G. ADAPTATION** | 36% | 55% | 82% | 55% | 9% | 27% |
| G1.1 Coastal zones | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| G1.2 Water resources | 38% | 38% | 88% | 63% | | 25% |
| G1.3 Agriculture | | | | | | |
| G1.4 Public Health | | 100% | 100% | | | |
| G1.5 Infrastructure | | | | | | |
| **H. GEOENGINEERING** | | | | | | |
| H1. geoengineering technologies | 100% | 100% | | | | |

# Annex 4 - Short descriptions of the TRMs discussed in Section 6 on good practices

*Note: In our review, we did not find any 'perfect' TRMs: all of them can be improved in some respects. Therefore, none of these examples can be literally copied: our intention is to highlight particularly strong features of each TRM.*

## A4.1    IEA Technology Roadmap on Wind energy

120.    The International Energy Agency has published some ten roadmap documents on key energy technologies since 2009. They essentially follow the same structure, and use the process guideline we already discussed in Section 5; here we discuss the wind energy TRM as a representative example.

*Objective:*

121.    The roadmap aims to identify the primary tasks that must be addressed in order to reach the IEA vision for wind energy deployment. It also allocates these tasks to specific actors, in this case the wind energy industry, governments and power sector actors.

*Methodology:*

122.    The methodology for preparing the TRM is not discussed in the document, but has been published in a separate report (IEA 2010) that we discussed in section 8.

*Structure:*

123.    The TRM has the following structure:

1. *Wind energy today*, describing the wind power capacity growth in the past decades, and its economics
2. *Vision for deployment*, which discusses the foreseen future wind production capacity, projected cost reductions and the investments in wind power until 2050.
3. Four *Actions and Milestones* sections go into for actions and milestones related to:
   - Wind Technology Development and Deployment:
   - Delivery and System Integration
   - Policy Frameworks
   - International Collaboration
4. *Roadmap action plan and next steps,* in which the actions and milestones are allocated to specific actors, in this case the wind energy industry, governments and power sector.

## A4.2    PV Group TRM for PV in China

*Objective:*

This document (PV Power et al 2011), produced by PV group, SEM and CPIA is an update of an earlier TRM on PV in China. Its objective is to provide a recommended

Roadmap for PV on the basis of more recent material on e.g. global solar-PV development.

*Methodology:*
The document does not provide detailed information about the methodology applied

*Structure:*
The structure is as follows:
1. In the *introduction* chapter, the IEA global outlook for PV is summarized, and it is discussed what role China plays in global energy development, that of PV in particular.
2. A *China PV industry overview* summarises the characteristics of the PV sector in China today, including seven key trends it is facing
3. The section *development of China's PV market and government incentive programs* focuses on future demand for PV in the Chinese domestic market, and how the government incentivises this
4. The *new recommended China PV policy roadmap* provides a target trajectory for the share of PV in Chinese power supply
5. The *policy recommendations* section finalizes the TRM

## A4.3 Bonneville Power Administration TRM on energy efficiency technologies

*Objective:*
This TRM (Bonneville 2006) by regional governmental organization BonneVille Power Administration (BPA) mainly aims to streamline the R&D efforts of the organization itself. It provides road maps for seven energy efficiency technologies, such as efficient lighting and efficiency in industrial processes.

*Methodology:*
Main method for the TRM was literature study on e.g. key technology features, R&D challenges and R&D activities by other parties, and some quantitative assessment on technology potentials. Stakeholders were mainly used for the identification of technologies to focus on.

*Structure:*
The structure of each of the TRMs in this document is as follows.
1. A Technology overview describing essential elements of the technology
2. An *Opportunity overview*, describing which commercial opportunities
3. The *R&D challenges* section summarises the challenges that need to be overcome for the technology to reap the identified opportunities
4. *Sector actors* identifies which other parties are active in R&D on the technology, and what they focus on
5. The *Roadmap* summarises the findings so far, after which
6. The *Role for BPA* section identifies what role BPA could play, including concrete actions.

## A4.4 SEAI TRM for Electric vehicles

*Objective:*
The TRM (SEAI 2005) aims to contribute to a strategic approach in which deployment of electric vehicles is integrated with the development of related technologies, such as intermittent renewable energy generation and smart grids.

*Methodology:*
For its scenarios, the TRM builds further on IEA work in this field; this is however not specified any further. The required activities were identified in consultation with stakeholders.

*Structure:*
The TRM contains:
1. An *introduction*, describing the challenges to the transport sector and the importance of electric vehicles to be deployed in an integrated manner
2. *Key findings* in terms of projected future market shares of electric vehicles, energy demand and relate (renewable) supply
3. A time-specific *EV deployment scenario*, including time-specific actions and the key parties responsible for them
4. Further detailed scenario *Key Results*.


## A4.5 Fuel cells UK TRM for Fuel cell development and deployment

*Objective:*
This TRM (Fuel Cells UK 2005) is a follow-up of the 'Fuel Cell Vision for the UK', published by Fuel Cells UK in 2003. This Vision highlighted the benefits to the UK in taking a leading role in fuel cell (FC) development and deployment. The purpose of this Roadmap is to accelerate the commercialisation of fuel cell technologies within the UK, and to ensure that the UK derives maximum benefit from that process. It aims to specify routes and milestones for all stakeholders, including government, industry and society at large.

*Methodology:*
The methodology is not discussed in full detail, but the development of this TRM involved an extensive process of consultation. The UK fuel cell community put substantial effort into the work, estimated at almost 500 hours committed.

*Structure:*
The TRM has the following structure:
1. An *introduction*, in which the reasons for fuel cells, their commercial potential and the objectives of the TRM are specified
2. An extensive *review of FC activities* in the UK, in industry, research, government and other sectors, and a discussion of the position of the UK in the global context
3.  An identification of *UK FC strengths*
4. A *UK FC Focus* chapter proposing areas to concentrate activities on
5. The *UK FC Challenges, strategies and actions* chapter is the most comprehensive
6. A *recommendations* chapter.


## A4.6 Crystal Faraday Partnership TRM on Green Chemical Technology

*Objective:*
This TRM (Crystal Faraday Partnership 2004) aimed to develop a strategy for green chemical technology research and development based on the future needs of industry, with a 2025 time horizon. The technology strategy provides key decision-makers in industry, academia and the government with a picture of the role that green chemical

technology can play in developing a vibrant and sustainable chemical industry in the UK. It identifies the opportunities, gaps and key actions that need to be taken to make sure that the potential of green chemical technology is delivered.

*Methodology*
This TRM used an elaborate method, starting with an identification of basic (societal, technical, environmental and other) trends and drivers, linking them to consequent future requirements to chemical products and processes, identifying technology characteristics, and ending with key R&D challenges and corresponding gaps in current R&D. See also Figure 5. The strength of such an outside-in approach is that it contributes to the societal relevance and value added of a TRM.

*Structure:*
The TRM has the following structure:
1. An *introduction*, with an introductory overview of the chemical sector and the TRM objectives
2. A *Development of the Roadmap* section, describing the methodology applied for the TRM
3. A review of *Trends and Drivers* that affect the future of the chemical industry, describing trends in social, technology, economic, environmental and political areas. Trends are summarized in Vision statements
4. In the section *Features, Attributes and Technology Impact*, the vision is translated in to goals, and then into required sector features, attributes and the technology areas that are related to them
5. The *Technology Roadmaps* section describes for the different technology areas which barriers and dependencies exist
6. It concludes with *Priority Activity areas.*


## A4.7   Asian Development Bank TRM on Water in Viet Nam

*Objective:*
The objective of this TRM (ADB 2003) is to contribute to the country's Comprehensive Poverty Reduction and Growth Strategy. This strategy aims to (i) increased income in the rural sector, (ii) reduce income disparities, risks and vulnerability, and improved food security and social well-being of the poor, and (iii) improve sustainability of natural resources in rural areas. Water plays an important role in meeting these goals, and the TRM goes into issues on (a) water resource management, (b) irrigation services, and (c) water supply & sanitation.

*Methodology:*
The report does not contain any information on the methodology followed to come to the TRM.

*Structure:*
After an introductory background chapter, the core of the TRM is a table set that structures:
1. *Sector Outcomes*, specified for points a-c above, with indications of the developments in the past 5 years, the current situation, and indicators for success in 5 and 10 years.
2. A S*ector Outputs* table, in which the desired outcomes are transferred in more practical ambitions.
3. An *Issues and Constraints* table, discussing regulatory, institutional, infrastructural and other barriers.

4. An *Actions, Milestones and Investments* table, including a time schedule and an identification of the role of ADB and other parties.

## A4.8    International Technology Roadmap for Semiconductors (ITRS)

*Objective:*
As a whole, the semiconductor industry aims to continue the rapid improvements in semiconductor products that have led to the frequently cited Moore's Law, whilst simultaneously decreasing the costs per function of their products.
The most significant objective of the ITRS itself is industry collaboration. The improvement trends are enabled by large R&D investments, which require industrial collaboration.
As a result of this collaboration, the ITRS has improved the quality of R&D investment decisions made at all levels and successfully channelled research efforts to areas that most need research breakthroughs.

*Methodology:*
The development of the ITRS is a dynamic process, with participation from semiconductor experts from EU, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the US. Experts meet in workshops to identify trends and challenges in specific technology areas, before a committee brings all these together to form an industry wide roadmap.

*Structure:*
The ITRS is well laid out with an introductory section contains a summary of the key findings, and the roadmap itself. The findings of each of the 15 technology workgroups are then presented.

## A4.9    TRM on Power Grids

*Objective:*
Years of under-investment in the electricity grid contributed to the 2003 blackout that affected 50 million people in the Great Lakes region of USA. Modernizing the grid became a national priority. Recognising that neither the government nor the industry could act along, a roadmap was created as a framework to bring together all the stakeholders involved in the electric industry to work towards common aims.

*Methodology*
The US Department of Energy convened a series of two day workshops bringing together over 250 industry professional to generate an 'action agenda'. The first workshop brought together senior executives and policy makers to develop a 'vision' of the future. The aim of a second workshop attended by technical experts was on building a consensus on how to achieve the vision.

*Structure*
The introduction makes a clear explanation of the roadmapping concept, and describing its context and aims. The roadmap is presented at the start of the document, before the action items are developed in subsequent chapters. The appendices list out the participants and a useful summary of the short term RD&D needs.