

CDM-EB86-A02-INFO

Independent third-party evaluation report of the regional collaboration centres

Version 01.0



United Nations
Framework Convention on
Climate Change

COVER NOTE

1. Procedural background

1. The Executive Board of the clean development mechanism (CDM) (hereafter referred to as the Board) while approving the management plan for 2015 at its eighty-first meeting (EB 81), expressed its desire for an independent evaluation of the work conducted by the regional collaboration centres (RCCs) with regard to their overall effectiveness and efficiency of operations.
2. The Board at EB 82 agreed to the terms of reference (ToR) for a consultant to undertake a third-party evaluation of the regional collaboration centres and requested the secretariat to launch a call for experts for the consultancy. Based on expression of interests received, the Board at EB 83 selected a consultant for independent evaluation of RCCs. The Board also approved electronically in May 2015 the project plan proposed by the selected consultant for the evaluation of the RCCs, and made publicly available the plan in annex 2 to the EB 85 meeting report.
3. The appendix presents the independent third-party evaluation report prepared by the selected consultant. The Board has considered this evaluation report at this EB 86 meeting and agreed to make it publicly available, as annex to its meeting report.

Appendix 1. Independent third-party evaluation report of the regional collaboration centres



Independent Evaluation
of the
CDM Regional Collaboration Centres:
Final Report

Carolyn Luce
Solea Consulting

September 28, 2015

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

1. Background	1
2. Initial Stage of Evaluation Consultancy	3
3. Implementation of the Project Plan	8
4. Presentation of Findings and Results	11
5. RCC Kampala.....	12
6. RCC Lomé.....	23
7. RCC Bogotá	34
8. RCC St. George’s.....	41
9. RCC Budget	49
10. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	51
<i>Appendix 1 – LFA Evaluation Framework.....</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Appendix 2a – Questionnaire for Project Participants.....</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Appendix 2b – Questionnaire for DNAs.....</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Appendix 2c – Questionnaire for International/Government Agencies</i>	<i>vii</i>
Annex 1 – Compilation of Questionnaire Responses – Excel Spreadsheet	

Executive Summary

Four Regional Collaboration Centres (RCCs) began operations between January and September 2013 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. These RCCs are located in Lomé (Togo), Kampala (Uganda), St. George's (Grenada) and Bogotá (Colombia) and are partnered with local organizations, either development banks or research institutes in these locations.

The Board requested that an independent third party evaluation be carried out of the activities and operations of these four RCCs, in order to assess their effectiveness in achieving their objectives, the impact the RCC's have had in their regions, as well as the efficiency of their operations. A Terms of Reference for a consultant to carry out this evaluation was prepared and made public in early March 2015 and the Consultant was contracted in early May 2015. A project plan was prepared by the Consultant in June 2015 outlining how the evaluation would be carried out and was approved by the Board shortly afterwards. The results of this evaluation are presented in this report.

The Consultant visited the four RCCs during the months of July and August, spending three full days at each site, meeting with RCC staff, partner organizations, project developers, DNAs and international organizations in order to assess the RCC operations and solicit feedback from stakeholders on the impacts they have had in the regions. A monitoring and evaluation framework, including activities, outputs and indicators was designed as a structured means to assess how well the objectives of the RCCs are being achieved, and a set of questionnaires was prepared to assist in collecting quantitative data with which to measure these indicators. These questionnaires were given to all interviewed stakeholders as well as all DNAs in the four regions and the results of completed questionnaires were compiled in an excel spreadsheet that is provided as an Annex to this document. Copies of the questionnaires as well as the monitoring framework can be viewed in the appendices of this document.

Results of the questionnaires, interviews and review of relevant RCC documents are presented individually for each RCC in sections 5 through 8 of this report. The presentation of results follows the structure of the evaluation framework, such that each of the four main objectives and the activities that fall under these objectives are assessed separately with a discussion of the values of the relevant indicators and feedback received for each activity. In this way, the strengths and weaknesses of each RCC in each area can be identified. There is also a presentation of the feedback received suggesting relevant future areas of work for each RCC.

In section 9 of the report, there is an assessment of the RCC budget and expenditures, with a focus on the years 2014 and 2015, which includes a breakdown of how this budget is being spent, as well as a look at the funds that have been leveraged from the partner organizations and international agencies.

Finally, section 10 presents the Conclusions and Recommendations of the report, beginning with a summary of the results of each RCC, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of each. This is followed by a discussion of additional observations pertaining to the RCC program as a whole, including some unexpected benefits of the program, recommendations on potential improvements that can be made and suggestions for future directions.

Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

1. Background

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 serving as the meeting of the parties to the Kyoto Protocol.

The four RCCs currently in operation are in¹:

Lomé, Togo, in partnership with the Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD), operational as of January 2013;

Kampala, Uganda, in partnership with East African Development Bank (EADB), opened in May 2013;

St. George's, Grenada in partnership with Windward Islands Research & Education Foundation (WINDREF), started in July 2013; and

Bogotá, Colombia, in partnership with the Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF), beginning in September 2013.

As these Regional Centres have now been in operation for close to two years, the Board requested that an independent third party 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. A Terms of Reference for a consultant to carry out this evaluation was prepared and made public in early March 2015 and the Consultant was contracted in early May 2015.

As per the Terms of Reference for the Consultancy, the purpose of the evaluation is the following:

The Board desires an independent evaluation of the work conducted by the RCCs with regard to their overall effectiveness and efficiency of operations. It shall identify the areas of work that are particularly effective, which are comparatively less effective, and how the work is perceived by the stakeholders involved as well as the impact of the RCCs in the region including the additional value of the RCCs in supporting the CDM locally. It will also evaluate the use of funds to ensure that CDM funds are used appropriately. It shall provide insights into the present operations of the RCCs as well as recommendations on how the operation of RCCs should progress into the near future.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference for this consultancy, combined with further communications with the Board, the primary aim of this Evaluation is summarized as:

¹ A fifth RCC was recently set up at the beginning of September 2015 in Bangkok, but since it is just beginning operations, it was not covered under this evaluation.

Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

- ❖ To determine the impact of the RCCs in their respective regions, in particular in terms of regional distribution and in the CDM project cycle, by assessing how much difference the RCC's activities really make.

Furthermore the evaluation is to be carried out taking into account the following guidelines, as provided by the Board:

- *The focus shall be more on the current activities and achievements of the RCCs and where they are heading, with less focus on where they have come from;*
- *Given that CDM funding should only be used for CDM-related activities this evaluation should only cover activities directly relevant to the CDM;*
- *The evaluation should be independent, impartial and free from bias and should focus on objective evaluation and fact-finding, rather than on opinions and interpretation.*
- *The evaluation and analysis of findings shall be conducted in a transparent and consistent manner, and observations, findings, recommendations and conclusions shall be based upon objective evidence.*



Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

2. Initial Stage of Evaluation Consultancy

A first stage of this Evaluation was carried out from early May 2015 until 15, June 2015 when a Project Plan was submitted by the Consultant outlining approach to be taken for the evaluation, as per the Terms of Reference for the Consultancy. 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 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.

These initial discussions and document review 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 also provided a more up-to-date understanding of the current focus of the Board and the secretariat with regards to promoting the CDM.

Based on the discussion at the secretariat and with the Board, as well an initial document review, the Consultant began by summarizing the goals, objectives and areas of work of the RCCs as follows:

2.1 Summary of the Overall Goals and Objectives of the RCCs

Since the RCCs were established in response to the repeated requests of CMP to improve the regional distribution of the CDM², 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;

(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;

² 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”.

Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

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/CMP7.

Hence, based on this original mandate and goals, three main objectives were identified:

Objective 1. 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;

Objective 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

Objective 3. 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;

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.

Objective 4. Collaborate with local partners in increasing the attractiveness of CDM project activities, for example, by promoting the Sustainable Development Co-benefits Tool.

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

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 LFA³-type monitoring framework provided in Appendix 1 that is used to create an overall framework for the evaluation. In this framework, the goals and objectives of the RCCs are linked directly with activities that correspond to those objectives, as well as outputs and indicators with which the achievement of those objectives can be evaluated. Table 1 provides a modified version of this framework, identifying the potential Activities that fall under each of the four main objectives.

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).



Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

Table 1 – Objectives and Activities

Overall Objective	Activities Under Each Objective
<p>1. Direct Support to Stakeholders: Provide direct support to local stakeholders in CDM project and PoA development, registration and issuance.</p>	<p>1.1 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</p> <p>1.2 Identify barriers faced by stakeholders in these regions (e.g. project participants, DNAs; DOEs etc.) involved in the CDM process</p> <p>1.3 Assist in eliminating the identified barriers</p> <p>1.4 Identify new potential project activities for inclusion in the pipeline</p>
<p>2. Build Local Capacity, Strengthen Institutions and Develop Partnerships 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</p>	<p>2.1 Promote knowledge dissemination to local stakeholders with regards to the CDM via outreach activities in order to increase awareness of the CDM</p> <p>2.2 Collaborate directly with DNAs aiming to improve the integration of CDM into national climate policy</p> <p>2.3 Build local capacity through establishing networks and partnerships with other local and regional institutions and agencies</p>
<p>3. Promote SBL's and Other Simplified Tools 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</p>	<p>3.1 Support the development and use of standardized baselines</p> <p>3.2 Support the development and use of suppressed demand methodologies</p> <p>3.3 Support the improvement and use of other simplified procedures of the CDM</p>
<p>4. Promote Demand-Side Initiatives Collaborate with local partners in increasing the attractiveness of CDM project activities, for example, by promoting the SD Co-benefits Tool.</p>	<p>4.1 Capacity-building on the SD Tool and collaboration on other Demand-side initiatives</p> <p>4.2 Promote other CDM Demand-Site Initiatives such as Voluntary Cancellation and New Markets</p>

Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

2.2 Project Plan

Using these objectives as a starting point, the Project Plan⁴ for this evaluation outlined the overall approach and methodological framework that the evaluation would use in order to attempt 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 the Project Plan proposed a three-pronged approach that would focus on the following:

- i) **Stakeholder feedback**, that would include face-to-face and telephone interviews with a diverse group of stakeholders, including project developers, DNAs and international organizations, in addition to a set of questionnaires tailor-made to the groups of stakeholders and the outputs and indicators to be assessed;
- ii) an **assessment of RCC operations and activities** including 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.
- iii) an evaluation of the **project pipeline** in the relevant regions since the time that the RCCs began operation in order to assess, for example, how much existing projects have advanced in the project cycle, how many new projects are in the pipeline, and how many projects have been registered, in an attempt to assess the impact on regional involvement in the CDM that the Centres have had;⁵

Since the aim is to assess the impact of the RCCs on outputs such as capacity-building and institutional-strengthening, which are inherently difficult to measure, it was proposed that the 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.

This Project Plan also provided details on the expected data collection and analysis methods, suitable indicators to measure performance, perceptions and impacts, a list of resources required, and a tentative schedule for meetings and interactions with RCC staff and stakeholders.

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 (i.e. in which there is no RCC in the region), however is 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. Table 2 contains a list of indicators identified, that assist in evaluating how well the RCCs are meeting their objectives:

⁴ The Project Plan developed by the Consultant was approved electronically by the Board as of 26 June 2015.

⁵ Though it was initially proposed by the Consultant to compare movements in the pipeline over the time the RCCs have been operational to an equivalent period of time prior to their start-up, the Consultant quickly realized that this would not be a fair comparison, given both the rapid decline of the CDM market at that time, and the major spike in registrations in the period before the Dec. 2012 deadline.



Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

Table 2 – Indicators used in the Evaluation under each Objective

Indicators under Objective 1: Direct Support to Stakeholders	
1.1.a	Stakeholder rating of direct project assistance
1.1.b	The number/percentage of project developers who respond that the RCC has significantly impacted the advancement of their Projects
1.1.c	Movement of projects through the pipeline following an intervention by the RCC
1.1.d	The number of projects developers for which the RCC has facilitated assistance from the CDM Loan Scheme
1.2	Regional needs analyses and barrier identification carried out by the RCCs
1.3	The number/proportion of stakeholders who respond that the RCC has helped to reduce barriers to the CDM
1.4	The number of new projects that have entered the pipeline (supported by the RCC)
Indicators under Objective 2: Build Local Capacity, Strengthen Institutions and Develop Partnerships	
2.1.a	Number/percentage of stakeholders for whom the RCCs have made a significant impact in their understanding of the CDM
2.1.b	Stakeholder rating of the effectiveness of capacity-building activities
2.1.c	Number/Percentage of DNAs who respond that the RCCs have significantly improved their capacity to promote and approve CDM
2.2	The number of countries that integrated CDM into national policies with guidance from the RCCs
2.3.a	Stakeholder rating of partnership-building and networks
2.3.b	Funding leveraged relative to RCC budget
Indicators under Objective 3: Promote SBL's and Other Simplified Tools	
3.1.a	The number/percentage of stakeholders who respond that the RCCs development of a standardized baseline has helped move their project(s) forward
3.1.b	Stakeholder rating of standardized baseline development by the RCCs
3.1.c	The number of standardized baselines developed with RCC involvement
3.1.d	Number/percentage of DNAs who respond that SBL's facilitated by the RCC have moved projects forward
3.2.	Stakeholder rating of the impact of suppressed demand methodology development by the RCCs
3.3	RCC involvement in the simplification of tools such as the grid emission factor tool
Indicators under Objective 4: Promote Demand-Side Initiatives	
4.1.a	The number/percentage of project developers using the SD co-benefit tool
4.1.b	The number/percentage of DNAs who respond that the SD Tool is being used in their Country
4.2	Involvement in other Demand-Side Initiatives

Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

3. Implementation of the Project Plan

3.1 On-site Visits to RCCs

As per the terms of reference and the Project Plan, the Consultant travelled to all RCC sites and interviewed RCC officers and partner staff, as well as relevant stakeholders in the region. As soon as the project plan was approved, the travel schedule to the four RCC locations was finalized, and RCC staff, in coordination with the Consultant began setting up meetings with relevant stakeholders. It was decided that three days would be spent at each RCC site, to spend at least one day meeting with RCC staff, and the other two days meeting with stakeholders, including DNA representatives where possible, project developers and other organizations as appropriate. Where face-to-face meetings were not possible, telephone calls would be set up with these stakeholders. In an effort to remain unbiased, attempts were made to include diverse stakeholders, some randomly selected from the broader contact list, as well as contacts from the Consultant's existing network. The Consultant also requested that individual one-on-one meetings could be organized with RCC officers and local partner staff wherever possible, in order to have open, frank discussions with each staff member.

The travel schedule was organized 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 St. George). In order to maximize the direct contact with stakeholders, there was an attempt made to schedule these visits around events in the region where diverse stakeholders would already be present. For example, the visit to RCC Kampala was scheduled to overlap with the East Africa Carbon Fair, organized for the 14-15th of July in Kampala where many project developers and other stakeholders would be present, as it was felt that this would a good opportunity to meet and interview numerous stakeholders in an efficient manner. Unfortunately, no similar events were identified for the other regions, and therefore it was only the visit to Kampala that was scheduled around a stakeholder event.

The final schedule for visiting the RCC's was as follows:

RCC Kampala – July 14-16 (overlapping with the East Africa Carbon Fair)
RCC Lomé – July 20-22
RCC Bogotá – August 12-14
RCC Grenada – August 17-19

As well, an additional trip to Bonn was conducted on August 28 for final meetings with RCC staff located in Bonn in order to obtain any final clarifications on remaining issues and additional data and documents.

3.2 Document Review

An extensive list of required resources was provided to the secretariat during the initial stage of this work and the bulk of these were received promptly and reviewed. These documents include but are not limited to the following:

- RCC Terms of Reference, Strategy and Conception Documents;
- EB Reports relevant to RCC operations;
- RCC Status Reports to the Board;
- MOUs with partner organizations;
- RCC Work Plans (2012-2015);
- Contact Lists for each RCC (including all project participants, DNAs, international agencies etc.);



Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

- RCC Events lists;
- Financial Reports for each RCC, as well summaries of the RCC Budget from 2013-2015;
- Funding leveraged by each RCC, (2014-2015).

The Consultant requested and obtained access to the RCC SharePoint system in order to easily view the databases developed by the RCCs regarding Work Plans, activities, workshops and related presentations, project pipeline, contacts, etc.

Further documents and data have also been requested and received from the Secretariat and RCCs, including updated data on the project pipeline in the four regions, details on the standardized baselines whose development has been facilitated by the RCCs, details of DNAs where the RCCs have assisted in developing CDM procedures or policy, projects that have received assistance via the CDM Loan Scheme in the RCC regions and RCC input to the simplification of CDM Tools. As well, during the RCC visits, other documents were requested during the meetings with RCC Staff and provided either during the visit, or in follow-up emails.

3.3 Questionnaires

Three sets of questionnaires were developed by the Consultant, before travelling to the regions, one for Project Participants, a second for DNAs and a third for International and Governmental Agencies. These questionnaires were developed in English and then translated into French and Spanish so that they were consistent for each region. The aim of the questionnaires is to attempt to assess how the RCC has made a difference to CDM development in the region and in particular to the stakeholder in question, and therefore aims to assess the value-added of the RCC, relative to what would have occurred without the presence and activities of the RCC. The questions were 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 aimed to be as quantitative as possible, for example using scales from 1 to 5 to assess impact and effectiveness, such that the results could be used as quantitative indicators. The questionnaires were kept relatively short - 2 pages - and simple in order to maximize the response rate. Copies of these blank questionnaires are provided in Annex 2. To the extent possible, anonymity was maintained in these surveys, so that they remain unbiased, with the Consultant keeping track of stakeholders who have responded via a numbering system.

A questionnaire was provided to the stakeholder at each face-to-face interview, and in most cases these were filled in on the spot. For phone interviews, a questionnaire was sent to the stakeholder by email, and many of these were filled in and returned, although as to be expected, the response rate was somewhat lower. At each RCC there were stakeholders with whom it was not possible to have a phone conversation, and in some cases questionnaires were sent to them afterwards, though the response rate was even less.

Because DNAs are key stakeholders for the RCCs and it was felt that their input was especially valuable, DNA questionnaires were sent to every DNA in each of the four regions. In all cases an introductory email was sent to each DNA contact by the staff at the corresponding RCC to give them some background on the evaluation and the questionnaire. In addition a reminder email was sent by the secretariat to any DNA that did not respond within a period of a couple of weeks. This helped increase the response rate somewhat.

In all cases the questionnaire was distributed and collected by the Consultant and anonymity was maintained as much as possible, so that the responses would be as honest and frank as possible. Response rate for the questionnaires was approximately 90% for those where there was face-to-face contact, about



Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

60% for those with whom a phone or Skype call was held, and perhaps 10% for those with whom the only contact was via email.

It is important to note that the responses to these questionnaires cannot be viewed as statistically representative, as the sample of stakeholders surveyed is fairly low. Rather, they are indicative of how the RCCs are viewed by project developers, DNAs and International Agencies working in the respective regions. Perhaps only in Kampala, where responses were received from a total of seventeen project developers and seven DNAs, can the responses, in particular the average ratings, and the indicators that are framed as ratios of respondents, be viewed as somewhat representative. As well, though attempts were made to keep them unbiased as possible, it was impossible to keep them completely free of bias. For example, those who have a positive view of the RCC work and wish to continue collaborating with them are more likely to make themselves available for an interview, and to respond to the questionnaire. In addition, one cannot rule out the possibility that prior to the Consultant's visit, RCC staff may have encouraged some stakeholders to give positive feedback.



Independent Evaluation of the CDM Regional Collaboration Centres

4. Presentation of Findings and Results

Findings will be presented separately for each RCC, (sections 5 to 8) beginning with a short overview of the Centre and how it operates, and brief description of the meetings that took place during the RCC visits, both with the RCC and partner staff and with regional stakeholders.

Results of the evaluation will then be presented following the structure of LFA framework, as given in Table 1, such that for each RCC there will be discussion and assessment of each of the four principal objectives of the centres and the activities that fall under them, based on the indicators related to those activities, listed in section 2.2, that have been assessed as part of the evaluation. There will also be a presentation of the comments received on potential future work of the RCCs.

Results will be presented first for RCC Kampala, in part because it was the first Centre visited, but also because more direct contact was made with stakeholders in that region and there is a wider range of feedback to draw from in order to begin discussions, parts of which can extend to the other regions as well.

Following the individual assessment of each RCC an overview and assessment of the RCC budget will be presented in section 9, and then conclusion and recommendations will be presented in section 10, including an overall assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each RCC, general observations on the RCC program, and suggestions for future directions.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

5. RCC Kampala

RCC Kampala began operations in May 2013 in collaboration with the East African Development Bank (EADB), whose headquarters are located in Kampala, and therefore the RCC had been operating just over two years when the Consultant visited their offices at EADB. This RCC covers twenty-four countries in East Africa, most of which are English-speaking, though they also work with several Portuguese-speaking countries (Mozambique and Angola) and Mauritius, which is French and English speaking, is shared with RCC Lomé.

The staff at the RCC at the time of the Consultant’s visit consisted of one Technical Officer (acting Team Lead) from the secretariat⁶, an Administrative Assistant from EADB and two Research Associates, who are local staff but paid for as part of the RCC budget. Two other staff from the BOAD (an investment officer and environmental specialist with CDM experience) are also involved in the Centre as members of the RCC Steering Committee, which assists in managing the Centre and provides a communication channel to the Bank. The Steering Committee approves all expenditures and gives feedback on the workplans as well as strategic direction. The EADB also has 3 regional offices or focal points, in Kenya, Rwanda and Tanzania, which facilitate contact with stakeholders in those countries.

The first two days of the Consultant’s visit were spent primarily at the East African Carbon Fair, which the RCC was co-hosting with GIZ and at which all RCC staff participated. During these two days the Consultant met and held discussions with at least fifteen stakeholders, primarily project developers and consultants, several staff from international agencies (GIZ in particular) and one DNA representative. In the afternoon of the 15th July, phone interviews were also held with four other DNA representatives, one international agency and additional other project participants. Following the Carbon Fair, the full day of August 16th was spent at the RCC offices meeting with all RCC staff (including the two Steering Committee Members), both group and individual meetings. Phone calls were also held with two of the BOAD regional focal points. During the group meeting with the RCC staff, there was a detailed review and discussion of the RCC Work Plan, day to day operations, management systems, the annual budget, Standardized Baselines (SBLs) which they have developed or are facilitating, capacity-building activities, and details of the project pipeline.

5.1 Objective 1 - Providing Direct Support to Local Stakeholders

Activity 1.1 - Provide direct support to existing and potential CDM projects and PoAs to help them move through the project pipeline

Based on the discussions with the participants at the East African Carbon Fair, phone discussions with other project developers and from the results of the questionnaire, it is clear that direct support to project participants is where RCC Kampala is having a very positive impact and their work is much appreciated in the region. As part of the questionnaire, project participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the RCC in assisting their project activity on a scale of 0 to 5. The average rating from seventeen project participants was 4.1, with seven out of 17 respondents giving them 5 out of 5 (i.e. **very effective**) and another six gave them 4 out of 5. (*Indicator 1.1a*) On a similar question asking PPs to rate the impact that

⁶ Since that time a second Technical Officer from the Secretariat has joined RCC Kampala, in early September 2015.

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

the RCC has had on the advancement of their project, the average response was 3.8 out of 5, indicating that they have had at least a **moderate impact** on average (*Indicator 1.1.b*)

All of the PPs that I spoke with were very positive about the technical support provided by the RCC staff. Many highlighted the quick response time of the RCC in responding to any of their technical or procedural questions, indicating that they generally received a response within a day to any of their queries.⁷ They generally contrasted this with the response time from the secretariat in Bonn from which it could often take months to get a response. Another issue mentioned by many stakeholders was the ease of communicating with staff at the RCC, and it was clear that many had built up personal relationships with the staff, in particular with the Team Lead, indicating that it was important to them to be able to pick up the phone or send a quick email and talk directly to someone that you knew. Many explained how the RCC directly assisted them with unblocking their project that was stalled, for example by facilitating contact with the DNA to help obtain their project Letter of Approval (LoA). The RCC staff also mentioned (in meetings) that LOA assistance is one of their major interventions, where they talk directly to the DNA and encourage them to provide the LOA. Another comment from a project developer was that “the RCC has put a new face on the secretariat”.

The specifics of the types of technical assistance received from the RCC can be understood better through the responses to the survey question asking PPs in what way the RCC had assisted them with their project. A collection of the responses are provided in Table 3 below, and the individual responses can be found in the tabulated results of the survey in Annex 1.

⁷ It's worth noting that RCC Kampala has a policy of responding to queries within a 24 hour period, providing at least an acknowledgement or instant response within 24 hours. Each staff member is assigned a case and each has approx. 120 active cases or queries open at any time. All queries are recorded in the query system.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

Table 3 – Responses from Project Participants on the assistance received from RCC Kampala

Question 12: Please describe briefly how the RCC has assisted you with your project? (Responses to this question from fifteen project participants in East Africa as part of the Questionnaire for Project Participants)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• They kept the DNA engaged throughout the process;• Interpretation of specific methodological issues and paragraphs;• For the issuance of CERs for one project the RCC facilitated discussion with the RIT;• Review of documentation, including quality report for the Uganda GEF SBL;• Fast-tracking approval of the Uganda GEF SBL;• Comment on TOR's for hiring a Consultant for SBL development and TORs for DOE assessment;• Fast tracking response to a clarification request to the EB;• Comments on draft SBL documents;• Helped expedite methodology questions with the Meth Panel;• Provided market intelligence of funding opportunities;• Provided clarifications on CDM regulations in collaboration with Bonn;• RCC has acted as a bridge between us and potential buyers. This has kept us motivated despite the lower market prices;• Technical advice on methodologies in the forestry sector;• Creating an umbrella platform for project developers (networking);• Prompt updates on existing finances in climate change;• Positive influence in LoA process with DNA; encouraging DNA to reduce barriers to cost-effective technical review of project documentation;• They were always very professional, clear and prompt to reply to all our clarifications requests about the mechanism and the registration requirements;• RCC facilitated an early review of our PoA DD and CPA DD by the secretariat, and assisted in following up on a clarification request and methodology revision request for the relevant methodology. They also contacted us regularly to check on progress and ask if there was any way they could help;• Really helped unlock barriers with DNAs from two countries; really assisted in clarifying many aspects of CDM modalities and procedures that were unclear;• Access to the UNFCCC on methodological issues and CDM registry issues with regard to cancellation of CERs;• Introduction to and development of SD tool;• Review of a PDD before submission for final TR and registration;• They have initiated the development of a national Grid Emission Factor for Kenya which will eventually reduce the time we spend on generating GEFs for various projects;• For the Wastewater SBL they were present in workshops to provide further assistance and help to provide early comments before the documents are finalized;

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

The comments received in person by the consultant during the face-to-face interviews were very similar to those provided in the questionnaires, always emphasizing the quick responses obtained to their queries and the importance of having a personal contact there in the region who knows in detail the workings of the secretariat and exactly who to contact when an issue needs to be resolved. Several PPs who had been working in the region for many years said that presence of the RCC has made a huge difference in the region for project developers.

DNAs were slightly less enthusiastic than PPs when asked to rate the impact of the RCC on moving projects through the project cycle in their country. Their average rating (based on seven DNAs who responded to the questionnaire) was **2.9** out of 5, that is, a **moderate impact** - however three DNAs gave a rating of 4. This is understandable when according to the PP's in many cases it was the DNA that was stalling the project, and the RCC intervention has been to facilitate LoA approval.

Movements through the Project Pipeline

Another indicator of how successful direct project support has been are the advances in the project pipeline in the region, in particular for those projects that the RCC has provided some type of assistance or intervention. During the discussions with the RCC, it was explained that the Project Database was updated on a daily basis and contained all of the CDM pipeline in the 22 countries in the region. They contact each project every three months to request a status update and ask if they need any assistance. All projects have been contacted, but not all have responded.

The RCC also keep track of any interventions they have made for each project and whether it has advanced in the pipeline afterwards. This data then gets fed into the official CDM pipeline to determine the impact that they have on the projects. The most recent data available⁸ for these movements for Kampala, indicates that **thirteen projects or PoAs** in the region have been registered after an intervention from the RCC and there have been **four verifications** with CER issuance. According to this data, there have been a total of 66 impacts on the CDM pipeline by the RCC. (*Indicator 1.1.c*)

Project Participants Assisted by the CDM Loan Scheme

Another indicator of successful project assistance is the promotion and facilitation of the CDM Loan Scheme. **Four of the seventeen** PPs who filled out the questionnaire responded that the RCC had facilitated their access to the CDM Loan Scheme, and only one responded that they were not familiar with the Loan Scheme. As well, two of the DNAs who responded mentioned that assisting them with understanding the Loan Scheme was one of the barriers reduced by the RCC. Considering that the CDM Loan Scheme only applies to certain types of projects in specific countries, these responses appear to indicate that the RCC has been actively promoting the Loan Scheme and assisting projects who that have shown interest to apply for it. (*Indicator 1.1.d*)

The RCC regularly sends out emails on new opportunities, including any new information on the CDM Loan Scheme. For the most recent call for applicants for the Loan Scheme, RCC Kampala confirms that they shared the information with 498 PPs/CMEs. From these PPs they received responses from a total of twenty-three who were interested in applying, many of whom sought clarification on the eligibility of their projects.

⁸ This data is produced by the Secretariat's Data Analysis Team on the basis of RCC data entered into the SharePoint system combined with the project pipeline data. The figures provided here are as of 15 September 2015 and are cumulative figures since the start of operation of each RCC.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

Activity 1.2 - Identify Barriers faced by Stakeholders in the Regions

The RCC has not produced any formal needs analysis or barrier studies for the region (*Indicator 1.2*). The RCC has indicated that their approach was rather to ask stakeholders what barriers they face as part of their initial meetings with them, for example during their first contact with DNAs in the region. This approach can be seen in the Mission reports⁹ produced by the RCC following their initial visits to countries in their region, where they list the barriers to the CDM identified during their discussions. In any case, **three out of seven DNAs** responded as part of the questionnaire that they had been asked by the RCC for input for a needs analysis study in the region. Those who responded negatively to this question may still have been asked about barriers, but not as a part of a formal study. One DNA commented that they were asked at the first meeting with the RCC about gaps and challenges, but there was no specific follow-up. (*Indicator 1.2*)

Activity 1.3 - Assist in Eliminating Identified Barriers

As part of the questionnaire, project participants were also asked what barriers to the CDM has the RCC reduced or eliminated. Only one responded that no barrier affecting their project was reduced and one respondent left this question blank. The others identified one or several barriers related to securing the LoA from the DNA, communicating with the secretariat, understanding complex CDM procedures etc.¹⁰ In sum, **15 out of 17 respondents (89%)** responded that the RCC had assisted in reducing or eliminating barriers (*Indicator 1.3*).

Here are a few examples of the responses:

- Access barrier in forums of communication with the secretariat and other CDM bodies;
- Communication barrier with UNFCCC: easily accessed through the RCC;
- Knowledge barrier: simplified information on the CDM;
- Long lead time between submission of project and getting a response from the EB;
- Significantly improved communication with CDM secretariat;
- Understanding CDM procedures, particularly on biomass leakage;
- Reduced time and cost to obtain LoA from DNA;
- Helped secure the LoA for our project;
- Mechanism and requirements comprehension;
- Reduced the DNA barrier of poor communication with PPs;
- Reduced the barrier of lack of understanding of CDM modalities and procedures;
- Access to UNFCCC and clarification on issues to do with CDM, brought together CDM project developers, improving collaboration and networking;
- Easier contact with secretariat in Bonn.

DNAs were also asked about the barriers that the RCC has reduced or eliminated in their countries. One of the respondents left this field blank and another answered that it was too early to tell as the RCC had only been in Kampala a few years. The following are a sample of the other comments received from DNAs:

- Understanding SBLs/Access to CDM Loan Scheme/ Technical Advice and Support;
- Facilitated awareness on project development and the CDM Loan Scheme;

⁹ Following each Mission to one of the countries in their region, RCC staff are required to produce a Mission Report describing the meetings that were held, their interactions with stakeholders and the results of discussions etc. These reports can be found in the SharePoint system.

¹⁰ All of these responses can be read in the Excel table of questionnaire responses in Annex 1.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

- Assisted in sharing the first steps towards registering the CDM projects;
- Shared the latest templates of the prior consideration forms and assisted interested stakeholders in filling in the forms;
- The existence and interaction of the RCC with the project developers **have helped in making project developers believe in CDM again**;
- Despite the fall in prices, structures such as the RCC give hope to project developers in terms of them understanding that CDM still exists and the UNFCCC is working towards streamlining the process to work for use developing countries.

Activity 1.4 Identify New Potential Project Activities

The RCC has made efforts to assist in identifying new project activities, and have collaborated with other international agencies to help identify new projects, but given current CDM markets this is not a high priority area for them at this time. GIZ in their discussions with the Consultant confirmed that they have done research together with the RCC on new project identification in the region.

The RCC has also assisted a number of project proponents in submitting their Prior Consideration forms, according to stakeholder comments and the RCC records. According to the data from the UNFCCC project databases,¹¹ RCC Kampala has identified **73 new project leads** since the beginning operations and of these **18 have obtained prior consideration** and moved into the CDM project pipeline. The average response of the DNAs regarding the impact of the RCCs on the development of new CDM projects was **2.3 out of 5**, or moderate. (*Indicator 1.4*)

5.2 Objective 2 - Build Local Capacity, Strengthen Institutions and Develop Partnerships

RCC Kampala has been involved in numerous capacity-building events, training workshops often co-hosted with partners such as GIZ, the World Bank Ci-Dev Program, and USAID, and has also carried out hands-on training sessions with stakeholders. Details of these events, and related presentations are available on the SharePoint system. Presentations from many of these events are also publically available on the RCC page on the UNFCCC website¹².

Activity 2.1 - Promote Local CDM Knowledge Dissemination via Outreach Activities

In order to get an idea of the impact of these capacity-building events and activities, several questions were asked on the stakeholder questionnaires. Project participants were asked:

“How much of an impact has the CDM Regional Collaboration Centre (RCC) made in your understanding of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and the project cycle?”

For the seventeen respondents, the average rating was **3 out of 5**, or a **moderate impact**, and of these, six (35%) rated this impact as 4 or 5, indicating that there has been a significant impact on their understanding. As well, four of the respondents (24%) rated the impact as minor or null (**0 or 1**). Based on discussions with these stakeholders as well as their comments, those responses were in general from PPs

¹¹ This data is produced the Secretariat’s Data Analysis Team on the basis of RCC data entered into the SharePoint system combined with the project pipeline data. The figures provided here are as of 15 September 2015 and are cumulative figures since the start of operation of each RCC.

¹² <<https://cdm.unfccc.int/stakeholder/rcc/index.html>>.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

who have been involved in the CDM for many years and already had a good understanding of the project cycle. (*Indicator 2.1.a*)

A second question was also asked, related to general understanding: “Please rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM, in your view”.

Here the numbers were just slightly higher, **3.4 out of 5** on average, with the individual responses covering the whole range from 0 to 5. The DNAs were also asked the question regarding the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding, their response was fairly similar, giving the RCC an average rating of **3.3**, or **somewhat effective**. (*Indicator 2.1.b*)

When PPs were asked to describe in what way the RCC had improved their understanding of the CDM, nine of the seventeen respondents, about 50% either left the question blank, or wrote that their understanding of the CDM was already quite strong, and therefore the RCC did not have much of an impact on their understanding. The other 50% answered with comments such as:

- By providing information re CDM A/R and possible dropping of tCERs and ICERs in favour of ordinary CERs;
- They organized and facilitated several events that have been useful in training participants on CDM;
- Through education, informative communications and forums. These have assisted us to update and increased our knowledge of the CDM and what is going on in the carbon market;
- Replying to all our information and clarification requests about the mechanism and the registration requirement;
- Helped to clarify some methodological issues, but mainly helped us to navigate the UNFCCC systems and liaise with the secretariat;
- Sharing information on opportunities and information on CDM, and being available to clarify issues on demand.

DNA Capacity

DNAs were also asked how much of an impact had the RCC had on their capacity to facilitate and approve projects. Of the seven DNAs who responded, all answered that the RCCs had at least had a **moderately impact** on their capacity to promote and approve projects, all giving a rating of 3 or 4, with the average being **3.6**. (*Indicator 2.1.c*)

DNAs were also asked in what way the RCC strengthened their capacity. Here is a sample of the responses:

- Through training and skill development to the DNA and attendance at the Carbon forum and CDM workshops;
- Through continuous networking, provision of technical support, by following the development of CDM projects in this country to facilitate any difficulties that may be faced;
- By conducting training workshops in-country or out to exchange views and learn lessons between different countries;
- Access to climate finance access;
- Shared the stages and steps involved in CDM registration and the available funding windows;



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

- The RCC have been instrumental in disseminating CDM EB decisions that affect project developers in the country;
- It is easier also for us as a DNA to ask questions of the RCC and get an instant response than using the long route through official CDM structures;
- They have been instrumental in introducing the sustainable development tool and have assisted the country in developing its own sustainable development criteria for projects.

These comments speak for themselves and confirm that the RCC has been active trying to contact DNAs, determine what their needs are, meet with them physically when possible, and assist them when feasible. It is important to note that in general, the DNAs who have responded or with whom the Consultant spoke, would likely be among those who the RCC has collaborated with most. The RCC did initially contact all DNAs, but they received no response from a number of them, and tend to work with those who respond to them and request assistance. They have held several targeted workshops on specific issues at the request of DNAs.

One DNA (who did not fill in a form) commented that for improving DNA capacity, the DNA training was in fact more effective for them in terms of increasing the DNA capacity". And another during a phone interview, commented that "RCC is quick to respond, and provides links to buyers."

Activity 2.2 -Collaborate directly with DNAs aiming to improve the integration of CDM into national climate policy;

Two out of the seven DNAs who answered the questionnaire said that their government has integrated CDM into national policy with guidance from the RCC. Details were not provided on the nature of these policies, however the RCC has been actively promoting the integration of the CDM into broader climate change policy at national levels, with DNAs and other government officials, in particular at the events in which they participate. In a response to the question discussed above, one DNA wrote that the RCC had have assisted their country in developing its own sustainable development criteria for projects, based on the SD Tool. In a phone conversation another DNA mentioned that they do not have SD criteria, and draft guidelines still need to be integrated, and they have gotten feedback from RCC on this issue. (*Indicator 2.2*)

Activity 2.3 - Build local capacity through establishing networks and partnerships with other local and regional institutions and agencies.

To the question: "Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in building long-lasting partnerships and networks, based on your own experience (scale of 0 to 5)?" the DNAs' response ranged from 2 to 5 with an average of **3.8**, and the average rating from PPs was **3.9**, in the same range. (*Indicator 2.3.a*). Both of these responses indicate that most stakeholders feel that the RCC is **effective** in building long-term partnerships and networks. (*Indicator 2.3.a*)

One comment received in the response on this issue related to the change in staff at the RCC, specifically that when staff appointments are only for 6 months, it is difficult to build long-lasting partnerships. This issue was also mentioned by other stakeholders, that staff changes at the RCC could negatively affect the partnerships built up in the region, as staff were generally posted for 6 months, with an extension to 11 months on account of Human Resources rules. This issue is being addressed by the secretariat however, as they are now proposing to Human Resources to classify the positions as two year posts.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

The Consultant had conversations with key personnel from both GIZ and from the World Bank–Ci Dev program, both of which have strong partnerships with RCC Kampala. The GIZ representative said that they have an excellent partnership and that the RCC had been a “game-changer especially regarding technical expertise” and that they regularly direct people to the RCC for technical issues. The Ci-Dev program has collaborated both with RCC Kampala and with RCC St. George’s, co-organizing workshops in both locations. The comments from Ci-Dev were all positive, indicating that they were fortunate to have the RCCs on the ground, who had the connections in the region to know who to invite to the workshops. Since the World Bank does not have local personnel on the ground they take advantage of the local networks of both RCCs both when organizing events and when identifying suitable projects for their program.

The amount of funding leveraged in Kampala so far for the year 2015 totals 82,000 USD,¹³ with the bulk of these funds coming from the World Bank Ci-Dev program and GIZ Uganda to cover the cost of participants attending the Ci-Dev Workshop in Kampala and the East African Carbon Fair.

In 2014 leveraged funds from external sources totaled 48,636 USD, which is about 22% relative to the total budget in 2014 of 216,210 USD. If the estimated contribution from the partner organization is taken into account (133,200 USD), then the leveraged funds reaches 84% of the secretariat funding to the Centre, which can be considered to be significant. As well, the fact that the leveraged funding has increased substantially in 2015 from 2014 indicates that the strength of partnerships in the region is increasing. (*Indicator 2.3.b*)

5.3 Objective 3 - Promote SBL’s and Other Simplified Tools.

Activity 3.1 - Support the development and use of standardized baselines

Six out of eleven project developers answered that the “development of a standardized baseline with the assistance of the RCC has helped their project move forward”, which is rather significant given the length of time that it generally takes to develop a SBL and then get it approved. (*Indicator 3.1.a*),

When asked to rate the impact that the RCC has had in assisting with the development of standardized baselines, PP’s gave an average rating of **2.6 (i.e. a moderate impact)** with their ratings ranging from 0 to 5. In this case, three PPs rated this impact having had zero impact and four did not respond, possibly because it did not apply to their project. When asked the same question, DNAs rated this impact as somewhat higher, at **3.4 out of 5**, possibly because in most cases they had been directly involved in developing the SBLs with the RCCs. (*Indicator 3.1.b*)

RCC Kampala has collaborated in the development of **41** standardized baselines in the region, most of these for the grid emission factor (GEF), which they helped develop for five countries, and for waste (landfill gas recovery), and cookstove projects. Regarding the GEF SBL they covered the costs of DNA’s and national electrical utilities to come to a workshop to develop these. They also assist in collecting data for top down SBLs initiated by the secretariat, for example for cookstoves and charcoal. (*Indicator 3.1.c*)

Development of standardized baselines is only useful if those SBLs are relevant to projects in the pipeline, and result in helping projects move forward. DNAs were asked if the “development of standardized baselines facilitated by the RCC assistance helped move your projects forward in your country”, and **five**

¹³ Figures for leveraged funds for 2015, for each RCC have been provided by the Secretariat, including a breakdown of the donor and the funding details. Figures for previous years are taken from the signed Financial Reports of the individual RCCs.

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

out of six responded yes, which is a very positive response, and indicates that the SBL's developed are directly relevant to projects/PoAs in the region. (*Indicator 3.1.d*)

Activity 3.2 - Support the development and use of suppressed demand methodologies

DNA's were asked to rate the impact that the RCC has had in facilitating the development of suppressed demand methodologies, applicable to their country circumstances, again on a scale from 0 to 5 with 0 indicating no impact and 5 indicating a significant impact. (*Indicator 3.2.a*)

The average response from the seven DNAs was close to **1**, i.e. **minimal impact**, with all responses being 0 or 2. For PPs, the average rating regarding RCC facilitation of suppressed demand methodologies was **1.4**, with the vast majority (12 out of 17) of respondents indicating "Not Applicable" or leaving the question blank. These responses clearly indicate that facilitation of suppressed demand methodologies has not been a priority for the RCC, and in fact RCC Kampala has confirmed that they have had little involvement in this area.

Activity 3.3 – Support the improvement and use of other simplified procedures of the CDM

The RCCs all provide feedback to Bonn on potential improvements to simplified procedures and methodologies based on experience with project activities they are involved with, both on an ad hoc basis, as well as following specific requests for input from the secretariat. This feedback is then fed into the document revision process. For example, feedback from RCC Kampala related to cookstove PoAs in the region resulted in amendments to the PoA procedures for including additional methodologies in registered PoAs. More recently, RCC Kampala has provided input recommending that there be a decoupling of the validation process from the LoA approval,¹⁴ after a number of cases in the region experienced difficulties securing LoAs, which then caused significant delays in finalizing their project validation. There has been no specific input from RCC Kampala on the Grid Emission Tool.

Many PPs commented on the regular emails that they receive from the RCC, whenever there is a new CDM Tool or a revision of a Tool, a change in procedures or new funding opportunities etc. The RCC sends out emails on a regular basis to their extensive contact list in order to keep them up to date on the most recent rule changes, new or revised methodological tools and new opportunities relevant to the region. (*Indicator 3.3*)

5.4 Objective 4 - Promote Demand-Side Initiatives

Activity 4.1 – Promotion of the SD Co-Benefits Tool

The SD Tool is being promoted as a way to make CDM projects and PoAs more attractive to buyers by accentuating their co-benefits. RCC Kampala held a webinar in Sept. 2014 on use of the SD Tool, and promote it at events they participate in. They now maintain a list of stakeholders who are using or are planning to use the Tool.

From the questionnaire, **five out of fourteen project participants** indicated that they were using the SD Tool for their projects, and only one said they were not familiar with it. This can be considered a significant result, given that the Tool is relatively new. (*Indicator 4.1.a*)

¹⁴ Note that the recommendation on this issue is still in proposal stage and has not yet been approved.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Kampala

In addition, **four out of seven DNA's** were familiar with the SD Tool, and four out of seven DNAs also responded that the Tool was being used by projects and PoAs in their country.

Activity 4.2 - Collaboration on other Demand-side initiatives

Also on the demand-side, the RCC assists in matching project developers with CER purchasers or other funding opportunities, and send out 2 or 3 emails a month regarding funding initiatives or calls etc. that are tailored to relevant projects.

Most recently the RCC is being requested by Parties and other organizations to assist in initiatives exploring how to position the CDM into other mitigation instruments, in particular NAMAs and INDCs.

4.5 Future Areas of Work

DNAs were asked what areas of work they felt would be most beneficial for the RCC to focus on in the future, and the following are some of the comments were received as part of the questionnaire:

- Look for new CDM markets and promote efforts to revive the market;
- Continue to facilitate the development of SBLs;
- Enhance the understanding of PoAs and SBLs;
- Assist the DNA to identify the relevant methodologies and legal aspects involved in the CDM process;
- Enhance the understanding of how can we link the CDM projects in the national policies within the context of the low carbon development and national development priorities;
- Assistance with NAMAs;
- It would be important for the RCC is focus and assistance countries with NAMAs and also the INDCs. They could be very influential in making sure that INDCs are implemented and achieve the set results or outcomes

Other feedback regarding future work was received from DNAs during the interviews with the Consultant:

- Focus on getting together PPs with funding opportunities in order to move more projects forward;
- RCCs should expand into other areas, for example INDCs and NAMAs;
- Would like more capacity-building and to explore market opportunities for non LDC countries;
- Would like to know what their strategy is for outreach to PPs, so they can join efforts.

Although this question was not asked specifically on the PP form, a number of PPs made suggestions on future activities:

- Would like to see more capacity-building activities;
- Provide direct financial support for projects;
- Branch into other areas, such as NAMAs.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

6. RCC Lomé

The Lomé RCC became operational in January 2013, as a partnership with the Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD), and covers thirty countries in West Africa. This RCC was launched at the African Carbon Fair in 2012. Most of the countries served by RCC Lomé are francophone, though there are a number of Anglophone and Portuguese-speaking countries as well. Twenty of these thirty countries are considered LDCs, three are SIDS, and all except for Nigeria have less than ten registered CDM projects. The staff at the RCC at the time of the Consultant's visit consisted of a Team Lead and a Technical Officer from the secretariat, plus two Technical Officers, an Administrative Assistant and a Communications Officer from EABD, as well as two Research Associates and an intern.

The partner organization, the BOAD, is active in the fields of climate change and clean energy, and funds a number of climate change projects, both related to mitigation and to adaptation and the RCC has referred several of their project developers to BOAD to seek financing. The BOAD is content to have the UNFCCC presence on site as it strengthens their role in the climate change areas as well as improving its credibility in the field¹⁵. Some of the partner staff had some previous familiarity with CDM concepts while working with the Bank. As in the case in all of the RCCs the Centre is managed by a Steering Committee, made up of the RCC manager at the secretariat as well as someone from the partner organization, in this case the Director of BOAD.

The Consultant's visit to Lomé began with presentations from the RCC Team Lead and Technical Officers that provided an overview of the BOAD, the partner organization, the collaboration agreement with the UNFCCC, as well as the system in place at RCC Lomé to support RCC activities and clients. This was followed by a presentation of the annual Work Plans and activities carried out for 2013, 2014, and 2015, the partnerships that have been established, and the regular reports to the Board.

The results of the Management Review and internal audit for 2015 were also presented. This internal audit was one of the early outputs of this evaluation, as RRC Lomé took the initiative to carry out an internal audit once they had heard that an on-site evaluation was to occur in order to be better prepared. Some of the results are directly related to data requested by the Consultant that was not readily available, for example, the number of countries that are SIDS, and LDC's in their region, specifics on numbers of SBLs supported by RCC Lomé, and an overview of the Budget. The Centre took measures to address the twelve issues that were raised during this internal review.

Interviews were held with all of the staff of Lomé, including the Team Lead, the Technical officer from the secretariat, and the partner staff, including three technical officers and two administrative staff, in order to get an idea of their background, expertise, their day-to-day work and what they have learned at the centre. All staff I spoke with are well-qualified in terms of education and experience and appeared to be very interested in their work and have had a positive experience overall. They are all bilingual (French-English) and are from the region, which is important in particular because the secretariat staff have not generally been French speakers¹⁶. The staff do find the administrative and bureaucratic work at times to be overwhelming, with the UNFCCC systems (SharePoint, CRM, and budget system) combined with the

¹⁵ Note that in July 2015 the MOU for the RCC between the BOAD and the UNFCCC was extended for another two years.

¹⁶ It has been challenging for the Secretariat to find French-speaking staff to fill the positions in Lomé, and therefore they are always accompanied by one of the bilingual partner staff when at meetings or on Mission.

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

highly bureaucratic systems of the Bank¹⁷. Simply maintaining the project pipeline and contact databases requires substantial time. All staff said they have learned a lot during their time at the RCC, both regarding the CDM procedures and project cycle, and mitigation in general, as well as the UNFCCC systems.

During the first day of the visit, the Consultant met with the DNA of Togo, at their offices, with at least ten Ministry employers present. Meetings were also held with the President of BOAD, the Director of BOAD, and the CEO of African Biofuel and Renewable Energy Company (ABREC), also located in Lomé. Other stakeholders were interviewed by telephone from the RCC offices¹⁸ including three other DNA offices, seven project proponents and three international agencies (including UNDP and the World Bank – Ci Dev Program). Other calls had been arranged but the other party was not available when attempts were made to contact them. However, the Consultant was able to arrange one additional phone call later in the month with another project proponent who had had assistance from the RCC. All of these stakeholders were sent a questionnaire, and the majority responded. In all questionnaire responses were received from six project participants, five DNAs and two International Agencies.

6.1 Objective 1 - Providing Direct Support to Local Stakeholders

Activity 1.1 - Provide direct support to existing and potential CDM projects and PoAs to help them move through the project pipeline

In 2013, when just beginning operations, RCC Lomé contacted all projects in the pipeline to establish initial contact, check on their status and to inform them of new opportunities, for example regarding CER purchasers or other types of financial assistance. They receive frequent queries from project owners and attempt to provide a quick response, sending at least a confirmation of receipt of the query within 2 to 3 hours. The RCC has assisted projects in finding financing, and assisted them directly with drafting PDDs as well as facilitated relations with DNAs in procuring the LOA's for their projects.

For this region project participants rated the effectiveness of the RCC in assisting their project activity or PoA (*Indicator 1.1a*) with an average rating of **3.8** out of 5, or effective, with two out of six respondents considering their assistance to be very effective (**5** out of 5). With regards to the impact that the RCC has had on the advancement of their project, the average response was **4.0** out of 5, with half of the respondents answering with a **5** out of 5, or a significant impact. (*Indicator 1.1.b*)

The details of the types of technical assistance received from the RCC are provided in the Table 3.

¹⁷ The consultant noted that BOAD, has inherited the highly bureaucratic system of the French, and this creates extra paperwork for the RRC in Lomé – everything has to be on paper, often in quadruplicate, and this creates extra administrative work for the Centre. In the case of Lomé, monthly reports must be sent not only to Bonn, but also to the office of the BOAD president.

¹⁸ As was the case at all four RCCs, in order to for the calls to be unbiased the consultant spoke alone during these phone interviews to the stakeholders, without the presence of RCC staff, although an RCC officer always made an initial introduction. This was also the case with face-to-face meetings.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

Table 4 – Responses from Project Participants on the assistance received from RCC Lomé

<p>Question 12: Please describe briefly how the RCC has assisted you with your project? (A sample of responses to this question from project participants in West Africa as part of the Questionnaire for Project Participants)¹⁹</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Facilitated capacity-building meetings;• Facilitated introductions to financing routes;• Put our company in contact with CERs buyers, leading to the signing of an attractive ERPA;• Introductions and accompaniment at meetings;• Help in identifying funding opportunities;• After the submission of the verification report by the DOE, RCC Lomé led our company step by step through the issuance process in order to obtain the CERs as quickly as possible and within the deadlines established within its ERPA;• By encouraging the validating DOE to respect its engagement towards the project;• The RCC serves to interpret in a small way the UNFCCC bureaucracy. This is partly of course because the Bonn UNFCCC is so aggressively un-helpful;• Respond to questions that would otherwise take too long to run through the EB secretariat;• Smoothing/facilitating communication with UNFCCC and DNAs;• Clarifying procedural matters informally/quickly;• Nice newsletter & forwards of new opportunities;• Introduction to buyer schemes;• Providing early comments on documents before they are finalized;• Due diligence;• Assisted with documentation;• RCC Lomé has intervened in the following ways: clarifications on technical questions and methodologies; support on structuring a PoA (conception and optimization); interactions with other parties (financers, DOE, ...); consideration of issues on-the-ground: related to the behaviour of actual projects).

In sum, the main areas of assistance are facilitating communications with the secretariat, the DOEs and DNAs, providing assistance and clarification on documentation and procedures, and assisting in finding buyers and funding opportunities.

All of the PPs that were interviewed were positive about their interaction with RCC Lomé. They had a good rapport with the office, often with one person in particular, and found that they were easy to approach, responded quickly to their requests, and were in general quite willing to help them resolve their issues. These PPs had been assisted with both technical issues and procedural issues with the UNFCCC as well as their interactions with both DNAs and DOEs. One comment was that the RCC was always ready to help in approaching the EB or the secretariat, even for assisting with very minor questions. They have also helped to surmount the language barrier as there is always someone on staff who speaks French. More than one mentioned that they had difficulties obtaining their LOA from the host country DNA, and would not have got it without the assistance of RCC Lomé.

¹⁹ Note that some of these comments were originally in French and have been translated by the consultant. The original version of the comments is available in the comment fields of the questionnaire spreadsheet.

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

Another project developer described how the RCC provided them with support in the conception of their project and in their PoAs as well as the validation and registration processes, which would have been much more difficult without the RCC. They even assisted them with writing the PDD and with understanding the carbon market. They have had regular communications with the RCC by Skype, telephone, email, always in French, and commented that the support has been high-quality.

The RCC has also been effective in assisting with obtaining financing and finding CER buyers for PPs. One project developer explained how they had been accompanied by the RCC throughout the process of requesting financing from the BOAD. And another said that they had assisted them in finding a buyer by putting them in touch with buyers and then assisted them with verification, and they felt that if it wasn't for the RCC they would not have sold their credits.

DNAs were also positive about the impact of the RCC on moving projects through the project cycle in their country, though slightly less so than PPs. Their average rating (based on the five DNAs who responded to the questionnaire) was **3.0** out of 5, that is, a **moderate impact**, however three of these DNAs gave a rating of **4**. Responses were received as well from two international agencies that have collaborated with RCC Lomé. Together they gave a rating of **4.5, significant**, for the impact the RCC has on advancing projects and PoAs through the project cycle.

Movements through the Project Pipeline

The RCC contacts at least five projects per week to check on their status and find out if any assistance is needed, and constantly updates the project database. According to the most recent project pipeline data available²⁰ RCC Lomé has had the greatest impact at the early stages of the project cycle, for example with assisting in obtaining prior consideration, for which they have made a difference for a total of **29 projects or PoAs**. The data indicates that ten projects or PoAs in the region have been registered after an intervention from the RCC and twelve projects have been validated and are requesting registration. RCC Lomé has not yet made any impact on verification or issuance, likely as many of the projects they are assisting are in the pre-registration phase. In all, according to this data, RCC Lomé has had a total of **60 impacts** on the CDM pipeline. (*Indicator 1.1.c*)

Project Participants Assisted by the CDM Loan Scheme

RCC Lomé staff indicated that have provided support to two projects regarding applications to the Loan Scheme but neither was successful. However they do send out details of the Loan Scheme to stakeholders in their regular newsletter.

None of the six PPs who filled out the questionnaire responded that the RCC had facilitated their access to the CDM Loan Scheme, and one answered that they were not familiar with the Loan Scheme. Two DNAs responded that the RCC had facilitated access to the CDM Loan Scheme to projects in their country (*Indicator 1.1.d*), which corresponds with RCC data.

Activity 1.2 - Identify Barriers faced by Stakeholders in the Regions

All five of the DNAs in the region answered that they had been asked by the RCC for input for a needs analysis or barrier identification study in the region. (*Indicator 1.2*). Though the RCC did not carry out a formal needs study, they asked each DNA what their needs were, during their initial missions to each country in the region. As with the other RCCs the results of these Missions are described in each Mission

²⁰ UNFCCC data as of 15 September, 2015.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

report. For the year 2015, for example, mission reports are available for nine different countries in the region that have been visited by RCC staff.

One of the barriers identified by the RCC in this region is a communication barrier – they have found that there is a need to have physical contact with someone in order to establish a rapport, that emails and websites is not sufficient, which is why they make an effort to meet in person with as many DNAs and project proponents as possible.

Activity 1.3 - Assist in Eliminating Identified Barriers

Project participants were asked what barriers to the CDM the RCC reduced or eliminated, as part of the questionnaire. Two of the six respondents responded that no barriers had been reduced and one respondent left this question blank. The others identified one or more barriers related to communications with the UNFCCC, speed of clarification, DNA obstructions, system knowhow, and delays due to DOE inaction (*Indicator 1.3*).

DNAs were also asked about the barriers that the RCC has reduced or eliminated in their countries. One of the respondents left this field blank and another answered that no barriers had been reduced. Three of the DNAs answered with the following barriers:

- Linguistic barrier related to the use of CDM tools that are usually in English;
- Technical barriers related to developing CDM projects;
- Access to BOAD financing;
- Contributed to a better understanding of the CDM.

Barriers identified by international agencies that were reduced or eliminated in the region by the RCC were the lack of understanding on the part of DNAs, and the communication gaps that often exist between project developers and DNAs, which the RCC has successfully bridged.

Activity 1.4 Identify New Potential Project Activities

According to the data from the UNFCCC project databases, RCC Lomé has identified 36 new project leads since 2013 and of these 29 have obtained prior consideration and moved into the CDM project pipeline. (*Indicator 1.4*)

On average, the DNAs that filled in the questionnaire felt that the RCC had had a **moderate impact** on the development of new CDM projects in their country. The responses from the two international agencies on this issue were **1 (minor impact)** and **5 (significant impact)** respectively, with the first respondent explaining that “*the reason for this (minor impact) is that the enabling environment for the development of new CDM projects is sub-optimal because of the lack of an attractive market price and the reluctance of DNAs to sell their mitigation potential to developed countries*”. Staff at the RCC also mentioned that there is less interest now in developing new projects, unless there is money available for a specific type of project.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

6.2 Objective 2 - Build Local Capacity, Strengthen Institutions and Develop Partnerships

RCC Lomé has participated in twenty-one capacity-building events over the last two years, most often co-hosted with other organizations. A recent example of a prominent event was a technical workshop held in Lomé in May 2015, “Supporting energy access through results-based finance using the Clean Development Mechanism”, which was jointly organized with the World Bank Ci-Dev Program, and the BOAD²¹. In the discussions with the consultant, the representative from the Ci-Dev Program involved in organizing the workshop emphasized that RCCs were valuable partners that helped bridge the gap between Washington and the stakeholders that they hoping to fund. Presentations from this event and others are available on the RCC page on the UNFCCC website.²²

Activity 2.1 - Promote Local CDM Knowledge Dissemination via Outreach Activities

Several questions on the surveys were designed to get an idea of the impact of such capacity-building events and activities. To begin with, project participants were asked how much of an impact has the RCC in their understanding of the CDM and the project cycle. In this case **three (50%) of the PPs** rated the impact as **4 or 5**, indicating that there has been a **significant impact** on their understanding of the CDM. The other three respondents rated this impact as minor - however those responses come from PPs with more experience in the CDM. Overall, the average rating was **2.7** out of 5, or a **moderate impact** (*Indicator 2.1.a*).

A second question was also asked, related to general understanding, asking PPs to rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in **improving stakeholder understanding** of the CDM. In this case the numbers were slightly higher, 3.5 out of 5 on average, with the individual responses ranging from 0 to 5. (*Indicator 2.1.b*) DNAs were also asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding, and to this question they gave the RCC an average rating of **3.5** on a scale from 0 to 5. Both of the international agencies, however, felt that the RCC was **very effective** at improving stakeholder understanding, giving them a rating of **5** out of 5.

Some details of how the RCC has improved the understanding of the CDM on the part of project participants were provided in the questionnaires:

- They led us step by step throughout the process, thus increasing our knowhow of the system;
- RCC Lomé has also conducted strong presentations regarding the CDM at events where we have participated and we gained much knowledge;
- RCC Lomé circulates a newsletter which is effective in keeping us updated on CDM news;
- By clarifying concepts that are not very well explained on the CDM website, for instance, how to account for the emissions reductions of cook stoves that are installed prior to the start of the crediting period, and how to replace a CME in the Modalities of Communications, etc.

As well, from interviews with stakeholders, the following comments were received –

²¹ For the two events co-hosted by CI-Dev, (in Kampala and Lomé) there was a total of 150 participants from 35 countries. Logistical support was provided by the RCC’s and participants travel paid for by CI-Dev.

²² Presentations from this event and others are available on the RCC page on the UNFCCC website <<https://cdm.unfccc.int/stakeholder/rcc/index.html>>.

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

- Projects in the region appreciate having a regional presence - much easier to contact and talk to;
- The RCC is very good at engaging stakeholders - they identify individuals they can talk to, for example, at the secretariat.

Another area where the RCC attempts to build capacity is through in-house events for BOAD employees on the latest CDM updates.

DNA Capacity-Building

In the first year of operation the Centre contacted the DNAs of all the countries in their region and has provided some type of support to 90% of them. As mentioned earlier, they have found that physical contact is necessary in order to develop a rapport with the DNAs and therefore have found it very important to visit them as often as possible.

The four DNAs with whom the consultant spoke have all had close collaboration with the RCC, including technical support and workshops and indicated that they are in regular contact with the RCC staff via email and Skype. One DNA said that they have made a real difference. The RCCs have also facilitated their participation in national and regional workshops. One DNA mentioned that they organized a workshop on PDD writing in their region and have provided assistance on developing SBLs. They also appreciate the monthly newsletter sent out by the RCC. The general response was that the RCC is much appreciated, at least by those DNAs interviewed²³ and that they would like continued collaboration.

Regarding the DNA of Togo, it was evident that they had a close relationship with the RCC and that the presence of the RCC was very important to them. The DNA realized that they had a definite advantage having RCC Lomé so close to them, and that they have likely benefitted from their presence more than other DNAs. The major benefits have been in terms of information diffusion - the RCC keeps them in the loop and lets them know what is going on and what new opportunities there are -, as well as with technical support, for example for standardized baselines, and PDD development. At a regional level, the RCC has helped bring together several countries for regional workshops, and for joint development of the grid emission factor for the WAPP.

As part of the questionnaire, the DNAs were asked what impact the RCC had had on their capacity to facilitate and approve projects. Of the six DNAs who responded, all answered that the RCCs had had at least a **moderate impact** on their capacity to promote and approve projects, all giving them a rating of **3 or 4**, with the average being **3.6**.²⁴ (*Indicator 2.1.c*)

The DNAs were also asked to describe in what ways the RCC has strengthened their capacity. The following is a sample of the responses:

- Capacity-building on CDM development concepts and tools: additionality, baselines, monitoring plans, CDM eligibility criteria, standardized baselines, the link between the CDM and the new market mechanisms (NAMA, REDD+);
- Capacity-building on methodologies and PDD development, SBLs, and on the calculation of the Grid Emission Factor;

²³ Apparently there are other DNAs who have shown no interest in collaborating with the RCC, and a number of them in the region who are very difficult to work with.

²⁴ It is interesting to note that this result of is exactly the same as for RCC Kampala, i.e. all DNAs giving them a rating of 3 or 4, with an average of 3.6.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

- Through visits to Burkina Faso and meetings with project developers;
- By opening the doors to BOAD financing to project developers;
- Standardized Baseline development.

An additional comment was that “*it is easier for us as a DNA to ask questions directly to the RCC and get an instant response rather than using the long route through the CDM structures.*”

Activity 2.2 - Collaborate directly with DNAs aiming to improve the integration of CDM into national climate policy.

Two out of the seven DNAs (who answered the questionnaire) said that their government has integrated CDM into national policy with guidance from the RCC. (*Indicator 2.2*) In addition, the RCC assisted in establishing the DNAs in both the Central African Republic and in Comoros.

Activity 2.3 - Build local capacity through establishing networks and partnerships with other local and regional institutions and agencies.

The consultant had conversations with key personnel from both the UNDP and the World Bank – Ci Dev program, both of which have strong partnerships with RCC Lomé. The Ci-Dev program has collaborated both with RCC Kampala and with RCC Lomé, co-organizing workshops together in both locations. The comments from Ci-Dev were all positive, indicating that they were fortunate to have the RCCs on the ground, who had the connections in the region. Since the World Bank does not have local personnel on the ground they take advantage of the local networks of both RCCs both when organizing events and when identifying suitable projects for their program.

The UNDP has worked together with the RCC on a number of projects in Cameroon, and commented that their presence and assistance has improved the partnership between the UNFCCC and the UNDP. The relationship works both ways, as they have invited them to the UNDP offices in each country. The UNDP contact also commented that the RCC improved communications between them and the DNA, assisted in obtaining the LOA for their PoA, and also assisted in getting the required data for them for the GEF in the Gambia. In addition to their close collaboration with the World Bank and UNDP, RCC Lomé has partnered with a number of other organizations, including the Government of Norway and the African Renewable Energy Association.

To the question: “*Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in building long-lasting partnerships and networks, based on your own experience*”, the DNAs response ranged from **2 to 5** with an average of **3.8**, and the average rating from PPs was **3.9**, in the same range. (*Indicator 2.3.a*). Both international agencies that responded rated this as **5** out of **5**, or *very effective*. In summary most feel that the RCC is **effective or very effective** in building long-term partnerships.

The international agencies were also asked to assess the effectiveness of the RCC in bringing together project developers and CER purchasers and funding programs in the region, and both of them rated this as **5** out of **5**.

When these agencies were asked in what ways the RCC has collaborated with their organization, they responded as follows:

- Helped to obtain and translate the LoAs, and helped to communicate with the DNAs;
- Helped to obtain data for GEF;



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

- Collaborated in the form of training sessions on the utilization of CDM methodologies and writing PDDs and PoA documents.

They were also asked what activities of the RCC had been most effective, responding:

- Facilitating the communication between project developers and DNAs;
- Supporting project developers in obtaining LoAs and data, not only for CDM projects but also for SBLs;
- Guidance, training and hands-on assistance to project developers in the elaboration of CDM project documents.

Funding leveraged relative to RCC budget

The amount of funding leveraged in Lomé so far for the year 2015 totals 65,791 USD²⁵, with more than half of those funds (42,000 USD) provided by the World Bank Ci-Dev program as their contribution for the joint CDM workshop held in May²⁶. Other funding came from KfW for an SBL workshop in Ghana, and from the BOAD.

In 2014 leveraged funds from external sources totaled 65,401 USD, which is about 36% relative to the total budget in 2014 of 183,095 USD. If the estimated contribution from the partner organization is taken into account (115,398 USD), then the leveraged funds reaches 99% of the secretariat funding to the Centre. As partner funding for CDM activities is practically equivalent to the funding from the secretariat, this can be viewed as a good indication that the RCC has been successful in developing partnerships in the region, especially given that the leveraged amount in 2015 will likely surpass 2014. (*Indicator 2.3.b*)

6.3 Objective 3 - Promote SBL's and Other Simplified Tools.

Activity 3.1 - Support the development and use of standardized baselines

RCC Lomé has collaborated in the development of twenty-seven standardized baselines in the region, most of these in for landfill gas recovery projects (ACM0001) and for the Grid Emission Factor, which they helped developed for the West African Power Pool (WAPP) covering five countries, for which they organized a regional workshop. They have also been involved in SBL's for cookstove and charcoal projects. The GEF SBL for the Gambia, which they helped facilitate has now been approved, as has the waste sector SBL for Sao Tome and Principe. (*Indicator 3.1.c*)

When asked to rate the impact that the RCC has had in assisting the development of standardized baselines, PPs gave an average rating of **2, i.e. a moderate impact**, with all of the responses at either zero or 5, likely depending on whether or not they had had involvement. When DNAs were asked the same question, they rated this impact as somewhat higher, at **3.8** out of 5, with all of the responses at **3** or above, indicating that felt the RCC had had a **moderate impact on SBL development**. (*Indicator 3.1.b*)

None of the six stakeholders answered that the "development of a standardized baseline with the assistance of the RCC has helped their project move forward" (*Indicator 3.1.a*), which may be because many of their

²⁶ Note that these figures came from the Secretariat as being classified as leveraged funding. However, one could argue that the funding directed at workshops by Ci-Dev or KfW may have been spent in any case on these workshops, with or without the presence of the RCCs in the region. On the other hand, they may have not had such a strong focus on the CDM, and most likely the workshops would not have been as successful, since the RCC has developed the contacts to draw the right participants to this type of workshop.

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

projects are still in the early stages and that the relevant SBLs have not yet been approved. On a similar question, two out of five DNAs indicated that the “development of standardized baselines facilitated by the RCC assistance helped move projects forward in your country”, which implies that SBL’s are already assisting at least some projects in the region. (*Indicator 3.1.d*)

Activity 3.2 - Support the development and use of suppressed demand methodologies

RCC Lomé confirmed that they have supported approximately twenty projects in the region that use methodologies that account for suppressed demand, and gave the example of the National Biodigestor Programme in Burkina Faso.

DNAs in their questionnaire were asked to rate the impact that the RCC has had in facilitating the development of suppressed demand methodologies, applicable to their country circumstances, and the average response from the seven DNAs was **3.2**, i.e. a **moderate impact**, with most responses at 3. As for the PPs, only one responded to this question with a rating of **3** out of 5. One could assume that the others were either not familiar with the concept, or it did not apply to their project. (*Indicator 3.2.a*)

Activity 3.3 – Support the improvement and use of other simplified procedures of the CDM

RCC Lomé provides feedback to Bonn on a regular basis, regarding for example assistance in obtaining the NRB fraction, or data for streamlining the CDM as requested. They have not carried out specific work on improving or simplifying the tools such as the Grid Emission Factor Tool. They also send out a monthly newsletter to their extensive contact list in order to keep them up to date on the most recent rule changes, new or simplified methodological tools and new funding opportunities relevant to the region. (*Indicator 3.3*)

6.4 Objective 4 - Promote Demand-Side Initiatives

Activity 4.1 - Promotion the SD Co-Benefits Tool

The RCC is now promoting the SD Tool regularly among project proponents as a way to make CDM projects and PoAs more attractive to buyers. **Two out of the five PPs** that responded to the questionnaire indicated that were using the SD Tool for their projects, which is significant, considering the Tool is relatively recent. However only one of five DNAs were familiar with the SD Tool, and none of them responded that it was being used by projects and PoAs in their country. It appears that continued promotion is still needed in order to create awareness about this Tool. (*Indicator 4.1.a*),

Activity 4.2 - Collaboration on other Demand-side initiatives

Based on the feedback received, the RCC has been very active in promoting funding opportunities and trying to match project developers with CER purchase programs. In their monthly newsletter they include details about potential funding programs, and several PPs said that the RCC had helped them find funding, and matched them with programs such as NEFCO, the Swiss Government and KfW. Most recently the RCC is now beginning to explore how the CDM might be positioned into INDC’s in countries in the region, as well as promoting CDM Tools in other mitigation mechanisms such as NAMAs.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Lomé

6.5 Future Areas of Work

DNAs were asked what areas of work they felt would be most beneficial for the RCC to focus on in the future, and the following suggestions were received as part of the questionnaire:

- Continue to work on standardized baselines and PoAs in the waste, transport and forestry sectors;
- Capacity-building on issues of materiality, suppressed demand, and the evolution of markets before and after 2020;
- Awareness on the best available technologies and technology transfer of GHG emission reduction technologies;
- Expansion of the activities of the Centre to capacity-building for the formulation of projects under the new market mechanisms: NAMA et REDD+;
- Identify individually with each DNA the real needs and barriers to CDM project development, with a focus on the formulation of projects aimed at the access and efficient management of energy for preserving forestry biomass;
- Identify financing sources for PDD development (a crucial and discouraging stage) and accompany DNAs in obtaining these funds;
- Increased capacity-building on PoAs, for example how to include the participation of national experts in south-south cooperation regarding capacity-building;
- Develop a list of CDM/PoA projects already developed and distribute it to the African DNAs with the aim of adapting them to local conditions at a minimum cost;
- Be open to the requests from countries to assist them in the case of technical blockage - this implies having a budget to cover interventions at the country level;
- The synergy between RCC Lomé and RCC Kampala is not appreciated at the country level, due to linguistic difficulties - this is a significant handicap.

Other feedback regarding future work was received from DNAs during the interviews with the Consultant was that in the future they would like to have more support in the forestry and land-use sectors, as well as in the transport and waste sectors and would like to have assistance with the formulation of NAMAs and INDCs. As well one of the International agency recommended that the RCC work on highlighting the linkages between the CDM and new instruments like NAMAs.

Although this question was not asked specifically on the PP form, a number of PPs made suggestions on future activities:

- Would like to see more capacity-building activities;
- Provide direct financial support for projects;
- Branch into other areas, such as NAMAs;
- More capacity-building is needed in the region, as they do not have the competence;
- Think that the RCC should have a broader mandate as they are often worried about overstepping their boundary (e.g. in relations with DNAs or DOEs);
- More follow-up visits are needed to DNA in order to obtain LOAs.

RCC staff also commented that there is more interest now in converting CDM into NAMAs, and how to fit the CDM into INDCs.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Bogotá

7. RCC Bogotá

RCC Bogotá started operations officially in August 2013 as a partnership with the Corporación Andina de Fomento (CAF) Latin American Development Bank, and had therefore been operating just two years when the Consultant visited in the CAF offices in central Bogotá in the 12-14th of August 2015. RCC Bogotá covers nineteen countries in Latin America, all Spanish-speaking except for Brazil. In the region there are a total of 1149 registered projects and PoAs in this region.

Two UNFCCC staff are posted at the RCC, both of whom are considered Technical Officers. The Team Lead is a CAF officer who has many years of experience working on the CDM and climate change mitigation in the region. However the Team Lead only works 50% of his time with the RCC. An intern was also working with the team during the Consultant's visit, primarily on administrative details (setting up phone calls, preparing documentation, etc.) Otherwise there appeared to be no dedicated administrative personnel working with this RCC.

The first morning of the Consultant's visit was spent primarily in meetings with RCC staff, reviewing the Work Plans, the main activities in which they have been involved, and the priorities of the Centre. Meetings with senior CAF management were also held. Following this the Consultant met with several stakeholders at the CAF offices over the next two days, including the DNA for Colombia, a local DOE, and three project proponents. Telephone and Skype interviews were also held during time with other stakeholders in the region, including one other DNA, and international agency (UNDP), and seven project proponents. A number of stakeholders with whom calls had been arranged were not available when attempts were made to contact them. A lunch meeting was also held with the Ambassador of the United Arab Emirates. The final afternoon of the visit was spent once again with the RCC staff, reviewing the activities that they had collaborated on with each country in their region.

Right from the start of these discussions it was made clear that there was very little interest in the CDM in most countries in the region, that there were many registered projects that were not proceeding with verification and issuance because of the low price of CERs and that the partner organization CAF was no longer working directly on CDM projects but had shifted their focus to the development of NAMAs.

7.1 Objective 1 - Providing Direct Support to Local Stakeholders

In the first year of operations, the RCC contacted all DNAs in the region and sent emails to project participants to let them know of their presence and ask about their status. Following this they collaborated with stakeholders primarily on a reactive basis, whenever there was a request for assistance or support. In the past six months the RCC has started an extensive survey of all project participants as part of their Work Plan in order gain information on the status of each project, find out what their barriers are, and update their database. On average they contact by phone ten project participants from the database and ask them a common set of survey questions. More than 200 projects were contacted from March to June 2015, and 166 answered their telephone survey. Hence the RCC now has a detailed database of the operational status of each of these projects, their familiarity with CDM Tools as well as their views on current barriers to the CDM.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Bogotá

Activity 1.1 - Provide direct support to existing and potential CDM projects and PoAs to help them move through the project pipeline

The project proponents spoken to by the consultant were essentially of two types, those who had been in the business for many years and whose projects were in the phases of monitoring and verification or renewal of crediting period, and those for whom the CDM was completely new, and who were looking for basic information from the RCC. Thus the types of assistance were either on general understanding of the project cycle, or specific assistance with verification and issuance, renewal of crediting period, or post registration changes.

The responses received from the PPs regarding the effectiveness of the RCC in assisting their project were relatively high, with the average rating based on four project participants at **4.5**, or **very effective**. (*Indicator 1.1a*) With respect to the impact that the RCC has had on the advancement of their project, the average response was **3.5** out of 5. (*Indicator 1.1.b*)

Some details regarding the types of technical assistance received from the RCC were provided on the questionnaire, as follows:

- Assistance in understanding the CDM project cycle for the phases we have not yet reached;
- Assistance on how to revise the expected monitoring period, due to delays in our project;
- Collaboration in the interaction between the DOE/PP/EB. In the case of this project, the RCC helped to unblock the flow of information from the DOE to the EB in order to begin the registration process;
- Assistance with speeding up the CER issuance process in order to deliver CERs in time;
- The RCC is always available to answer our doubts and to listen to our complaints;
- RCC team's help to identify suitable projects was excellent.

Comments received in person by the consultant during the face-to-face interviews and phone calls were that the RCC had assisted them with both procedural and technical issues and in facilitating communications with the secretariat in Bonn. One PP mentioned that they had had direct assistance from the Centre processing a post-registration change. Another PP with various CDM projects described how the RCC had assisted them when the crediting period for one of their projects had expired and they wished to register a new project at the same landfill site.

Several PPs said that it is very important to have the RCC here in the region, as it provides support that is closer in terms of time zone, language and geography, which really makes a difference. One felt that having this regional presence may help keep some project developers within the CDM system, rather than looking for other markets, for example the voluntary sector.

The DNAs who answered the questionnaire were less enthusiastic than PPs however, when asked to rate the impact of the RCC on moving projects through the project cycle in their country. Their average rating (based on five DNAs who responded) was **0.5 out of 5**, a very **minor impact**. Responses were received as well from two international agencies that have collaborated with RCC Bogotá. Together they gave a rating of **3.0 (moderate)** on the impact of the RCC on advancing projects through the project cycle.

Movements through the Project Pipeline

According to the most recent data available, three projects or PoAs in the region have been registered after an intervention from the RCC. In this region, however the RCC has had more impact at the monitoring



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Bogotá

and verification stages of the project cycle, having assisted with a total of **29 monitoring reports**, leading to 6 issuances at this point. In total, according to this data, RCC Bogota has had a total of **57 impacts on the CDM pipeline**. (*Indicator 1.1.c*)

Project Participants Assisted by the CDM Loan Scheme

RCC Bogotá has been promoting the CDM Loan Scheme to eligible PPs, but no response has been received. In this region, only Cuba, El Salvador, Paraguay and Bolivia are eligible, and the number of projects in these countries is fairly limited. As can be expected none of the five PPs who filled out the questionnaire responded that the RCC had facilitated their access to the CDM Loan Scheme. The DNAs also responded negatively to this question. (Indicator 1.1.d)

Activity 1.2 - Identify Barriers faced by Stakeholders in the Regions

As discussed above, the RCC has recently carried out a survey of project proponents in the region and one of the questions in the survey asked them what barriers/difficulties they are facing with their CDM project activities. Of the 166 projects that have answered the survey, 58% of them (or 96 projects) stated that the most significant barrier they face to continue the CDM cycle is the low price of CERs. They also added that in most of the cases, the revenues are not enough to pay for verification as well as the share of proceeds.

Three of the DNAs who responded said that they also had been asked by the RCC for input for a needs analysis or barrier identification study in the region. As with the other RCCs this has been generally done during the initial communications with each DNA, and during missions to each country. (*Indicator 1.2*)

Activity 1.3 - Assist in Eliminating Identified Barriers

As part of the questionnaire, project participants were also asked what barriers to the CDM has the RCC reduced or eliminated. Two of the six who responded said that no barriers had been reduced and one respondent left this question blank. (*Indicator 1.3*).

The others identified one or several barriers related to:

- Communication barrier (response time and language) with the central offices of the UNFCCC;
- Access to the EB to coordinate fee payment, and to EB decisions levels;
- Assistance in understanding the CDM project cycle;
- RCC helps us to identify suitable CDM-projects and facilitate contact (note this from a CER purchaser).

DNAs were also asked about the barriers that the RCC has reduced or eliminated in their countries. One of the respondents left this field blank, and two answered that no barriers had been reduced. The other two DNAs answered that they **helped reduce technical barriers**, and have provided technical support on the CDM in general and standardized baselines. It is important to note that in this region many DNAs have many years of experience working in the CDM, and a high level of capacity, and that many have now moved their focus to NAMAs and INDCs.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Bogotá

Activity 1.4 Identify New Potential Project Activities

Given the current CDM market and low level of interest in CDM in the region, identifying new projects has not been a priority for RCC Bogotá. According to the pipeline data they have identified a total of four new projects, and all of these have moved into the CDM pipeline. As is to be expected, the DNAs rated the impact the RCC has had on the development of new CDM projects in their country as **minor**, with an average rating of 1 out of 5.

7.2 Objective 2 - Build Local Capacity, Strengthen Institutions and Develop Partnerships

Most recently, RCC Bogotá has participated in an SBL workshop in Honduras, giving a presentation on updating Honduras' grid emission factor using the SBL approach, attended an INDC workshop in Cartagena, and participated in the Latin American Carbon Forum. In 2014 they also participated in events in Ecuador (SBL's in the Transport Sector) and in Mexico. The RCC has had missions this year to Brazil, Panama, and Peru to meet with DNA's and other stakeholders in those countries.

Activity 2.1 - Promote Local CDM Knowledge Dissemination via Outreach Activities

Project participants who responded to the questionnaire rated the impact of the RCC on their understanding of the CDM as **3 out of 5**, indicating a **moderate impact** based on four responses (*Indicator 2.1.a*). With regards to the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM, the numbers were slightly higher, **3.3** on average, or **somewhat effective**. (*Indicator 2.1.b*)

DNAs were also asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding, and were slightly less enthusiastic, giving the RCC an average rating of **1.8** based on four responses, ranging from 0 to 4. (*Indicator 2.1.b*) The one international agency, however rated this impact as **3** out of 5, as **somewhat effective**.

DNA Capacity-Building

The DNAs who were queried felt that the RCC has only had a **minor impact** on their capacity to promote and approve projects, giving them an average rating of **1.3**. When asked in what way the RCC strengthened their capacity, their responses were primarily related to assistance in the development and presentation of standardized baselines, as well as through the "constant availability of the RCC to assist in any type of issue related to the CDM". This low rating is to be expected given that many the DNAs in many countries in the region already had a high level of capacity, and are now focusing primarily on preparing their INDCs and developing NAMAs. (*Indicator 2.1.c*)

Activity 2.2 - Collaborate directly with DNAs, aiming to improve the integration of CDM into national climate policy;

RCC Bogota has worked closely with the DNA of Colombia on calculating the mitigation potential of all of Colombia's registered CDM projects with the aim of potentially including them in their INDC, as well as using the CERs in a national climate change policy. They have also collaborated with the government of Mexico in their discussions of a Carbon Tax Law and on the creation of an emissions trading platform



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Bogotá

and emission registry system. Support has also been provided to the government of Ecuador on a proposal to use CERs to compensate emissions from industries. Of the five DNAs who answered the questionnaire, none of them said that their government has integrated CDM into national policy with guidance from the RCC. (*Indicator 2.2*)

Activity 2.3 - Build local capacity through establishing networks and partnerships with other local and regional institutions and agencies.

To the question of the effectiveness of the RCC in building long-lasting partnerships and networks, both PPs and international agencies found them to be fairly effective, giving them average ratings of **3.7** and **4** respectively. However, the DNAs rating of their effectiveness averaged just **2.0**, with individual responses ranging from zero to 5 (*Indicator 2.3.a*).

One comment from an international agency said that the RCC provides a UNFCCC presence in the region and is an important regional symbol of the UNFCCC commitment to support and continue the CDM. Another mentioned that they had had a good experience with the RCC in their dialogue regarding support on issues related to NAMAs and MRV. International agencies were also asked to rate the effectiveness of the RCC in bringing together project developers with CER purchasers and funding programs in the region, and rated this as **3 out of 5**, or somewhat effective.

Funding leveraged relative to RCC budget

Leveraged funding in RCC Bogotá so far in 2015 is relatively low, estimated at 6,406 USD in total, from the IDB for a GEF SBL workshop in Honduras, and from OLADE for the participation of an RCC Officer in a climate change workshop in the Dominican Republic. In 2014 leveraged funds are identified as 2100 USD for RCC Bogotá and in 2013, at 1400 USD. These amounts are low when compared to the funds leveraged from the African RCCs, and not very significant when compared to their 2014 annual budget of 210,016 USD. However, when the partner contribution (130,100 USD in 2014), is also taken into account funds, total leveraged are about 63% of those from provided from the secretariat. In sum, these amounts tend to indicate that RCC Bogotá has not been particularly effective at building strong networks and partnerships. (*Indicator 2.3.b*)

7.3 Objective 3 - Promote SBL's and Other Simplified Tools

Activity 3.1 - Support the development and use of standardized baselines

RCC Bogotá has supported the development of twenty-two standardized baselines in the region, mostly for Grid Emission Factors (12 in total), but also in the waste and agriculture sectors and for brick production. Countries that have been involved include Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Honduras. Two of these SBLs have been submitted at this point (*Indicator 3.1.c*).

None of the five project participants answered that the "development of a standardized baseline with the assistance of the RCC has helped their project move forward" (*Indicator 3.1.a*), and they gave an average rating of **1.0 out of 5, i.e. a minor impact** to the RCC's assistance with the development of standardized baselines (*Indicator 3.1.b*).

When asked the same question, DNAs rated this impact as somewhat higher, at an average of **2.4**. As well, three out of five DNAs responded yes that the development of standardized baselines facilitated by the



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Bogotá

RCC assistance helped move forward projects their countries, indicating that at least some projects in the region had been assisted by SBLs. (*Indicator 3.1.d*)

Activity 3.2 - Support the development and use of suppressed demand methodologies

According to the DNAs the impact that the RCC has had in facilitating the development of suppressed demand methodologies, applicable to their country circumstances has been very **minor**, with their average rating being **1.0**. The five PPs responded that this was either not applicable to them, or rated it as no impact. (*Indicator 3.2.a*)

Activity 3.3 – Support the improvement and use of other simplified procedures of the CDM

RCC Bogotá has been not involved specifically in the simplification of any tools, however it is currently working on a proposal to revise either ACM0001 or the CDM procedures such that landfill gas projects that were registered with gas flaring only can add on a power generation component post registration. (*Indicator 3.3*)

7.4 Objective 4 - Promote Demand-Side Initiatives

Activity 4.1 - Promotion the SD Co-Benefits Tool

As part of its Work Plan, RCC Bogotá promotes the SD Tool to project developers to increase the attractiveness of their projects to buyers and has prepared a flyer in Spanish that describes the Tool and its use. Also, as part of the survey the RCC carried out this year, they asked project contacts if they were familiar with the SD Tool, and if they had every used it. The majority of those surveyed were not familiar with the Tool and requested further information.

In the Consultant´s questionnaire, **one out of the five PPs** indicated that they were using the SD Tool for their projects. Two of the five DNAs were familiar with the SD Tool, but none of them responded that it was being used by projects and PoAs in their country. (*Indicator 4.1.a*)

Activity 4.2 - Collaboration on other Demand-side initiatives

As with the other RCCs, RCC Bogotá has been active in informing project participants of new funding opportunities and potential buyers and matching projects with appropriate funds. For example, they provided information to a number of landfill gas projects on the Pilot Auction Facility (PAF) of the World Bank, and carried out an analysis of the value of CERs for projects in the region eligible under PAF. One project owner that who was interviewed mentioned that the RCC had informed them of the PAF funding, and assisted him in formulating their application. As well, a consulting firm who was interviewed described how the RCC had been very helpful to them by providing information regarding potential projects for a new LFG funding program they manage. They mentioned that the RCC had a good understanding of the mood of the PPs and the status of the projects in the region, and have been quick to respond.

The RCC has also been promoting the concept of Voluntary Cancellation among relevant stakeholders and as well as promoting and exploring the use of CERs in other new carbon markets that are being developed, both domestic and regional, for example, in Mexico, Colombia and through the Santiago Climate Exchange.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres – Bogotá

7.5 Future Areas of Work

DNA comments on the areas of work that would most beneficial for the RCC to focus on in the future mostly concentrated on assisting countries in the formulation and submission of NAMAs and other mechanisms, such as REDD+. They would like to see the RCC continue their work on developing SBLs, but the focus was on using these for future NAMAs.

International agencies would like the RCC to continue to explore and promote new market opportunities, including through domestic and regional carbon markets. As well, one organization would like to see the RCC do more to promote the environmental credibility of the CDM, defending it from critics who seek to discredit the mechanism, including an emphasis on the many improvements that have made that strengthen the demonstration of additionality.

PPs would like to see the RCC provide even more information on funding mechanisms and new markets for projects, as well as updates on UNFCCC processes and negotiations. A DOE in the region would like to collaborate more with the RCC to speak together with PPs of stranded projects (i.e. who no longer find it worthwhile to certify) to determine what would be necessary to make it worth their while to monitor and certify credits, and potentially come up with a solution together. He would also like to see the RCC doing more to promote the CDM at national levels to ensure that CDM MRV is included in NAMAs.

In sum, most stakeholders in this region would like to see the RCC mandate to be expanded into assisting with the development of NAMAs.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

8. RCC St. George's

RCC St. George's began operations in May 2013 in collaboration with the Windwards Island Research and Education Centre (WINDREF), whose headquarters are located on the campus of St. George's University in St. George's Grenada. The RCC had been operating slightly over two years when the Consultant visited their offices the 17th to 19th August 2015. This RCC covers sixteen countries in the Caribbean region, primarily English-speaking, along with Cuba and the Dominican Republic that are Spanish-speaking countries, plus Haiti, which is francophone. All countries in the region are considered Small Island Developing States (SIDs).

The staff at the RCC at the time of the Consultant's visit consisted of one Team Lead and one Technical Officer from the secretariat, a Technical Assistant from WINDREF who works with the Centre on a 50% basis, and another senior Technical Advisor, a professor at the University,²⁷ collaborates with the Centre approximately four hours a week. There is no dedicated administrative staff at the RCC; however some administrative support is provided. The Steering Committee at RCC St. George's comprises a Program Manager for Research from WINDREF and two UNFCCC staff. The Steering Committee approves all expenditures, workplans and mission plans.

The Consultant's visit to St. George's began with meetings with the Director and the Program Manager of WINDREF who explained how their institute works and how the RCC fits into it. This was followed by an initial meeting with the RCC Team where an overview of their operations and activities was given and then meetings were held in St. George's with the DNA of Grenada, and with the Climate Change office at the Ministry of Agriculture. In the afternoon, the Consultant met individually with the three key RCC officers. The second day of the visit was spent in Trinidad, where meetings were held with the DNA of Trinidad and four different project proponents. Finally, day 3 was spent back at the RCC, where meetings were held with two other senior staff at the University, including the Technical Advisor, and then interviews with diverse stakeholders were conducted by phone and Skype for the remainder of the day, including with four additional DNAs.

This region is unique in that it covers mostly island states where it has been difficult to develop CDM projects due to their size, the monopolies in the electricity sectors, and the lack of industry in many of the countries. There are a total of twenty-five registered CDM activities in the region, primarily renewable energy but the majority (fourteen) of these are in the Dominican Republic. The total number of projects and PoAs in the CDM project pipeline in the region is just seventy-eight. All PPs were contacted in the first year of operation, and this year the RCC is making an effort to renew contact with all PPs, to ask them basic information, such as contact details, project status etc. as well as ask if they need any type of assistance. These details will then be added to the project database. All DNAs have been contacted as well, and there has been some degree of collaboration with most of them, although for some countries such as Guyana where there is no DNA, contact has been limited.

²⁷ Dr. Hugh Sealey.

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

8.1 Objective 1 - Providing Direct Support to Local Stakeholders

Activity 1.1 - Provide direct support to existing and potential CDM projects and PoAs to help them move through the project pipeline

Since there are relatively few CDM projects in the region, the RCC staff is able to give dedicated personalized support to those who request it. The PPs who were interviewed explained how the RCC assisted them in the formulation of their projects, most often PoAs,²⁸ in writing the PINs, preparing the Prior Consideration forms and assisting with other documentation. These PPs have also been informed by the RCCs of potential funding sources such as NEFCo²⁹ or SDTC³⁰ and then received support in the preparation of funding applications including data collection if required. Another PP had assistance from the RCC in the facilitation of methodological procedures, specifically for the approval for combining two methodologies for use in waste gas recovery projects (AM0037 and AM0055).

These PPs were all very appreciative of the support they have received from the RCC, saying that their presence has been extremely valuable to them. This appreciation was also shown in their responses to the questionnaire, in which they rated the assistance provided by the RCC to their project activities as **very effective**, with an average rating of **4.6** out of 5, and three out of the four respondents giving them 5 out of 5. (*Indicator 1.1a*) With regards to the impact that the RCC has had on the advancement of their project, the average response was **4.2** out of 5, a **significant impact**.

Some details of the type of assistance they received were provided in the questionnaires, when asked to describe how the RCC has assisted them with their project, for example:

- Provided support and advice on how to use the PoA as a foundation for a Caribbean New Market Mechanism;
- They have guided us through their comments on the different documents that we constantly submit;
- RCC has helped us in the structural development of the project;
- The RCC has been incredibly proactive with the CHENACT PoA. They approached us with the guidelines on how to proceed with the setting up of the PoA ... and they assisted greatly in advising the consultants we hired to design, develop and register the PoA;
- The RCC is currently assisting our PoA with the calculations of carbon emissions reductions.

Only two DNA responses were received on the question regarding the impact of the RCC on moving projects through the project cycle in their country. The average rating of these two was **2.0** out of 5, or a **minor impact**. Responses were received as well from two international/government agencies that have collaborated with RCC Lomé. Together they rated the impact of the RCC advancing projects and PoAs through the project cycle as **3.5**, i.e. a **moderate impact**.³¹

²⁸ Because the region is made up of many very small countries, PoAs make the most sense here as they can be developed regionally, with individual CPAs in each country.

²⁹ The Norwegian Environment Finance Corporation.

³⁰ Sustainable Development Technology Canada., a program that funds new technologies.

³¹ It is important to take into account that many countries in the region have only one or two projects in the pipeline, so it was difficult for DNA to answer a number of the questions, especially those regarding impact on projects in their country.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

Movements through the Project Pipeline

According to the most recent data available for movements through the project pipeline most of the work of RCC St. George's has been in the early stages of the project cycle, regarding Prior Consideration, where they have had impacts on fourteen projects or PoAs. There have been no registrations of projects or PoAs in the region following an intervention from the RCC, however two are currently requesting registration. RCC St. George has also assisted with monitoring reports for 6 project activities and CER issuance for one, and has had a total of **29 impacts on the CDM pipeline**. (*Indicator 1.1.c*)

Project Participants Assisted by the CDM Loan Scheme

Two out of five PPs who filled out the questionnaire responded that the RCC had facilitated their access to the CDM Loan Scheme. Also one of the DNAs (out of two) responded that the RCC had facilitated access to the CDM Loan Scheme to projects in their country. RCC staff indicated that have provided support to a regional solar energy PoA for their application to the Loan Scheme, however the submission was not completed due to lack of data. (*Indicator 1.1.d*)

Activity 1.2 - Identify Barriers faced by Stakeholders in the Regions

Just one of the DNAs answered that they had been asked by the RCC for input to a needs analysis or barrier identification study in the region, though two of the others did not answer this question. However, early on (i.e. in the 2013 Work Plan) they had identified that some of the barriers in this region were the fact that the countries were very small, had low emissions levels and strong monopolies were present in the energy sector. (*Indicator 1.2*)

Activity 1.3 - Assist in Eliminating Identified Barriers

Four project participants answered the question regarding what barriers to the CDM have been reduced or eliminated by the RCC, with the following details: (*Indicator 1.3*)

- The understanding of the whole process;
- The procedure to request approval of a methodology combination through the EB Process;
- The formulation of the Prior Consideration Letter;
- The "fear" of involvement in CDM projects because of the difficulty in understanding the process - the RCC has greatly assisted in making the objectives, methodologies and guidelines much easier to comprehend and to make the terminologies less daunting;
- They have assisted greatly being proactive and constantly maintaining contact to ensure that the PoA is moving forward.

When asked about the barriers that the RCC has reduced or eliminated in their countries, one DNA responded that their country "has not engaged in the CDM process due to its small size and capacity but that is not due to any deficiencies on the part of the RCC, which has interacted with us several occasions." The other responses included the following comments:

- The RCC has helped reduced methodological barriers, financial barriers, and communication barriers. This is in relation to the assistance given in the provision of a standardised baseline, providing financial advice and facilitating access to the CDM loan scheme, and creating a forum for the DNA to communicate with other regional DNAs. Moreover, there are many instances where the RCC sought to reduce market barriers by providing avenues for the sale of CERs.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

Lately this was done by providing the DNA with information relating to the Pilot Auction Facility (PAF);

- Knowledge/Information, Communications, Emission Factors/Standardized Baselines;
- Support in development of the PINs and the development of standardised baselines.

Activity 1.4 Identify New Potential Project Activities

Because of the limited number of CDM activities in the region, RCC St. George's has put a particular emphasis on identifying new project opportunities, primarily in the form of PoAs, and then assisting project proponents in formulating these projects. Several project proponents mentioned that it was the RCC that saw the potential for a regional PoA and suggested they develop it under the CDM. According to the data from the UNFCCC project pipeline databases, RCC St. George's has identified thirteen new project leads since beginning operations and all of these have obtained Prior Consideration and moved into the CDM project pipeline. (*Indicator 1.4*)

DNAs were asked what impact the RCC has had on the development of new CDM projects in their country, on a scale from 0 to 5, and their average rating was **2**. The responses from the two international/government agencies to the same question were **2.5** on average, based on two responses. Both of these indicate that the RCC has had some impact on identifying new projects, but that more could be done.

8.2 Objective 2 - Build Local Capacity, Strengthen Institutions and Develop Partnerships

RCC St. George's organized a 2-day workshop in Grenada earlier this year on opportunities for clean technologies under the carbon market, with a particular focus on PoAs and on funding opportunities³². A number of stakeholders commented that this was a very useful event for them. RCC staff have also participated in diverse conferences and workshops in the region, giving presentations on CDM opportunities and the work of the RCC, and have given lectures on the CDM and climate change at the University campus.

Activity 2.1 - Promote Local CDM Knowledge Dissemination via Outreach Activities

In order to get an idea of the impact of capacity-building events and activities, several questions were asked on the stakeholder questionnaires. To the question "How much of an impact has the CDM Regional Collaboration Centre (RCC) made in your understanding of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and the project cycle?", all five PPs responded with a **5.0** out of 5, indicating that the Centre has made a **significant impact** on their understanding of the CDM (*Indicator 2.1.a*).

Similarly, when asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM, they answered **4.8** out of 5 on average, in other words that it has been **very effective**. The response of the DNAs to the same question was on average **3.3** out of 5 and both of the international/government agencies provided a rating of **4.0** out of 5, indicating that in their view the RCC has been effective at improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM. (*Indicator 2.1.b*)

PPs provided the following comments on the questionnaires when asked to describe in what way the RCC has improved their understanding of the CDM:

³² The Agenda and presentations of this workshop are available at <<https://cdm.unfccc.int/stakeholder/rcc/index.html>>.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

- By taking us by the hand and guiding us through the process;
- Through forums and workshops, they have kept us grounded with technical aspects that will survive a Paris agreement;
- We have better understood the importance of having a project that follows the CDM rules in order to obtain CERs;
- The RCC staff are always there to answer questions and provide guidance and understanding on the CDM;
- The workshop held in Grenada earlier this year provided an opportunity to hear about other similar activities and some not so similar. The workshop was extremely educational and the broad range of topics presented enabled me to learn more about the processes of the CDM;
- Great sharing of CDM literature and verbal explanations. Also look forward to better understanding the methodologies to be used for the calculation of carbon emissions reduction for our project.

DNA Capacity-Building

DNAs were asked what impact the RCC had had on their capacity to promote and approve projects. Of the three DNAs who responded, the average rating was **3.3**, indicating that they had a **moderate impact** (*Indicator 2.1.c*)

They were also asked to describe in what way the RCC had strengthened their capacity, and provided the following responses:

- In the computation of Emission Factor (i.e. Power Sector), Technical Assistance & Guidance to the DNA and National Climate Change Committee;
- Having provided the technical backstopping for the DNA;
- The RCC has sought to build capacity in the understanding and use of standardized baselines within our DNA. It has been noted that the organization works with various partners, including UNEP/DTU and ICAP, to provide access to training events, webinars and other resources which have provided information relating to the development and use of standardized baselines and emissions trading mechanisms;
- The RCC also facilitated access to other training sessions relating to NAMAs, renewable energy and EE;
- The RCC has facilitated discussion on the aforementioned topics between DNAs in the LAC region, helping us to learn from the experiences, challenges and recommendations of other DNAs and enabling us to make valid contributions to the activities being carried out by the CDM EB to reform the mechanism;
- In 2014 the RCC played an integral role in the execution of a LAC workshop on CDM and NAMAs which helped to build the capacity of the representative from our DNA. The workshop provided information relating to institutional arrangements, national approval processes, the NAMA registry, stakeholder consultation processes, and financial and technical support for NAMAs and CDM, etc."

Other DNA comments from those interviewed related to the assistance they had received determining the Grid Emissions Factor, a standardized baseline in the waste sector and in assessing mitigation potential in their countries. It is worth noting that many of these countries have no registered CDM projects as of yet,



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

and therefore the collaboration focuses more on identifying and formulating potential projects or PoAs, as well as assistance in other areas of climate change mitigation.

Activity 2.2 - Collaborate directly with DNAs, aiming to improve the integration of CDM into national climate policy

Of the four DNAs who answered the questionnaire, none said that their government has integrated CDM into national policy with guidance from the RCC, although one commented that they are just beginning to formulate a climate change policy and would like assistance from the RCC during the process. (*Indicator 2.2*) The RCC did however assist several countries in setting up their DNA offices.

The RCC has interacted with the government of Trinidad and Tobago on the potential inclusion of the CDM in their domestic carbon trading scheme and has provided technical input to the INDC of Grenada, establishing baselines for the electricity, solid waste, transport and forestry sectors. Although the CDM is not specifically included in the Grenada INDC, CDM tools have been applied to establish the baselines.

Activity 2.3 - Build local capacity through establishing networks and partnerships with other local and regional institutions and agencies

RCC Grenada has been active setting up partnerships with regional and international agencies that work in the Caribbean, for example with CARICOM, UNDP and UNEP.

When DNAs were asked to rate the effectiveness of the RCC in building long-lasting partnerships and networks, their responses averaged of **2.3** out of 5, **somewhat effective**. The PP rating of the same question, however averaged **4.8**, or **very effective**. Both of the international/governmental agencies that responded rated their effectiveness as **4** out of 5. (*Indicator 2.3.a*).

The international and governmental agencies also rated the effectiveness of the RCC in bringing together project developers and CER purchasers and funding programs in the region as **4** out of 5, quite **effective**.

When these agencies were asked in what ways the RCC had collaborated with their organization, they responded that they assisted in developing a study of the mitigation potential in the Caribbean region, updating the country GEFs and developing standardized baselines for several countries in the region. They have also assisted in initiatives to raise awareness of climate change issues, for example the Climate Change Walk.

These agencies also commented on which RCC activities had been most effective, as follows:

- Assisted countries in the region to develop and update their GEFs or standardized baselines;
- Pushed countries to organize and manage information and data bases;
- Supported countries with NAMAs, especially setting up the BAUs and projections;
- Supported countries with INDCs and IBID.

Funding leveraged relative to RCC budget

No funding has been leveraged so far this year by RCC St. George's; however in 2014, the leveraged funds was estimated by the UNFCCC to be 8,954 USD, comprising funds from GIZ and UNDP-Barbados for events in the region and for covering the cost of an intern at the RCC. This amount is only about



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

4% relative to the RCC budget in 2014 of 217,729 USD, though if the estimated contribution from the partner organization is taken into account (53,500 USD), then the leveraged funds reaches **29%** of the level of secretariat funding to the Centre. This still cannot be viewed as substantial, and may indicate that RCC St. George's has not been as successful as building strong partnerships and networks as the RCCs in Africa, and may need to focus more on strengthening the partnerships they have begun developing. *(Indicator 2.3.b)*

8.3 Objective 3 - Promote SBLs and Other Simplified Tools.

Activity 3.1 - Support the development and use of standardized baselines

RCC St. George's has facilitated the development of twenty-four standardized baselines in the region, most of these in the waste sector (landfill gas recovery) and for the grid emission factor (GEF). Six of these SBLs have been submitted and were approved this year. *(Indicator 3.1.c)*

Three of the five project proponents answered that the "development of a standardized baseline with the assistance of the RCC has helped their project move forward" *(Indicator 3.1.a)*.

When asked to rate the impact that the RCC has had in assisting with the development of standardized baselines, PP's gave an average rating **4.2** and DNAs rated this impact as at **3.7** out of 5, with two responses of 5 out of 5, indicating that they felt they had had a **significant impact** on SBL development. *(Indicator 3.1.b)*

DNAs were also asked if the "development of standardized baselines facilitated by the RCC assistance helped move your projects forward in your country", and one out of three responded yes, with one of them commenting that "they are not yet complete, but once complete they will be useful". *(Indicator 3.1.d)*

Activity 3.2 - Support the development and use of suppressed demand methodologies

With respect to the facilitation of suppressed demand methodologies, DNAs viewed the impact of the RCC as being minor, giving it an average rating of **1.0**. The average response of the PPs was **4** out of 5, based on 3 respondents – however the RCC has indicated that they have not recently provided support in this area.

Activity 3.3 – Support the improvement and use of other simplified procedures of the CDM

As with the other RCCs, St. George's regularly provides input to Bonn to support efforts to improve the CDM, for example fNRB fractions for each country, and details at the project level. In the case of RCC St. George's they have also provided input on small scale methodologies AMC. III-G, and AMS.III-H, and notes on simplifying PDDs, landfill gas methodologies and the validation & verification processes. *(Indicator 3.3)*

8.4 Objective 4 - Promote Demand-Side Initiatives

Activity 4.1 - Promotion the SD Co-Benefits Tool

RCC St. George's does promote the SD Tool at events where they are participating and to project proponents in general. However, some of the project proponents I spoke to were not familiar with it. From



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - St. George's

the questionnaire, **two out of the five PPs** indicated that they were using the SD Tool for their projects or PoAs (*Indicator 4.1.a*) As well, two out of the four DNAs were familiar with the SD Tool, though none of them could confirm that it was being used by projects and PoAs in their country.

Activity 4.2 - Collaboration on other Demand-side initiatives such as Voluntary Cancellation and New Markets

As mentioned previously, the RCC actively tries to match project developers with funding opportunities, such as NEFCO and KFW, among others, when relevant, and has assisted several project proponents in formulating submissions for these funds.

8.5 Future Areas of Work

DNAs were asked what areas of work they felt would be most beneficial for the RCC to focus on in the future, and the following are some of the comments were received as part of the questionnaire:

- Stakeholder Workshops/Seminars; Registration of Renewable Energy & Energy Efficiency Projects; Public Education & Sensitisation on the CDM;
- Continue to build on the CDM and start to provide support in other areas such as INDCs, etc.;
- Capacity building in the following areas:
 - Development of institutional arrangements to implement INDCs.
 - Development of standardized baselines since implementation for use in CDM, NAMAs and INDCs
 - Development of baseline emissions trajectories and scenarios
 - How to address double-counting issues
 - Assessment of MRV in relation to INDCs
 - Measuring co-benefits
 - How to link GHG emissions reductions with cost assessments and finance options to ensure implementation of INDCs;
- Technical assistance in the INDC process.

Other feedback regarding future work was received from DNAs during the interviews with the Consultant. They would like further collaboration with the Centre, for example in the transport sector, and would also like to involve them in future initiatives aimed at including climate change in the school curriculum, in order to educate children at an early age. Another DNA would like support in implementing their INDC and with national communications, as well as continued collaboration with SBLs in other sectors such as transport and cement production, as they will be needed for developing NAMAs.

International/government agencies also had several comments on what they would like to see in the future:

- Would like a checklist for screening project proposals as well as a protocol for finalizing project concept notes so as to secure funding;
- It is not because of the RCCs work in the region that the situation for the CDM will change. An international political issue needs to be address first so it gives the necessary legal support to its work and presence in the region. My recommendation is that the centre expands its support to other areas of mitigation beyond the CDM.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

9. RCC Budget

The non-salary costs of the RCC initiative can be divided into two main categories: 1) the Operational Budget, and 2) the Logistical/Administrative Budget. Since UNFCCC officers working at the RCCs would otherwise be working from Bonn on CDM related activities, their salary costs would be paid in any case, and are therefore not considered to be extra costs, so they will not be included in this assessment of the budget³³.

1) The **Operational Budget** covers the costs to implement the workplans of each RCC, including costs for missions, capacity-building, outreach activities, etc. In 2014 (the only full year in which all four RCCs were operational) the approved budget for each RCC ranged from 64,000 USD (St. George's) to 130,000 USD (Kampala), with a total just under 400,000 USD for the four RCCs. However, the operational expenditures were significantly less than that – for example, total expenditures for Kampala in 2014 were 67,000 USD and for Lomé about 55,000 USD.

Approximately half of these expenditures are for travel to countries covered by the regions to meet with DNAs and project participants and attend capacity-building events, which is a central part of their work and essential for engaging stakeholders. Many DNAs and project participants mentioned how important the visits and physical contacts were and that they would like to have even more visits by the RCC. The remainder covers local costs for capacity-building activities, and other operational expenses, and may include the costs for research associates, as well as the participation of some regional participants at events. All expenditures are carefully monitored and need prior approval. Mission plans also need to be planned and approved ahead of time and all travel is carried out according to UN rules. For what they have achieved in the regions in a space of a couple of years, this level of operating expenditure appears to be reasonable, especially when one considers that the total in-kind contributions from the partner organizations combined with funds leveraged by the Centres from international organizations, were estimated to be in the range of 560,000 USD for 2014.

For the year 2015, the operational budget is somewhat less than in previous years, about 70,000 USD each for Kampala, Lomé and Bogotá, and 50,000 USD for St. George's. Leveraged funds from international organizations are already higher than in 2014, at least for Lomé and Kampala. In addition, two significant grants (in the range of 450,000 USD total) have been recently approved from donor organizations to support the integration of the CDM in other mitigation initiatives, in particular INDCs. Much of the work under these grants will be carried out through the RCCs.

2) The **Logistical/Administrative Budget** covers the cost of staff relocation (e.g. flights, relocation grant, living expenses), as well as the annual inter-RCC meeting known as the "Global Forum", and monitoring visits of the RCCs by staff from Bonn. The logistical budget for each RCC is in the range of 80,000 USD, except for St. George's which is at 124,000 USD (likely due to the high DSA costs in Grenada), plus 20,000 to cover monitoring visits and the costs of the annual global forum, with a total of about 400,000 USD for 2015 and similar amounts for previous years.

When assessing the total budget of the RCC's this Logistical budget must be considered. However, most of the costs are set costs, dictated by UNFCCC guidelines, e.g. for living expenses and relocation costs,

³³ As well, since this evaluation only covers the four RCCs that were visited, costs for the most recent RCC, which began operation in Bangkok in September 2015 are not being considered, although administrative costs for the Bangkok RCC cannot be completely separated from the total administrative budget.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

and therefore there is little or no flexibility in the amounts when staff are stationed in the regions. The 20,000 USD budgeted for the annual forum and monitoring visits appears to be reasonable. Based on comments from RCC staff, both UNFCCC and partner staff, the Global Forum seems to be an excellent opportunity for exchange and interaction among the four RCCs and secretariat staff in Bonn, for sharing experiences in the field and for updates on the most recent decisions affecting the CDM, as well as for capacity-building in particular for the RCC partner staff who have had the opportunity to attend. Monitoring visits to the RCCs by secretariat staff are also a necessary exercise to enable staff from Bonn to have a close-up view of operations at the Regional Centres, identify any potential issues, and instigate corrective actions.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

10. Conclusions and Recommendations

10.1 Summary of Results for each RCC

10.1.1 RCC Kampala

Based on a review of the indicator values described in section 5, it can be concluded that **RCC Kampala** has been very effective at providing direct support to project proponents, has helped many projects to advance through the project pipeline and has also been successful at reducing many of the barriers faced by PPs, including technical and procedural barriers, communications with the secretariat and DNAs and in some cases assisting with financial barriers. They have also been moderately successful in identifying new project opportunities and helping them move forward the project cycle.

The Centre is much appreciated in the region by project developers and has provided encouragement to many of them to continue within the CDM system. They have also made a moderate impact on stakeholder understanding of the CDM, especially among project proponents who were new to the CDM, and have had a moderate impact on the capacity of many DNAs in the region. In terms of building partnerships and establishing networks in the region, the majority of stakeholders felt that the RCC has been quite effective. Several international agencies have developed strong relationships with them, which is confirmed by the events they have co-organized and the level of funding leveraged from these agencies.

RCC Kampala has also been effective at developing numerous relevant standardised baselines in the region that are already having a significant impact on moving projects forward. However they have had only a minor impact on facilitating suppressed demand methodologies. With regards to promoting simplified tools and procedures of the CDM, they keep project proponents informed on the most recent developments via regular email communications to their vast list of project contacts, and have provided some feedback to Bonn on several issues. On the demand-side, they actively promote the use of the SD Tool, which is now being used by a high proportion of project proponents in the region, and are effective at matching project developers with CER purchasers and other funding opportunities.

10.1.2 RCC Lomé

RCC Lomé has also been quite effective at providing direct support to project proponents, and has had a significant impact on advancing many projects through the pipeline. Judging from most of the comments received from PPs, in addition to providing hands-on assistance and clarifications with regards to CDM documentation and procedures, they have been very effective at facilitating contact between PPs, DNAs, DOEs and the secretariat, as well as with assisting them in identifying funding opportunities. They have not however been so successful at facilitating access to the CDM Loan Scheme. The RCC has been able to reduce some barriers to the CDM, in particular the language barrier, by having local staff that communicates effectively in French as well as communications barriers between the various parties. The speed with which they respond and the willingness of the staff to assist is very much appreciated by PPs. They have had a moderate impact on identifying new project activities (29 in all), in spite of existing market prices, and in assisting these project proponents in obtaining their LoAs and moving into the project cycle.

In terms of capacity-building, PPs felt that RCC Lomé had had at least a moderate impact overall on their understanding of the CDM, and are viewed in general as being effective or very effective at improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM. DNAs also found them to have a moderate impact on their capacity and especially appreciated the visits by the RCC staff, capacity-building on methodologies and SBLs and the ease of communication with the Regional Centre. The majority of stakeholders felt that they



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

had been quite effective at building partnerships and establishing networks in the region. As is the case with Kampala, they have developed close relationships with a number of international agencies with whom they have co-organized events, and have been able to leverage funding from these partners, who are very content to have a UNFCCC presence in the region.

RCC Lomé has had a moderate impact on the development of standardised baselines in the region, in particular for Grid Emission Factors, though at this point it appears that only a few projects have benefitted from those SBLs. They have had a moderate impact on supporting the use of suppressed demand methodologies, having assisted approximately twenty projects in the region, and promote the use of simplified tools and procedures by sending out a monthly newsletter to their contacts to keep them up to date on relevant rule changes. On the demand-side, RCC Lomé has been promoting the use of the SD Tool; however awareness of the Tool is still somewhat low, especially among DNAs, so further promotion may be needed. The RCC also actively promotes potential funding programs to project developers via their monthly newsletter and in their direct contact with PPs.

10.1.2 RCC Bogotá

RCC Bogotá is viewed by the PPs that were surveyed as being very effective at assisting their project, and as having had a moderate impact on advancing their projects through the pipeline. The assistance provided by RCC Bogotá is generally related to the monitoring, verification and issuance phases as well as in post-registration changes, as there are so many registered projects in the region. In all they have assisted with 29 monitoring reports. They have also played a role in matching some projects to buyers or funding initiatives. They have not been effective at facilitating access to the CDM Loan Scheme, but this is primarily because most countries in the region are not eligible. Through a survey of project participants, the RCC has identified the strongest barrier in the region, which is the lower price of CERs. The RCC has been able to reduce some technical barriers to the CDM, by clarifying methodology issues of the CDM to stakeholders and by facilitating the development of standardized baselines. PPs particularly appreciate having a UNFCCC presence in the region to help alleviate communication barriers with the Secretariat due to language and time zone differences. They have had only a minor impact on identifying new project activities, but this has not been a priority for them, as there are very few buyers currently interested in projects in Latin America.

With regards to capacity-building, RCC Bogotá has not been as active as other RCCs, in part because the level of capacity in this region is much higher than in others, both among PPs and within the DNAs. Nonetheless PPs felt that the RCC had had at a moderate impact overall on their understanding of the CDM, and that it has been somewhat effective at improving stakeholder understanding. The DNAs who were surveyed however found this impact to be minimal and felt that the RCC had had only a minor impact on their capacity to facilitate projects. Many of these DNAs are currently focused on INDCs and NAMAs, and the RCC has assisted several in trying to integrate CDM projects into their INDCs. PPs and international agencies felt that RCC Bogotá has been effective at building partnerships and establishing networks in the region, though DNAs found them to be less so. International agencies also felt that the RCC had been somewhat effective at bringing together project developers and CER funding programs. However, the RCC does not appear to have developed many strong partnerships in the region at this point and their level of leveraged funding from other agencies has been relatively low.

The RCC has been active in the development of standardised baselines in the region, in particular for Grid Emission Factors, though at this point the impact of these SBLs has been relatively minor, according to PPs and DNAs, although some DNAs indicated that these SBLs have assisted a number of projects in their countries to move forward. The RCC has not facilitated suppressed demand methodologies as there is a



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

limited need for them in this region. However they are currently working on a methodological revision for landfill gas projects based on their direct experience with projects in the region.

On the demand-side, RCC Bogotá have been promoting the use of the SD Tool, and have recently developed a flyer in Spanish that describes the Tool and its use however at this point the SD Tool does not appear to be used by many projects in the region. The RCC has been active trying to match potential funding programs to appropriate project developers and has had some success. They have also promoted the concept of Voluntary Cancellation and are exploring the use of CERs in other carbon markets, both domestic and regional.

10.1.4 RCC St. George's

RCC St. George's was rated very highly by PPs that were surveyed who indicated they have been very effective at assisting their projects, and as having had a significant impact on advancing their projects through the pipeline. As there are relatively few CDM projects in the region, the RCC staff is able to give dedicated personalized support to those who request it and have assisted PPs in the formulation of their projects and PoAs, in writing PINs, preparing the Prior Consideration forms, calculating emissions reductions and assisting with other documentation and technical clarifications. Most of the work of RCC St. George's has been in the early stages of the project cycle, regarding Prior Consideration, where they have had impacts on fourteen projects or PoAs. They have facilitated access to the CDM Loan Scheme to a few projects, but not have been successful as of yet. Both PPs and DNAs indicated that the RCC has been able to reduce some barriers to the CDM, primarily the complexity of the CDM, by making it easier to understand, technical barriers through assisting with SBL development, and some market barriers by providing information on CER purchasers and funds. They have been active in identifying new project opportunities and the assisting project proponents in formulating projects or PoAs, though according to DNAs, the impact has been relatively low.

With regards to capacity-building, PPs felt that the Centre had made a significant impact in their understanding of the CDM, and that it has been very effective at improving stakeholder understanding, both through workshops and forums that they have organized as well as by assisting them hands-on with their projects and explaining the intricacies of the CDM. The DNAs surveyed also found them to be effective at improving stakeholder understanding in general and that they had had a moderate impact on their capacity to facilitate projects, highlighting the technical assistance they had received, the assistance in SBL development, and workshops at which the RCC had facilitated their participation. Both PPs and international agencies indicated that RCC St. George's had been very effective at establishing partnerships in the region, though DNAs found them to be less so. International and governmental agencies also felt that the RCC had been quite effective at bringing together project developers and CER purchasing programs. They have not yet leveraged any funding from partners in 2015 though in 2014 about 9000 USD was leveraged. This may indicate that RCC St. George's has not been as successful as building strong partnerships and networks as the RCCs in Africa, and may need to focus more on strengthening the partnerships they have begun developing.

The RCC has had a relatively strong impact on the development of standardised baselines in the region and three out of five PPs indicated that an SBL facilitated by the RCC had helped move their project forward. No suppressed demand methodologies have been facilitated by the RCC. However they have provided input to simplify several small-scale methodologies, as well as CDM procedures. On the demand-side, some promotion of the SD Tool has been carried out, as several PPs mentioned that they were using it, however others were not familiar with it, so stronger promotional work may be needed. The RCC actively tries to match potential funding programs to appropriate project developers and assists them in formulating their funding submissions.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

10.2 Additional Observations

10.2.1 Country Prioritization

There has not been any clear policy within the RCCs to prioritize countries that are LDCs, SIDS or have less than ten projects, even though this was part of the initial goal of the RCCs. For RCC Lomé, all but two of the countries are LDCs, for RCC St. George's all countries are considered to be SIDS, and in RCC Kampala the majority are LDCs or have less than ten countries. In general, after making initial contact with each country in their region, the RCCs have worked on a reactive basis, collaborating with those stakeholders who have requested their assistance, and have expressed an interest in collaboration. This makes sense in terms of trying to maximize the impact of their efforts. However, in keeping with the overall goal of the initiative of improving regional distribution, some effort to prioritize the countries that they work with may be worthwhile. This is particularly the case for RCC Bogotá, which covers a very large region in which many countries have a high level of capacity and experience with the CDM, but at the same time currently have little or no interest in the CDM. Rather than spreading themselves too thin and trying to cover all countries to some degree, the RCC may wish to focus more on those countries with less than ten registered projects, for example, and those with less experience in the CDM that therefore a greater need for assistance.

10.2.2 Public Information on the RCCs

Apart from one page on the UNFCCC website, public information on the RCCs is scarce. If someone outside the UNFCCC wishes to find out what events are being held by the RCCs or what services they offer, they have to contact the RCC to ask, as there is no public information available. Contact information is provided on the UNFCCC website, but to get to it someone would have to know what they were looking for, as information about the regional offices is not posted on the main pages of the UNFCCC site or even the CDM pages, and there is no direct link to the contact information of the RCCs. This is likely one reason why awareness of the RCCs is rather limited.³⁴ A stakeholder from one of the regions looking for assistance on the CDM will not easily find out that there is a UNFCCC centre in their region, even if they go to the UNFCCC website. They will only learn of the Centre if they are directly contacted by them, through an event in their region or if someone refers them to the Centre. A public website for each RCC in the local languages could be very useful, ideally web pages in an accessible format providing details on the services offered by the RCC, the activities they are involved in, as well as specific contact people. Since one of the strengths of the RCCs is that they provide personal contact with someone in your own region in your own language, it would make sense to capitalize on this.

10.2.3 Additional Benefits to the Secretariat

Though not one of the original objectives of the RCCs, the on-the-ground presence of the RCCs has made them ideal for collecting data to support the Secretariat's ongoing work on improving and simplifying the CDM. Data regarding grid emission factors, NRB fractions, SBL development, as well as details on individual projects is much easier for the RCCs to collect once they have developed a network and personal contacts in the region. Their day-to-day experience dealing with the problems faced by project developers provides useful feedback into the simplification of methodologies and procedures. In addition, all Secretariat staff who have spent some time working at the RCCs have found it to be an excellent capacity-building experience, which gives them a different perspective in their work, once they return

³⁴ During the visits to the regions, the Consultant spoke with a number of project developers who were not aware of the RCC in their region and the services it offered, or had only heard of their existence when contacted by the RCC a month or two previously.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

back to Bonn. Even staff that only travelled to the RCCs on a short-term basis, for example to participate in a workshop, appear to have been enriched and inspired by the experience.

10.2.4 Capacity-Building for RCC Partner Staff

The partner staff in the regions have also gained significantly from their time working with the RCCs, learning not only about the CDM project cycle and methodological issues, but also about working within an international organization, and acquiring skills in data collection, databases, information sharing and event-organizing etc. Many of these staff however would like to learn more, and would like to see more formal training sessions organized for them in particular on technical issues such as standardized baselines and methodologies. RCC Lomé has already initiated monthly capacity-building sessions for partner staff, and other RCCs may wish to follow suit. This is particularly important if the eventual goal of the RCCs is for the UNFCCC staff to pull out and leave the partner organization to continue the work of the RCC on their own³⁵. A specific capacity-building program tailored to the needs and mandate of the Centre should be set up with the aim of equipping the partner staff with the skills they would need to run the Centre on their own. At the same time partner technical staff should be gradually given more responsibility, especially on technical issues³⁶, so that they strengthen their skills. This is happening to a degree at most of the Centres, but a formalized plan for partner staff would be beneficial. It was also noted that in some cases, in particular at St. George's, technical staff at the partner organization were spending a significant amount of time on administrative issues, as there was not sufficient administrative support available. This is another issue that should be addressed.

10.2.5 Future Directions

It became clear early on in this evaluation that it is becoming increasingly difficult for staff at the RCCs to limit their work to CDM issues alone. Requests for assistance with INDCs and NAMAs in particular are becoming more and more frequent, and they also receive requests to assist on inventories and National Action Plans etc. Practically all DNAs and International Agencies who were interviewed recommended that the RCC expand their focus into other areas, especially to provide assistance in the implementation of INDCs and the development of NAMAs. In many countries in the regions, DNA offices are very small, and the same staff who work on the CDM also work on other climate change issues, including INDCs, mitigation and even adaptation, so it is hard for them to isolate their work on the CDM from work on other issues. The RCCs are currently attempting to only work in areas that are related to the CDM but the lines are becoming increasingly blurry, for example they might assist with INDC work if CDM methodological tools are being used. As well, many of the SBLs that they are facilitating are geared more towards use in NAMAs than in CDM projects. The Secretariat has already received substantial funding this year to assist in positioning the CDM tools and methodologies within INDCs and other mechanisms. It makes sense that they continue to explore other funding sources for working in other issues and that their mandate be expanded.

10.2.6 Need for a Clear Mandate and Ongoing Monitoring

Whatever future direction is decided for the RCCs, it is recommended that a clear mandate is defined for them, and that objectives and activities be specified under this mandate. During the early stages of this evaluation it became evident that there was no clear mandate for the Centres agreed to by both the Board and the Secretariat, within which their workplans were designed. The workplans are very structured, and

³⁵ It was noted that while this is still considered to be a future goal of the RCCs, the Secretariat does not feel that any of the RCCs are ready at this point to continue without the UNFCCC staff presence. They currently do not have a clear plan for ending the UNFCCC commitment at any of the RCCs.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres

designed around five main activities, and the work carried out under each of these activities is monitored, though it appears that some of the indicators are not monitored on a regular basis, or they are not available publically. There is also some monitoring of impacts being carried out to some degree as part of the regular reporting to the Board, but this is not necessarily co-related with the objectives of the RCCs. It is recommended therefore that a clear mandate be defined, objectives and activities be structured under this mandate and that a monitoring and evaluation framework (similar to that used in this evaluation) be set up including outputs and indicators correlated to the objectives within the mandate, and that there be ongoing monitoring of these indicators. There may be a need to revise the mandate at times, but in that case the monitoring framework should also be revised accordingly.



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

Appendix 1 – LFA Evaluation Framework

Overall Objective	Activities	Outputs	Indicators
1. Provide direct support to local stakeholders in CDM project and PoA development, registration and issuance.	1.1 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 no. of projects registered	Projects registered after RCC intervention
		Facilitation of CDM Loan Scheme to project participants	Issuance of CERs after RCC intervention
	1.2 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 or needs analysis	Stakeholder rating of direct project assistance
			No. of project participants assisted via CDM Loan Scheme
	1.3 Assist in eliminating the identified barriers	Activities designed specifically to reduce barriers	No. type of barrier studies and/or needs analyses carried out by RCC
Barriers are reduced or eliminated			
1.4 Identify new potential project activities for inclusion in the pipeline	New project opportunities entering the pipeline	No. or % of project developers who respond that the RCC has helped to reduce barriers to the CDM	
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	Increased no. of projects that have entered pipeline
			No./% of Stakeholders for whom the RCCs have made a significant impact in their understanding of the CDM
			Number/ % 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



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

	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 no. Of standardized baselines available relevant to local projects	No./% of Stakeholders who respond that the RCC's development of a standardized baseline has helped their project move forward No. Standardized baselines developed with RCC involvement
	3.2 Support the development and use of suppressed demand methodologies	Development of suppressed demand methodologies facilitated by RCCs	No. of suppressed demand methodologies developed with assistance of RCCs
	3.3 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
	4.2 Promote other CDM Demand-side initiatives such as Voluntary Cancellation and New Markets	Increased awareness and use of Voluntary Cancellation	RCC promotion of other demand-side initiatives

Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

Appendix 2a – Questionnaire for Project Participants

Questionnaire for Project Participants

1. How much of an impact has the CDM Regional Collaboration Centre (RCC) made in your understanding of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and the project cycle? (scale from 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →

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 Impact →

3. Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in assisting your CDM project activity.

0 1 2 3 4 5
← Not effective ----- Somewhat effective ----- Very effective →

4. Please rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM, in your view.

0 1 2 3 4 5
← Not effective ----- Somewhat effective ----- Very effective →

5. Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in building long-lasting partnerships and networks based on your own experience. (Scale of 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← Not effective ----- Somewhat effective ----- Very effective →

6. Please rate the impact that the RCC has had in assisting with the development of standardized baselines, based on your own experience. (Scale of 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →

7. Has the development of a standardized baseline with RCC assistance helped move your project forward?

Yes No



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

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.**

N/A 0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →

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

Yes No Do not know what that is.

10. **Are you using the Sustainable Development Co-benefit Tool for your project(s) ?**

Yes No Do not know what that is.

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

12. **Please describe briefly how the RCC has assisted you with your project?**

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

Date _____

Location _____

RCC _____

Stakeholder reference no. _____



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

Appendix 2b – Questionnaire for DNAs

Questionnaire for DNAs

1. How much of an impact has the CDM Regional Collaboration Centre (RCC) made in your capacity to facilitate and approve CDM projects? (scale from 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →

2. How much of an impact has the RCC had on the development of new CDM projects in your country?

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →

3. How much of an impact has the RCC had on the advancement through the project cycle of existing CDM projects in your country?

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →

4. Has the RCC requested your collaboration/input in conducting a Needs Analysis or Barrier Identification Study for the CDM in your country?

Yes No

5. Please rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM, in your view.

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 of 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← Not effective ----- Somewhat effective ----- Very effective →

7. Please rate the impact that the RCC has had in assisting with the development of standardized baselines in your country. (Scale of 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

8. Has the development of standardized baselines facilitated by the RCC assistance helped move your projects forward in your country?

Yes No

9. Please rate the impact that the RCC has had in facilitating the development of suppressed demand methodologies that are applicable to your country circumstances.

0 1 2 3 4 5

← No impact ----- Minor impact ----- Moderate Impact ----- Significant Impact →

10. Has your government integrated the CDM into national policy with assistance or guidance from the RCC?

Yes No

11. Has the RCC facilitated access to the CDM Loan Scheme to projects in your country?

Yes No Do not know what that is.

12. Are you familiar with the Sustainable Development Co-benefit Tool?

Yes No

13. If so, is this tool being used in projects in your country?

Yes No Not sure

14. What barriers to the CDM has the RCC reduced or eliminated in your country?

15. Please describe in what way the RCC has strengthened the capacity of your DNA?

16. What new areas of work do you feel would be most beneficial for the RCC to focus on in the future? -----

Date _____

Location _____

RCC _____

Stakeholder reference no. _____



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

Appendix 2c – Questionnaire for International/Government Agencies

Questionnaire for International/Government Agencies

1. Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in building long-lasting partnerships and networks in the region. (Scale of 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← Not effective Somewhat effective Very effective →

2. Please rate the effectiveness of the RCC in bringing together project developers and CER purchasers and funding programs in the region. (Scale of 0 to 5)

0 1 2 3 4 5
← Not effective Somewhat effective Very effective →

3. How much of an impact has the CDM Regional Collaboration Centre (RCC) made in the advancement through the project cycle of existing CDM project activities and PoA 's in the region?

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact Minor impact Moderate Impact Significant Impact →

4. How much of an impact has the RCC had on the identification and development of new CDM projects in the region?

0 1 2 3 4 5
← No impact Minor impact Moderate Impact Significant Impact →

5. Has the RCC requested your collaboration/input in conducting a Needs Analysis or Barrier Identification Study for the CDM in the region?

Yes No

6. Please rate the overall effectiveness of the RCC in improving stakeholder understanding of the CDM, in your view.

0 1 2 3 4 5
← Not effective Somewhat effective Very effective →



Independent Evaluation of the Regional Collaboration Centres - Appendices

7. What activities of the RCCs have been most effective in your view?

8. Has the RCC facilitated access to the CDM Loan Scheme to projects in the region?

Yes No Unsure

9. What barriers to the CDM has the RCC reduced or eliminated in the region?

10. Please describe briefly in what way the RCC has collaborated with your organization.

11. Any suggestions for new areas of work for the RCCs that you feel would be beneficial to CDM development in the region?

Date _____

Location _____

RCC _____

Stakeholder reference no. _____



- - - - -

Document information

<i>Version</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
01.0	16 October 2015	EB 86, Annex 2. Initial publication.

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