

CDM-EB85-A02-INFO

Project plan for the evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. INITIATION STAGE OF EVALUATION CONSULTANCY	3
2.1. Documents Received	3
2.2. RCC Goals and Objectives	4
3. PROPOSED PROJECT PLAN	6
3.1. Overall approach and methodological framework	6
3.1.1. Project Pipeline	6
3.1.2. Stakeholder Feedback	7
3.1.3. Assessment of RCC Operations and Activities	7
3.2. Expected data collection and analysis methods	8
3.3. Suitable indicators to measure performance, perceptions and impact	9
3.4. List of resources required.....	11
3.5. Meetings or interactions expected with staff and stakeholders and their role in the process	11
4. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:	12
5. CLOSURE STAGE – PREPARATION OF FINAL REPORT	13
APPENDIX 1. SAMPLE LFA EVALUATION FRAMEWORK (DRAFT).....	14
APPENDIX 2. SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT PARTICIPANTS.....	17

1. Introduction

1. The regional distribution of CDM projects has been an issue of concern for Parties since the first session of the CMP, and both the Board and the secretariat have received mandates over the years to support underrepresented countries in engaging in the CDM. In order to help alleviate this concern and improve the regional distribution of the CDM, the secretariat in consultation with the CDM Executive Board (the Board) agreed to set up Regional Collaboration Centres (RCCs) with the aim of helping Parties, stakeholders and project participants overcome barriers to the development and implementation of CDM project activities and PoAs and guide them through the steps of the CDM project cycle. This initiative was welcomed by the Parties at the eighth session of the Conference of the Parties.
2. The four RCCs currently in operation are in:
 - (a) Lomé, Togo, in partnership with the Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD), operational as of January 2013;
 - (b) Kampala, Uganda, in partnership with East African Development Bank (EADB), opened in May 2013;
 - (c) St. George's, Grenada in partnership with Windward Islands Research & Education Foundation (WINDREF), started in July 2013; and
 - (d) Bogotá, Colombia, in partnership with the Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF), beginning in September 2013.
3. Now that these Regional Centres have been in operation for close to two years, the Board has requested that an independent evaluation be carried out of the activities and operations of the four operating RCCs, in order to assess their effectiveness in achieving their objectives, the impact the RCCs have had in their regions, as well as the efficiency of their operations. The Initiation Stage of this evaluation began in May with the objective of formulating a Project Plan for carrying out the evaluation of the RCC operations. The Project Plan is presented in this document.

2. Initiation stage of evaluation consultancy

4. During the first stage of this evaluation, the Consultant focused on gathering information on the initial establishment of the RCCs, including the rationale and objectives for setting up the centres, and has obtained detailed information on their operations, activities and workplans. The Consultant travelled to Bonn the third week of May, and met with numerous secretariat staff in Bonn, including RCC officers, communicated by Skype with the Board chair and co-chair and has been in regular communications (both electronic and telephone) with secretariat staff since that time.

2.1. Documents received

5. Numerous documents have been requested by the Consultant and received by the secretariat, including but not limited to the following:
 - (a) RCC terms of reference, strategy and conception documents;

- (b) EB reports relevant to RCC operations;
 - (c) RCC status reports to the Board;
 - (d) MoUs with partner organizations;
 - (e) RCC workplans;
 - (f) Contact lists for each RCC;
 - (g) RCC events lists;
 - (h) Financial reports.
6. The Consultant has also requested and received access to the RCC SharePoint system in order to easily view the databases developed the RCCs regarding events, projects, and contacts, as well as capacity-building and communications documents produced by the RCCs.
7. These initial discussions and document review have provided the Consultant with an improved understanding of the mandate and objectives of the RCCs, how they were set up and how they operate, as well as the types of data available as potential input to the evaluation. It has also provided a more up-to-date understanding of the current focus of the Board and the secretariat with regards to promoting the CDM.

2.2. RCC goals and objectives

8. Based on these discussions and an initial document review, the Consultant has the following understanding of the goals, objectives and areas of work of the RCCs.
9. As the RCCs were established in response to the repeated requests of CMP to improve the regional distribution of the CDM,¹ it is generally accepted that the overall goal of the RCCs is to increase the participation of underrepresented regions in CDM project activities, in order to enhance regional distribution. In particular, in 2011, Decision 8/CMP.8 requested the following:

The secretariat, in consultation with the Executive Board, including through working with the Designated National Authorities Forum and the partner agencies of the Nairobi Framework, to enhance its support for countries underrepresented in the clean development mechanism, in particular the least developed countries, small island developing States and African countries, by providing support, subject to workload and the availability of financial resources, for, inter alia, the following:

- (a) *Skills enhancement and training to assist designated national authorities, applicant and designated operational entities and project participants with regard to technical matters related to the clean development mechanism;*

¹ For example decision 3/CMP.6: “Encourages the Executive Board to support the enhancement of the regional distribution of clean development mechanism project activities by intensifying the provision of focused and targeted support to assist designated national authorities, applicant entities, and project participants in underrepresented regions and countries, in cooperation with the designated authorities of such Parties”.

- (b) Institutional strengthening through, inter alia, support to designated national authorities in the development and submission of standardized baselines and microscale renewable energy technologies that are automatically defined as additional;*
 - (c) Activities of designated national authorities and stakeholders in the implementation of the guidelines on standardized baselines and suppressed demand through system development and application.*
- 10. Although various measures had already been promoted and implemented by the Board and the secretariat with the aim of enhancing regional distribution, for example the development of standardized baselines, DNA workshops, setting up of a “help-desk”, creating a CDM Loan Scheme, simplifying additionality requirements for microscale and first-of-its-kind projects, among other initiatives, it was perceived that an on-the-ground presence was needed in order to address barriers to the CDM in these regions, in particular to assist stakeholders through the complicated CDM process. Based on feedback from stakeholders, they came to the conclusion that CDM capacity-building could be best achieved by getting involved with actual projects in the real world, and not simply examples as was previously done in workshops. Thus, in 2012 the secretariat proposed the concept of regional CDM support centres in regions that were under-represented in the CDM as a response to the requests from the CMP, including decision 8/CMP.7.
- 11. It is worth noting that CMP 8 welcomed the establishment by the secretariat of Regional Collaboration Centres to promote the clean development mechanism in regions underrepresented in the clean development mechanism and to support stakeholders at the regional and national levels (decision 5/CMP.8). As well, in their 2013 Annual report to the CMP, the Board reported on the establishment of the RCCs as follows:

With a view to increasing accessibility, through support for registration, issuance, PoA development and development of standardized baselines, by the end of the reporting period four regional collaboration centres (RCCs) had been launched with cooperating organizations.
- 12. Hence, based on this original mandate and goals, three main objectives have been identified:
 - (a) Provide direct support to local stakeholders in CDM project and PoA development, registration and issuance so that project registration and issuance in underrepresented countries is enhanced;
 - (b) Build local CDM capacity, strengthen institutions and develop partnerships, in order to develop long-term sustainable local capacity to continue developing CDM projects; and
 - (c) Collaborate with local partners in the development and promotion of standardized baselines, suppressed demand methodologies, and other simplified tools of the CDM, in order to facilitate and increase the accessibility of the CDM process.
- 13. It is important to note that priorities for these objectives and the activities designed to meet them will differ from one region to another depending on local circumstances and the specifics of the MoUs signed with partner organizations. They are fluid and will

change slightly from year to year based on lessons-learned, identified priorities in each region, as well as new direction from the Board.

14. A fourth objective can also be identified based on more recent work of the Board that focuses on enhancing the demand for the CDM, or “Demand-Side initiatives”, for example, by promoting the co-benefits of CDM project activities to potential buyers.
 - (a) Collaborate with local partners in increasing the attractiveness of CDM project activities, for example, by promoting the Sustainable Development Co-benefits Tool.
15. Within these main four objectives, specific activities or areas of work are identified, that have been designed to meet these objectives. These activities are listed in the draft monitoring framework provided in Appendix 1.

3. Proposed project plan

3.1. Overall approach and methodological framework

16. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact that the RCCs have had in their regions, and the effectiveness of the RCCs and their activities in achieving their objectives, as described above. Ideally this impact should be assessed relative to what would have occurred had the RCCs not been implemented. However, such a baseline (i.e. business-as-usual without the RCCs) was never developed and therefore it is challenging to quantitatively measure what this impact has been. In order to attempt to capture this impact, therefore, the Consultant proposes a three-pronged approach, including i) an evaluation of changes in the project pipeline, ii) stakeholder feedback, and iii) a detailed assessment of RCC operations and activities, as described below. Note that the emphasis will be on stakeholder feedback.

3.1.1. Project pipeline

17. One means of assessing the impact on the regional involvement in the CDM is to assess the change in the project pipeline in the relevant regions since the time that the RCCs began operation, to evaluate for example how many new projects are in the pipeline, and how many projects have been registered. This change can be assessed from the time of establishment of each RCC, but not relative to what would have occurred otherwise. It is also worth noting that since the CDM project cycle is a slow process (often taking two years or more to register a project), the two years or less that the RCCs have been operating may not yet have made a strong, noticeable change in the project pipeline. Nevertheless, since the overall goal of the RCCs is to increase the number of registered projects and PoAs in underrepresented regions, it is still deemed to be a worthwhile exercise to assess how the pipeline has changed. Since the RCCs have in fact done this analysis in their status reports to the Board, it would not be an effective use of the Consultant’s time to redo the analysis of the regional project pipelines, however the available data on the pipelines will be re-evaluated and verified to provide an overall assessment of the impact to the changes in the pipeline over the last two years, and if additional pipeline data is required, this will be requested of the secretariat.

3.1.2. Stakeholder feedback

18. Since outputs such as capacity-building and institutional strengthening are inherently difficult to measure, the Consultant proposes that emphasis be placed on obtaining direct feedback from relevant stakeholders, through interviews and surveys, to obtain their views on how the RCC has impacted their organizations and/or aided their projects through the project cycle. A diverse group of stakeholders will be surveyed, including DNAs, project developers, NGOs and funding institutions. In order to minimize bias in this feedback, the group of stakeholders to be interviewed and to be surveyed in each region will be balanced, composed of many of the RCCs' principal contacts, a balanced selection from the wider list of regional contacts,² as well as a number of contacts from the Consultant's existing network. The questions asked both in interviews and by surveys will be framed to try to assess the impact that the RCCs have had in their diverse areas of work, and their strengths and weaknesses, and will aim to be as quantitative as possible, for example using scales from 1 to 5 to assess impact. To the extent possible, anonymity will be maintained in these surveys, so that they remain unbiased, although the Consultant will keep track of those stakeholders who have responded via a numbering system.

3.1.3. Assessment of RCC operations and activities

19. The evaluation will also include a detailed review and assessment of how the RCCs operate, how their priorities and workplans are developed, the specific activities that they have carried out in capacity-building, developing partnerships, assisting individual project developers etc. and how their budget has been spent. This will be carried out via discussions with RCC staff, and a review of documents such as workplans, events lists, financial reports, status reports to the Board etc. This assessment will complement the input from stakeholder feedback, with the goal of assessing which activities have had the most impact and where further emphasis may be needed. It will also include an assessment of how effectively the budget has been used on promoting CDM activities, and a look at funds that have been leveraged from partner organizations in each of the regions.

3.1.4. Evaluation framework

20. As discussed in the technical proposal, an adapted LFA³ approach will be used to create an overall framework for the evaluation. The approach used would be to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework (LFA-type table) for each RCC in which the goals and objectives of the RCC are linked directly with activities that correspond to those objectives, as well as outputs and indicators (where possible) with which the achievement of those objectives can be evaluated. The design of each framework will begin with the overall objectives of the RCCs in general, and then additional objectives will be added for each RCC depending on the specific circumstances of that RCC and

² The RCC staff has provided the Consultant with two lists of contacts, one containing the contact information for the stakeholders for which they have had more frequent interaction and who are most active in the field, and another larger list with all stakeholders who have had any contact at all with the Regional Centres, for example, for a telephone query.

³ Logical Framework Approach – an approach that is often used for the monitoring and evaluating of international development and capacity-building programmes and projects, and is commonly used in Results Based Management (RBM).

region, and will take into account for example, the number of countries that are LDCs or SIDS. In other words, four separate LFA tables will be developed containing the overall objectives and activities that they have in common, but customized to account for the specific circumstances and objectives of the respective RCC.

21. Note that all efforts will be made to create an impartial and neutral framework, which is not biased by any previous evaluations that may have been carried out, but that is fair and appropriate to the objectives and circumstances of the individual RCCs. These templates will then serve as the framework for the evaluation and will be gradually filled in during the implementation phase of the project, as the required data is collected.
22. A draft example of this LFA framework is provided in Appendix 1. This draft will be further developed and modified for each RCC as discussed.

3.2. Expected data collection and analysis methods

23. As discussed above, for analysing the changes in the project pipeline, the project databases already prepared for the RCCs will be used, and if needed other data regarding the pipeline will be requested, for example data for the project pipeline during the time prior to the RCCs. This will then be reviewed to compare, for example, the number of new CDM projects/PoAs in each regional pipeline since each RCC began operation and the number in a similar time period prior to RCC operation, in order to assess how the RCC has assisted in bringing forward new project activities. The same exercise will be carried out for registered project activities/PoAs. Ideally these numbers will be compared to the pipeline in the two years (or similar appropriate timeframe) before the individual RCCs were established, in order to be consistent, if that data is available.
24. In order to collect stakeholder feedback several surveys or questionnaires will be created tailored to diverse stakeholder groups, eg. project developers, DNAs and partner organizations, etc. These questionnaires will be developed in English and then translated into French and Spanish and will be consistent for each region. The aim of the questionnaires will be attempt to learn how the RCC has made a difference to CDM development in the region and in particular to the stakeholder in question, and therefore will attempt to assess the value-added of the RCC, relative to what would have occurred without the presence and activities of the RCC. They will also provide a tool to provide consistency in obtaining feedback from stakeholders, either in person, by phone or Skype, or by email. The Consultant will attempt to have face-to-face contact with as many stakeholders as is feasible in each region, during the visits to the RCCs (i.e. those who are located close to the RCCs, or are visiting the RCCs for an event or meeting), and otherwise phone interviews will be organized, in order to maximize responses. Other questionnaires may also be sent by email, though a lower response rate would be expected. In all cases, it will requested that the RCC staff provide an introduction to the questionnaire before requesting it to be filled in and a brief explanation of this evaluation exercise – however the questionnaire will be distributed and collected by the Consultant, in an attempt to avoid any bias on the part of respondees. An attempt will be made to keep the surveys relatively short and simple in order to maximize the response rate. A sample draft questionnaire is provided in Appendix 2.
25. For the **assessment of RCC operations**, most data has already been received, including RCC workplans, financial reports, events lists etc. These will be reviewed in

greater detail and then discussed with RCC staff while on mission. If it is deemed that further data is required, that will be requested of the secretariat.

26. Though it was initially expected (i.e. in the technical proposal) that the Consultant would create a spreadsheet database for each RCC, since it is apparent that the secretariat already has developed several databases containing data for the RCC regions, organized by country (and whether they are SID, LDC etc.), including details of projects activities and their status, stakeholder queries, events in each region, etc. it is deemed to be more efficient to use existing databases for the analysis, and where necessary create additional tables using this data, in order to analyse and summarize the data and present the results, for example tables to tabulate the survey results.

3.3. Suitable indicators to measure performance, perceptions and impact

27. Indicators are a means of monitoring how well RCC objectives are being met, and should ideally measure the impact of the RCC as compared to a baseline scenario (in which there is no RCC in the region), however this will be challenging. Wherever possible quantitative indicators will be used, and attempts will be made to measure them relative to what would have occurred without the presence of the RCCs.
28. **Project pipeline** - As the higher objective or overall goal of the RCCs is to increase participation in the CDM in their respective regions, then the principle indicators relate directly to the level of project activity. The desired outcome is an increased number of registered projects and CERs issued. Thus indicators will be the **number of projects entering the pipeline** since the establishment of the RCCs (within their respective regions), **the number of projects registered**, as well as **the number of CERs issued**. Where possible (i.e. depending on data availability) these will be measured as compared to what occurred in a similar period of time prior to the establishment of the RCCs. For example for an RCC that has been operating for 24 months, these indicators will be compared to those numbers in that region during the 24 months prior to establishment. These indicators will be provided in absolute numbers as well as the difference between the RCC operating period and the prior period in order to get an idea of the impact they have had.
29. **Stakeholder feedback** - As the project cycle for CDM is a lengthy one and in most cases more than 2 years, the impact of the RCCs cannot be measured simply by the increased numbers of registered projects, because the length of time to register a project is generally longer than the time the RCCs have been operating. Thus there need to be indicators to assess capacity-building and institutional strengthening in the region, and to assess if the impact of the RCCs will be long-term and sustainable.
30. These will primarily be obtained from stakeholder feedback and will be formulated into indicators such as:
- (a) Number/Percentage of stakeholders for whom the RCCs have made a significant impact in their understanding of the CDM;
 - (b) Number/Percentage of Project Developers who respond that the RCC has significantly impacted the advancement of their Projects;
 - (c) Number/Percentage of stakeholders who respond that the RCC's development of a standardized baseline has helped their project move forward;

- (d) Number/Percentage of DNA's who respond that the RCCs have significantly improved their capacity to promote and approve CDM projects;
 - (e) Number/Percentage of project developers using the SD co-benefit tool.
31. Stakeholders will also be asked to rate the areas of work of the RCCs (e.g. direct project assistance, capacity-building, standardized baselines, building partnerships etc.) have made most of an impact, and what areas they could be more active in order to have a greater impact. These responses will be tallied to provide an indicator of how effective their work is in each area, and where they could improve, as follows:
- (a) Stakeholder rating of direct project assistance;
 - (b) Stakeholder rating of impact of capacity-building activities;
 - (c) Stakeholder rating of partnership-building;
 - (d) Stakeholder rating of standardized baseline development by the RCCs;
 - (e) Stakeholder rating of suppressed demand methodology development by the RCCs, etc.
32. **Assessment of RCC operations and activities** – This focus of the assessment will involve an analysis of existing RCC documents (workplans, financial reports etc) combined with discussions with RCC staff, it will be more qualitative, however quantitative indicators will be used whenever possible, for example:
- (a) Number of standardized baselines developed with project developers or partner organizations;
 - (b) Regional needs analyses and studies of barriers to the CDM carried out by the RCCs;
 - (c) Funding leveraged relative to RCC budget;
 - (d) Number of countries that integrated CDM into national policies with guidance from the RCCs;
 - (e) Number of projects for which the RCC has facilitated assistance from the CDM Loan Scheme;
 - (f) Number of suppressed demand methodologies the RCCs have facilitated;
 - (g) RCC involvement in the simplification of tools such as the grid emission factor tool.
33. One focus will be on how CDM barriers were identified in the region and/or capacity-building needs, and then how these were then used to design RCC workplans and orient their activities, with the idea of assessing how well activities were planned around identified needs or gaps.
34. As discussed earlier there will also be an attempt to co-relate the amounts budgeted for specific areas of work with the corresponding results from the surveys.

3.4. List of resources required

35. An extensive list of required resources was provided to the secretariat during the initial stage of this work (see section 2 above) and the bulk of these have already been received. As well, the Consultant now has access to the RCC SharePoint system, which contains regional project databases, events lists, workshop documents, contact lists, communications documents, RCC publications etc.
36. If any further documents are needed (i.e. that are not on the SharePoint site and have not already been received), these will be requested of the secretariat. Further details may be required for example regarding:
 - (a) The Project Pipeline in the four regions, in the period since the RCCs were established, and during a similar time period prior to their establishment;
 - (b) Standardized baselines whose development has been facilitated by the RCCs;
 - (c) Details of DNAs where the RCCs have assisted in developing CDM procedures or policy;
 - (d) Projects that have received assistance via the CDM Loan Scheme in the RCC regions.
37. With regards to back-up support from the secretariat, logistics support while on mission to the four RCCs will be required, with regards to travel itineraries, accommodation recommendations, and in-country transportation etc. As well, assistance will be required for setting up meetings with stakeholders while visiting the regions, and for informing stakeholders about this evaluation process and the associated surveys, before the stakeholders received these surveys. Some assistance in printing surveys while in the regions may be requested as well.

3.5. Meetings or interactions expected with staff and stakeholders and their role in the process

38. As per the terms of reference, the Consultant will travel to all RCC sites and interview RCC and partner staff as well as relevant stakeholders in the region. Travel will be carried out in the most efficient means possible, split into two trips, the first to Africa (to visit RCC Lomé and RCC Kampala) and a second to Latin America (to visit RCC Bogotá and RCC Grenada). In order to maximize the direct contact with stakeholders, where feasible, visits will be scheduled around events in the region where diverse stakeholders will already be present. For example, the visit to RCC Kampala is expected to overlap with the East Africa Carbon Fair, currently scheduled for 14 to 15 July in Kampala. Since many project developers and other stakeholders will be present at this event, it is expected to be a good opportunity to meet and interview numerous stakeholders in an efficient manner. There may be similar opportunities at the other RCC locations, though the schedule for other events has not yet been finalized. It is anticipated that about three days will be needed at each RCC site, to spend at least one day meeting with RCC staff, and the other days meeting with stakeholders, including DNA representatives where possible, project developers and other organizations as appropriate.

39. Therefore, the tentative travel schedule is as follows:
- (a) RCC Kampala – 3 days during the week of 14 to 15 July to overlap with Carbon Fair;
 - (b) RCC Lomé – 3 days in July either before or after the visit to Kampala;⁴
 - (c) RCC Bogotá - 3 days during the first week of August;
 - (d) RCC Grenada - 3 days in August following the trip to Bogotá.
40. This tentative schedule will be finalized in the weeks to come, once the Project Plan is approved, in collaboration with the secretariat staff and the RCC, and may be modified according to events planned in the regions and RCC schedules. As well, an additional trip to Bonn may be scheduled if it is deemed to be useful to have further meetings with RCC staff located in Bonn. That would most likely occur later in the month of August in order to obtain any final clarifications on remaining issues, depending on availability of secretariat staff at that time.
41. Each RCC will be requested to assist in organizing meetings with stakeholders, based on a list sent to them by the Consultant several weeks in advance of her visit. The list of stakeholders will include the principal contacts of each RCC, the local DNA (and others if feasible), project developers and representatives from relevant funding organizations who have a presence in the region, such as the World Bank, UNDP, KfW, etc. In order to remain unbiased, every attempt will be made to include diverse stakeholders, some randomly selected from the broader contact list, as well as contacts from the Consultant's existing network. For those stakeholders with whom it is not possible to meet face-to-face, interviews by phone or Skype will be organized, with assistance from RCC staff.⁵

4. Implementation Schedule:

42. Once the Project Plan has been approved by the Board, the Consultant will move on to the implementation phase of the evaluation, beginning with the following tasks:
- (a) Refining the LFA framework for each RCC;
 - (b) Finalizing the surveys and translating into French and Spanish;
 - (c) Reviewing the lists of stakeholders and determining who to meet with, who to interview by phone and who to simply provide a survey. Lists of stakeholders with whom meetings need to be arranged will be sent to the respective RCC;
 - (d) Conduct a more detailed review of documents received, including project pipeline data, workplans, financial data etc. and request clarifications of secretariat staff as needed;

⁴ The most effective time to visit Lomé is still being discussed, as an event may be scheduled to coincide with the visit.

⁵ Although it will be necessary for RCC staff to assist with scheduling meetings and phone calls, and making introductions, the stakeholder discussions will be held privately without RCC presence, in order to promote frank discussion and unbiased feedback.

- (e) In collaboration with secretariat staff and direct communication with the RCC, the meeting and travel schedule will be finalized;
 - (f) Prior to each mission, the Consultant will focus on reviewing data and projects for that specific region, and following the missions will begin to compile the results immediately, so as to be most efficient.
43. The Consultant will maintain open electronic communications with secretariat staff and RCC staff. Document review and analysis and data input into the monitoring framework and database will continue throughout the implementation phase, including while on mission to the regions, such that any gaps in data will be quickly identified and new resources requested or modifications made as appropriate.
44. This second phase is expected to be conducted from 23 June until the end of August, though this schedule will depend on the finalized travel schedule.

5. Closure Stage – Preparation of Final Report

45. Following the regional missions, the Consultant will analyse the stakeholder and RCC feedback and data obtained during the Implementation phase and will prepare a Final Report that comprises the facts, observations, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, in line with this Project Plan. The Final Report will include the evaluation of how well the RCCs are meeting their objectives, an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the RCC operations, an analysis of any gaps in their work and suggestions for potential areas of improvement. It will also include an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of expenditures CDM funds by the RCCs. All analysis will be carried out in a consistent and impartial manner, and observations, findings, recommendations and conclusions shall be based upon objective evidence and shall be presented in a transparent manner.
46. The Final Report shall be in an easily understandable format and shall clearly elaborate the reasons for the findings and conclusions. All background analysis and data generated during the appraisal will be delivered to the secretariat in a well-documented, usable format to ensure their further use. This includes the LFA monitoring tables that will be developed for each RCC, and all collected data, as well as the questionnaires and set of responses to the questionnaires by stakeholders.
47. This final phase is expected to be conducted from 1 September 2015 to 12 September 2015 with the Final Report with its accompanying annexes to be delivered by 12 September 2015.

Appendix 1. Sample LFA Evaluation Framework (Draft)

Overall Objective	Activities	Outputs	Indicators
1. Providing direct support to local stakeholders in CDM project and PoA development, registration and issuance so that project registration and issuance in underrepresented countries is enhanced	1.1. Identify barriers faced by stakeholders in these regions (e.g. project participants, DNAs; DOEs etc.) involved in the CDM process	RCC studies on barrier identification / needs analysis	Number / nature of barrier studies / needs analyses carried out by RCC
	1.2. Assist in eliminating the identified barriers	Activities designed specifically to reduce barriers Barriers are reduced or eliminated	Number / percentage of Project Developers who respond that the RCC has helped to reduce barriers to the CDM
	1.3 Provide direct support to existing and potential future CDM projects and PoAs to help them to move through the project pipeline, both registration and issuance	Advancement of existing projects thru the pipeline and increased number of projects registered Facilitation of CDM Loan Scheme to project participants	Increased number of projects registered Increased number of CERs issued Stakeholder rating of direct project assistance Number of project participants assisted via CDM Loan Scheme
	1.4 Identify new potential project activities for inclusion in the pipeline	New project opportunities entering the pipeline	Increased number of projects that have entered pipeline

Overall Objective	Activities	Outputs	Indicators
2. Build local CDM capacity, strengthen institutions and develop partnerships, in order to develop long term sustainable local capacity to continue developing CDM projects and PoAs	2.1. Promote knowledge dissemination to local stakeholders with regards to the CDM via outreach activities in order to increase awareness of the CDM	Increased understanding of the CDM on the part of stakeholders	Number / percentage of stakeholders for whom the RCCs have made a significant impact in their understanding of the CDM Number / percentage of DNAs who respond that the RCCs have significantly improved their capacity to promote and approve CDM projects Stakeholder rating of impact of capacity-building activities
	2.2. Collaborate directly with DNAs aiming to improve the integration of CDM into national climate policy		Number of countries that integrated CDM into national policies with guidance from the RCCs
	2.3. Build local capacity through establishing networks and partnerships with other local and regional institutions and agencies	Development of strong sustainable partnerships that will continue to collaborate on CDM promotion	Stakeholder rating of partnership-building Funding leveraged relative to RCC budget
3. Collaborate with local partners in the development and promotion of standardized baselines, suppressed demand and other simplified tools of the CDM in order to facilitate and increase the accessibility of the CDM process	3.1. Support the development and use of standardized baselines	Increased number of standardized baselines available relevant to local projects	Number / percentage of stakeholders who respond that the RCC's development of a standardized baseline has helped their project move forward Number of standardized baselines developed with RCC involvement

Overall Objective	Activities	Outputs	Indicators
	3.1 Support the development and use of suppressed demand methodologies	Development of suppressed demand methodologies facilitated by RCCs	Number of suppressed demand methodologies developed with assistance of RCCs
	3.2 Support the use of other simplified procedures of the CDM	Increased awareness and use of CDM simplified procedures	Number of project developers familiar with and using CDM simplified procedures
4. Collaborate with local partners in increasing the attractiveness of CDM project activities, for example, by promoting the SD Co-benefits Tool	4.1 Capacity-building on the SD Tool and collaboration on other Demand-side initiatives	Increased awareness and use of SD Tool	Number of project developers familiar with and using the SD co-benefit tool

Appendix 2. Sample Questionnaire for Project Participants¹

1. How much of an impact has the CDM Regional Collaboration Centre made in your understanding of the Clean Development Mechanism and project cycle? (scale 1 to 5)
0 1 2 3 4 5
No impact Minor impact Moderate impact Significant impact²
2. How much of an impact has the RCC had on the advancement of your project(s)?
0 1 2 3 4 5
No impact Minor impact Moderate impact Significant impact³
3. Are you using Sustainable Development co-benefit Tool for your projects?
Yes No Do not know what that is
4. Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in assisting your CDM project activity (scale 1 to 5).
0 1 2 3 4 5
Not effective Somewhat effective Very effective
5. Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM (scale 1 to 5).
0 1 2 3 4 5
Not effective Somewhat effective Very effective
6. Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in building long-lasting partnerships and networks, based on your own experience (scale 1 to 5).
0 1 2 3 4 5
Not effective Somewhat effective Very effective
7. Please rate the impact that the RCC has in assisting with the development of standardized baselines, based on your own experience (scale 1 to 5).
0 1 2 3 4 5
No impact Some impact Strong impact
8. Please rate the impact that the RCC has had in facilitating the development of suppressed demand methodologies, if applicable, based on your own experience (scale 1 to 5).

¹ Other similar surveys will be created for DNAs and other institutions.

² Note that this is an initial draft version – the final templates will be designed with text boxes, arrows in order to be as clear and easy-to-use as possible. They will also be translated into French and Spanish, and possibly Portuguese if required.

³ Note that this is an initial draft version – the final templates will be designed with text boxes, arrows in order to be as clear and easy-to-use as possible.

0 1 2 3 4 5
No impact Some impact Strong impact

9. Has the RCC facilitated your access to the CDM Loan Scheme?

Yes No N/A

10. Please describe how the RCC has assisted you with your project.

>>

11. Please describe in what way the RCC has improved your understanding of the CDM.

>>

12. What barriers to the CDM has the RCC reduced or eliminated?

>>

Date _____ Location _____

- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	24 July 2015	EB 85, Annex 2. Initial publication. This document was approved by the Board via electronic decision, in accordance with rule 30 of the Rules of procedure of the Board, based on the proposal made by the selected consultant for the third party evaluation of the RCCs.

Decision Class: Operational
Document Type: Information note
Business Function: Governance
Keywords: evaluation research, regional collaboration centres
