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# Executive Summary

The Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) is a European Policy initiative that was started in 2007 by the Communication from the European Commission to the Council and the European Parliament “***Building a Global Climate Change Alliance between the European Union and poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change***”. The GCCA intervenes in the five priority areas of (1) Mainstreaming climate change into poverty reduction and development efforts; (2) Adaptation; (3) Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR); (4) Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD); and (5) Enhancing participation in the global carbon market. The GCCA supports over 50 programmes to address climate change in more than 35 countries and four regions across the globe.

This report presents findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Evaluation of the GCCA, which was combined with a Mid-Term Assessment (MTA) of the Intra-ACP GCCA programme, an important operational programme under the GCCA with separate funding from the Intra ACP budget. The evaluators assessed ***a sample of six regional, ten national GCCA programmes and two support facilities***. The report is one of the final outputs of the GCCA Evaluation. The MTA of the Intra-ACP programme was submitted separately; however, for reference purposes, the Executive Summary of the Intra-ACP GCCA Mid-Term Assessment is included in the GCCA Report as Annex 9.

**Main findings and conclusions**

The GCCA focuses on providing assistance to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in undertaking climate change adaptation or mitigation actions. Overall, the GCCA was found to respond well to actual demands from beneficiary countries, both in terms of dialogue and negotiations and in terms of tangible action. In most cases, ***the GCCA funds have strengthened actions led by EU MS*** (DFID, Danida, AFD, GIZ and others) ***and multilateral agencies***, benefiting from existing structures and systems, which resulted in relatively quick results. The MS have seen their climate initiatives strengthened by the funding and policy support provided through the GCCA. Examples of this would be the DFID-supported climate resilience programme in Nepal, which promotes use of Local Adaptation Plans of Action, and the GIZ supported Sustainable Land Management Programme in Ethiopia, where the GCCA is pilot-testing climate change activities and contributes to the achievement of Ethiopia's Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) strategy. Nevertheless, the challenge remains to increase MS buy-in into the GCCA, notably those MS with a long track record in climate and development-related programmes and, in parallel, mobilising Commission resources in Brussels to raise the GCCA profile with MS.

Fragmentation of support for climate action has been avoided and, in a number of countries, such as Mozambique, Ethiopia or Mauritius, a basis for joint ‘European’ climate action is emerging. For the Member States that have provided Fast-Track funds (such as Ireland, Estonia or Cyprus), the GCCA has provided a ***good opportunity to support climate action with low transaction costs*** in countries such as Nepal and Bhutan. These examples from the first phase illustrate that a good basis exists for the GCCA (i.e. DG DEVCO) to actively dialogue with MS development partners at HQ level, and to build on EU and EU MS cooperation in the field of climate change at national and regional levels.

The GCCA also responds successfully to needs at the regional level, recognising that regional-level resources and capacities, such as shared meteorological services, add value to national programmes and capacities. The ***combination of global, regional and national foci*** complementing each other differentiates the GCCA from most Member State-led climate actions and the endeavours of other donors. It adds clear value to the existing climate action landscape. Other (non LDC, non SIDS) countries are also included in GCCA communications, making this a truly global initiative.

The overall performance of the components and interventions evaluated has been found to be good, on all evaluation criteria (refer Chapter 3: Overall assessment). Most of the programmes are still in an initial stage - the oldest programmes having been operational for a few years only – and require sustained support over a longer period of time. The current phase (287 MM EUR funding since 2008) has required ***considerable investments to be made in developing coalitions, partnerships and institutional arrangements*** to facilitate the delivery of the individual interventions. These have started to produce promising results, which merit further capitalisation during subsequent phases.

Identification of the right point of entry and the best organisations to lead the interventions was often a time-consuming challenge, and defining ***roles and responsibilities of partners or financial procedures*** caused delayed start-ups. While the GCCA makes good use of country systems, in line with the Paris Declaration, the use of country procurement systems, differing procedures of implementing partners such as UNDP, or changes in context, also added to the initial delays. Most programmes have only become operational on the ground during the latter part of the programme. This is particularly true for the regional programmes, which usually have additional layers of agreement and coordination to contend with.

Effective programme designs have sometimes been compromised by pressure to become operational too quickly. In cases where support was provided using the ***budget support modality*** (the preferred modality for GCCA support), indicators used for disbursement were not always appropriate to measure the targeted climate change adaptation or mitigation effects, since Performance Assessment Frameworks of national public policies do not always contain climate-related indicators. Greater effort is required, in future programming, ***to identify or help formulate indicators that align more effectively with GCCA objectives***. Adaptation of project monitoring to national performance systems was another challenge, especially in circumstances of sector or general budgetary support, as was the in Mozambique.

The GCCA has made ***a significant contribution to dialogue on climate change***, both within target countries, and at regional cooperation and global levels. In most cases, GCCA grants have supported policy debate on climate change and, in a few instances, this had led to raising climate change as a priority on the political agenda. In Jamaica, for example, GCCA contributed to the development of a Climate Change Policy Framework and Action Plan (Green Paper) and facilitated public consultations up to its presentation for Cabinet approval. GCCA also facilitated exchanges regarding good practices between countries, regions and the EU, as well as joint preparation of policy positions. Support for climate change negotiations, however, is spread over various national, regional and global actions, and there does not seem to be a clear division of responsibilities, in particular among Intra-ACP GCCA supported programme components (for details, refer to the Intra ACP Mid-Term Assessment).

The global services provided by the GCCA, in particular the organisation of two global policy events (one policy and one learning event) and the maintenance of a website and of a platform for exchanging ideas and experiences, have made ***an important contribution to learning and public awareness*** on global climate change issues affecting poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change. Still, the GCCA website could provide more complete and up-to-date information on all interventions supported by the programme. The GCCA website is an important communication tool for the programme; and a specific recommendation on the role of the website has been made which incorporates information received after the submission of the Draft Final Report. There is a strong interest, across stakeholder groups, in the organisation of more policy events, possibly at regional level, so that more stakeholders at regional and national levels can benefit. This would also be an opportunity to involve national and regional representatives of MS countries working on Climate Change in the region. The global support services have helped link national actions to regional and global policy processes and are generally much appreciated, but there is a need and scope for increased exchanges between the projects and programmes in the various countries. Better coordination of evaluation, identification and formulation missions is also desirable to allow for evaluation experience to feed properly into the design of new programmes.

The GCCA has proven to be ***a viable instrument for practical cooperation on climate action***. In most cases, in respect to the programmes/countries visited, the national GCCA programmes generate, or can be expected to generate tangible benefits for the most vulnerable populations, in terms of reduced poverty and vulnerability. In Ethiopia, for example, the GCCA contribution has helped establish a unique risk insurance facility for participating communities engaging in climate adaptation activities, which would compensate communities and individuals for any losses beyond those that they would normally have incurred when using the ‘traditional’ farming system.

Still, certain interventions clearly perform better than others, and success seems related to the presence of ***effective linkages to final beneficiary groups***. Non-state actors (NGOs and civil society groups) were found to play an important role in facilitating such functional linkages. Gender concerns are generally adequately incorporated into project design. With 70% of programmes this was found to be the case. Actual attention to gender during implementation depends much on the concerned governmental policies in this regard, and is more difficult to assess in the absence of gender disaggregated monitoring data.

While involvement of government institutions and NGOs in the programme is generally good, ***private sector involvement is still relatively weak***. This may be attributed to limited demand from countries to work with the private sector within the context of the GCCA. This seems to be largely due to the current conditions in the carbon markets, which do not provide strong incentives for Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) related action. None of the national programmes visited used GCCA support to strengthen participation in the CDM, though some of the regional, Intra-ACP GCCA supported programmes did. More focus should be put on identifying mechanisms to enhance private sector engagement, for example through funds that include access for private sector actors, such as Rwanda’s Fund for Environment and Climate Change (FONERWA).

Impacts of the programme at field level are, at the time of evaluation, still initial. This is primarily due to the fact most of the interventions assessed have only recently started to become fully operational. Moreover, the programme has a strong focus on capacity building and policy development, ***results and impacts of which are expected over the medium to long term.*** Generally, in cases where an intervention could build on solid existing structures, tangible impacts and benefits have been achieved quite quickly, in the form of adoption of improved varieties and increased crop yields. Ethiopia is an example of this. Even when no such structures were in place, such as in Belize, where the Intra-ACP and the national GCCA programmes built a Climate Change office from scratch, initial impacts were already becoming visible.

Though prospects for impact of the GCCA interventions are generally good, monitoring systems that would allow for assessing impacts were in most cases still weakly developed. This is partly due to limited attention for monitoring in the initial design of the action, partly to limited technical assistance available for the development of appropriate monitoring systems, including the establishment of baseline values. ***Greater attention for development of monitoring systems is required****.* In a few cases, for example Mauritius or Rwanda, where the GCCA programme is delivered under the budget support modality, and linked up to existing programmes on Sustainable Development and Land Reform respectively, GCCA support was found to be fully relevant from a development perspective. However, its impact on climate change was found to be rather indirect, due to a limited focus of the action on explicit climate change objectives. In a follow-up phase, such focus should be increased.

At country level, GCCA supported interventions are generally ***well harmonised with and linked to other climate change initiatives***. This is especially apparent in countries that actively coordinate donor action (example Burkina Faso) or where a donor takes a strong lead in a relevant sector. Still, in several cases, limited streamlining of procedures posed serious constraints to implementation, and improved communication and harmonisation is required. In a few countries, there is also scope for increased alignment of GCCA-supported initiatives with individual EU MS-funded climate activity. While the GCCA has fostered more of a joint European approach on climate change, and contributed to joint approaches among development partners (including USAID and SDC for example), this objective still requires a special effort, in particular from EU Member States many of whom prefer to directly finance their own climate initiatives. This is especially the case with MS with a long history of development cooperation. These MS, in the spirit of the Paris Declaration, do tend to be open to working jointly at the level of national programmes in “their” programme countries. Those MS with less “development cooperation experience” are more open to fully involve themselves under the GCCA umbrella. More focussed lobbying by GCCA/DG DEVCO directly with MS in Europe, through the various environment and climate policy directorates/ministries, using the positive experiences of the first phase, can contribute to broadening joint approaches with MS both nationally and regionally.

**Recommendations**

Ten policy level recommendations are made based on the results of the Evaluation’s fieldwork. The recommendations are based on a sample of national and regional projects evaluated and, as such, provide the basis for a number of strategic recommendations, rather than specific recommendations for the projects visited. While a number of action-oriented recommendations are made for each project visited - included in the Aide-Memoire completed for each project - the policy recommendations focus on the GCCA at the programme level. The supporting text for each recommendation expands on the recommendation and attempts to outline, in more detail, suggestions for the way forward. However, it remains outside the scope of the evaluation to develop a detailed work plan on how to transform the recommendations into actual financed interventions.

***Recommendation 1:***

Continued and increased support for GCCA climate action (GCCA+) is recommended*.*

*This recommendation is based on promising results and good overall performance of GCCA interventions, the realisation that climate action needs to be seen in a long-term perspective, as well as acknowledging the unique role that the EU can play in creating support for global climate change action. Continued support will need to build on existing experience, progressively improving institutional strengths, linkages and collaborative partnerships and encouraging innovative practices.*

*Continued support will also need to build on the pilot projects established during the first phase and, more importantly, the elaboration of a long-term strategy which specifies the roles of the various programme components (national and regional programmes; and support functions) and how they connect with, complement and reinforce each other.*

*This applies in particular to the Intra-ACP supported regional programmes, to ensure that they address the ACP regional climate change concerns while strengthening the global alliance between ACP countries, through shared and synergetic programming in line with article 32A of the Cotonou Agreement.*

***Recommendation 2:***

It is recommended that stronger linkages between national and regional GCCA programmes be established*.*

*The EU, as one of the few development partners that works with both Regional and National Programmes under its various funding mechanisms, is in a position to use its unique situation to ensure coordination and complementarity both within regions and between development partners (EU MS and other partners working on climate change). The EU’s added advantage, over and above the regional programming, is its role as an actor on the global environmental stage and, hence, the unique role of being able to foster linkages between national, regional and global levels. Linkages can go both ways - up-scaling from national to regional; and replication across the region. Pilot and demonstration activities supported by national GCCA programmes need monitoring for their suitability at the regional level. They should be used as sources of inspiration, actively promoted by the respective regional programmes, and, where possible, integrated into other national programmes. In this regard, the Regional Delegations would benefit by having a member of staff (preferably one already working at the Delegation on the environment and/or climate change portfolio) to formally include GCCA in their terms of reference, with the mandate to liaise both with the national programmes in “their” region as well as globally and with other EU regional climate change interventions.*

*The elaboration of comprehensive regional climate change strategies - which some regional programmes currently lack – should benefit from Intra-ACP GCCA support. For example, the CSF could make an important contribution to this end, as well as drawing support from the regional strategies of other development partners, where such strategies or programme initiatives exist.*

***Recommendation 3:***

It is recommended that the EU (at Commission and Delegation Level) intensify their lobbying efforts with policy makers in the MS, and with MS interventions in MS programme countries to raise awareness of the GCCA and develop joint intervention strategies focussing on climate change-related activities.

*While in some GCCA target countries a clear European response to climate change is emerging, EU services and Member States should, through the GCCA and other climate initiatives, play a more active role in* ***aligning, coordinating and harmonizing*** *European (EU and MS) support for climate action. The objective is to limit fragmentation.**Such a response should not be limited to involvement only at the national level in target countries of local representations, but should incorporate a regional vision - as well as targeted follow-up from GCCA/DG DEVCO with MS development partners back in Europe****.*** *Presently, levels of awareness of the GCCA among EU member states is not as well developed as it could be, pointing to the need for stronger lobbying efforts both at senior levels of the Commission with high level climate policy counterparts in the member states, as well as through the Delegations partnering in and/or jointly funding climate change interventions at national and regional level.*

*There is a tendency for newer MS, with a shorter history in international development/climate and more limited funds for such activities, to more closely align themselves with flagship programmes such as the GCCA. On the other hand, MS with a long history of interventions in the development/environment/climate change sectors are more likely to opt for continuing to support their own initiatives, while also continuing to contribute to multilateral agencies (dealing with climate-change and environment) which they have been supporting in the past.*

*In order to increase MS involvement with the GCCA, it is clear from the responses that the EU needs to raise the profile of the GCCA with MS, as* ***none*** *of those responding to the questionnaire sent to MS claim to be “****well aware****” of the GCCA. This will need to change through EU lobbying initiatives at EU-MS policy levels in Europe (such as the Climate Diplomacy Network, etc.); as well as at the level of the national/regional Delegations in their liaison with the national/regional programmes of MS.*

***Recommendation 4:***

It is recommended that the EU (as part of the implementation of their regional and national programmes) support long-term strategic planning and institutional capacity building for climate action at national and regional level in EU beneficiary countries.

*The objective of this recommendation is to ensure stronger regional and national ownership of the climate-change agenda. This should include: support for the establishment of National Climate Change Office/Departments with sufficient authority to define and influence national strategies, and to influence the development of regional (climate-action) strategies; and, in parallel, provide support for capacity building in these institutions to ensure adequate capabilities over the long-term. Additional technical assistance support - either long-term or as a series of short-term inputs using, for example, the Framework contract mechanism - could also be considered to increase support for national capacity building; in other cases GCCA support can be provided in the form of budget support. This could include technical assistance to facilitate budget support.*

***Recommendation 5:***

It is recommended that, when budget support for climate-change related interventions is provided, it should be tied to a clearly formulated procedure with corresponding climate related milestones monitored on a regular basis, which trigger further disbursements.

*In cases where interventions are delivered through* ***budget support****, greater effort is required to identify the most effective ways to achieve results. Key to this is the establishment of corresponding indicators, that meet both climate-related and, where directly applicable, poverty reduction objectives, in line with GCCA objectives.* *In cases of a relatively undefined operating environment, the role of indicators related to disbursement will be even more critical. Performance indicators should be developed for each individual action that maps out the evolution of that particular intervention. Where relevant, the experience with budget support from MS should be drawn on, as the EU is already involved, with other development partners in numerous Joint Assistance Strategies, many of which use the budget support modality. One key indicator of success will be the degree to which budgetary support contributes to long-term sustainability in the form of beneficiary countries progressively assuming financial responsibility for climate change related activity.*

***Recommendation 6:***

It is recommended that the EU uses its position on the European and International scene to mobilise high level policy support for global climate change action.

*This includes improving* ***coordination of the support*** *provided to climate change negotiations, mainstreaming of climate change and knowledge management between national, regional and global programmes, and between regional programmes. Particularly the EU needs to maximise the benefits of its unique position on both the European and the International scene, and its access to policy makers at high levels, to lobby for the coordination and streamlining of support. The EU also needs to use its unique position to ensure that advances made in research are integrated both into programmes working with CC in “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change”, as well as integrating research results into the climate change policy dialogue at the International and Global level.*

***Recommendation 7:***

It is recommended to promote stronger involvement of non-state actors and the private sector in GCCA-supported activities.

*It is important to promote stronger* ***involvement of relevant non-state actors*** *in GCCA-supported action (at both national and regional levels, as well as with NSA’s based in the North), in order to ensure proper engagement with, and capacity development of, the populations most vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Likewise, where possible,* ***engagement with the private sector*** *should be strengthened, for example through increased support for national climate action funds that include private sector support. Where relevant, GCCA-supported actions should also link up with the private sector support programmes funded by MS but which, thus far, have not developed a strong climate change focus.*

***Recommendation 8:***

It is recommended that the monitoring framework for the programme be strengthened*.*

*It is important to enhance* ***monitoring of regional and national programmes****, especially for more problematic programmes. Options for strengthened monitoring include: (1) a more pronounced role of the EU Delegations; (2) increased use of GSF and CSF services; and (3) procurement of technical backstopping services for the development and implementation of an impact monitoring system for the GCCA programme. The latter should include the development of an overall monitoring framework for the programme with - possibly - a number of compulsory indicators for all interventions.*

***Recommendation 9:***

It is recommended to intensify the facilitation of climate change learning communities and learning events (globally, regionally and nationally)

*The GCCA and its Support Facilities (GSF and CSF) should strengthen* ***facilitation and promotion of exchange of experience on climate action*** *across the GCCA-supported and other EU-funded projects working on climate change, through the organisation of global learning events and facilitation of learning communities. It would seem appropriate to complement global level events with regional events, fostering the participation of less involved target groups, notably of non-state actors including the private sector. National and regional EU delegations are seen as key actors, interlocutors and facilitators to achieve this.*

***Recommendation 10:***

It is recommended that the GCCA website become a more pro-active and inter-active tool in the GCCA communication strategy.

*The website should be seen as a proactive tool to increase GCCA visibility. The website could be a key platform for knowledge management in respect of regional and global learning events by adding a knowledge management function that makes best use of the electronic media to also encourage and incorporate feedback on an ongoing basis. The GCCA website is supposed to provide a platform for dialogue; however much more work can be done to ensure that feed-back “from the field” is incorporated. This includes, for example, capturing the follow-up from the “GCCA+ side-event” at the December 2014 COP 20, and building on this. The GCCA website should provide more up-to-date links to relevant outputs and documentation on the interventions supported under both the national and regional programmes.*

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Context of the evaluation

### 1.1.1 The evaluation assignment

This report is one of the two final outputs produced by the team responsible for the Evaluation of the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) and the Mid-Term Assessment of the Intra-ACP GCCA, This assignment was awarded under the Framework Contract EuropeAid/127054/C/SER/Multi - Lot 6: Environment. The Terms of Reference for the assignment are attached as *Annex 1*. For reasons relating to the assumed interaction and complementarity of the two programmes, it was decided to commission one single evaluation mandate to cover both programmes. However, as the programmes have different funding sources, two separate final reports were to be produced each covering one of the programmes. This report concerns the global programme.

The team was mobilised under the EURONET Consortium and comprised Mr Egger Topper (AGEG Consultants), evaluation and forestry specialist, and Mr Dean Pallen, climate change and evaluation expert (Baastel). Mr Pallen replaced Mr Alexandre Borde, economist and climate change expert, whose participation in the evaluation was limited to the initial phase. Mr.Topper and Mr. Pallen were supported by the Project Director, Mr Dolf Noppen (NCG) and Per Kirkeman (NCG), evaluation management experts. Short biographies of the team members are provided in *Annex 2.*

The assignment commenced in December 2013 with a desk phase. Field visits were undertaken between February and May 2014, while the months of June and July 2014 were dedicated to synthesis, reporting and presentations of the initial findings. The evaluators assessed a sample of six regional and ten national GCCA programmes.[[1]](#footnote-1) On the basis of several criteria developed for the Desk Report, the following countries were selected for three to five days’ field missions: In Asia: Nepal, Bhutan; In the Pacific: Fiji; In West Africa: Burkina Faso, Niger, Benin; In the Caribbean: Belize, Jamaica; In East Africa: Ethiopia, Rwanda; in Southern Africa: Zambia, Mozambique; and in the Indian Ocean region: Mauritius. In these countries, both regional and national-level interventions supported by either programme were assessed. A work calendar is provided in *Annex 7*. Subsequent to the presentation of the Draft Final report to the second Evaluation Reference Group meeting, on 6th of October 2014, a follow-up questionnaire survey was circulated to a sample of Member States focussing on MS awareness at headquarters level of the GCCA and MS technical and financial support to climate interventions in LDCs and SIDS. The questionnaire, as well as analysis of these responses and the agencies contacted, is included as Annex 9.

This report follows the desk report that outlined the proposed approach and methodology. Essentially, the final report aims to answer the ten main evaluation questions that were formulated during the Desk phase, using an evaluation matrix presented in *Annex 4A*. The report provides an analysis of findings, conclusions and recommendations for the Global GCCA programme, focusing on issues at the ‘macro-level’. It is complemented by a report on the evaluation of the Intra-ACP GCCA programme.

This report is based on the series of Mission Aide-Mémoires (presented in *Annex 3*) which are essentially short reviews of the national GCCA Programmes mentioned above and of the CSF. The findings and issues raised in the Aide-Mémoires provide the data foundation on which analysis of the GCCA global programme is based, and from which are derived the overall findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

The report is structured as follows: This introductory chapter provides background information on the GCCA initiative and the linkages between its various components. It goes on to explain how different instruments contribute to the operationalisation of the initiative. An understanding of this setup is essential for the way in which the evaluation is designed and conducted.

In chapter 1.2, the methodology used for data collection and analysis during the evaluation process is presented. It essentially consists of three elements: namely (1) the formulation of ten evaluation questions; (2) an evaluation matrix containing a set of evaluation questions and sub-questions covering the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, guiding the data collection; and (3) a scoring table reflecting performance of each of the projects and programmes evaluated according to the various evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. Further details on the methodology are provided in *Annex 4.* In chapter 1.2.5, some of the difficulties encountered during implementation of the assignment are discussed.

In Chapter Two, the main findings and answers to each of the ten Evaluation Questions (EQs) are presented along with evidence and reasoning. Chapter Three then synthesises all answers to evaluation questions into an overall assessment of the programme. Chapter Four, finally, presents the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from the evaluation. Chapter Five provides a listing of all annexes, which are submitted in full as a separate document (Volume 2).

### 1.1.2 The GCCA

The GCCA is an initiative of the European Union, launched in 2007 through a Communication (*COM (2007) 540 final)* from the European Commission to the Council and the European Parliament, entitled ‘*Building a Global Climate Change Alliance between the European Union and poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change’.* Implementation modalities of the Initiative have been further worked out in the Commission Staff Working Document - Implementation framework of the GCCA (July 2008).

The GCCA aims to strengthen dialogue and cooperation on the issue of climate change with those developing countries[[2]](#footnote-2) that are the most vulnerable to climate change, and to support their efforts to develop and implement adaptation and mitigation responses. The targeted countries have contributed the least to Green House Gas (GHG) emissions, but are often the most affected by climate change and have limited resources to address the related challenges. The GCCA involves a wide range of partners across the world, and is structured along two pillars:

1. *Policy dialogue and exchange*

The first pillar consists of a platform for dialogue and exchange. The GCCA enables dialogue between the EU and developing countries on climate policy, in the context of complex climate change negotiations under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). This result will be achieved by supporting the exchange of experience on practical approaches to integrate climate change into development policies and budgets. The results feed into the discussions on a post-Kyoto climate agreement, and inform the technical and financial cooperation supported by the GCCA. Dialogue takes place at global, regional and national levels.

1. *Technical and financial assistance and cooperation focusing on five priority areas*

The second pillar of the GCCA concerns providing technical and financial support and cooperation with the most vulnerable developing countries. The objective is to see climate change integrated into the development policies and budgets of vulnerable countries and to implement adaptation and mitigation interventions. To find the best solutions for tackling climate change, the GCCA works with government departments and agencies, regional organisations, non-governmental organisations, academic and scientific institutions, as well as the local representations of international organisations, multilateral and bilateral development agencies by pooling resources, expertise and knowledge. The technical and financial support and cooperation in turn informs the dialogue and exchange of experience at regional and global levels between the EU and partner countries.

For the purpose of the GCCA initiative, five priority areas have been defined:

1. *Mainstreaming climate change into poverty reduction and development efforts.* This means that the GCCA supports the systematic integration of climate change considerations into national development planning, from policymaking and budgeting to implementation and monitoring. This priority area, which focuses on institutional strengthening, is often combined with another priority, in particular *adaptation*.
2. The GCCA aims to help improve knowledge about the effects of climate change and the design and implementation of appropriate *adaptation* actions, in particular in the water and agriculture sectors. The objective of this priority area is to reduce the vulnerability of the population to the impacts of climate change. The GCCA builds on National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) and other national plans.
3. The third priority area is to *Reduce Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD).* In LDCs, 60% of the emissions originate from land use change, primarily deforestation. The GCCA supports solutions to reduce carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from deforestation and to create incentives for forest protection, while preserving those livelihoods and ecosystems that depend on forests.
4. Another priority area aimed at reducing GHG emissions is *enhancing participation in the global carbon market.* The GCCA aims to promote a more equitable geographic distribution of financing opportunities linked to the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) by building the capacities of partner countries to access this source of funding, particularly in the field of energy.
5. *Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)* is also among the five GCCA priority areas. It seeks to help developing countries to prepare for climate-related natural disasters, reduce their risks and limit their impacts.

In practice, an additional third pillar has been identified, which concerns the extensive *knowledge management and communication* activities, which constitute a joint effort by the various entities concerned with management of the two programmes (DEVCO C2, DEVCO E3, and the ACP Secretariat). The GCCA organisational structure is graphically depicted in *Annex 5.*

*Financial commitments*

Financial commitments to the GCCA amount to around 287 million EUR from the European Union (EU) budget, the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) and contributions from different Member States (MS)[[3]](#footnote-3). This includes 108 million EUR of fast-start-finance, respectively from the Development Cooperation Instrument (around 75 million EUR) and from Member States (around 33 million EUR). Amounts which were pledged at the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) 15th Conference of the Parties (COP) in Copenhagen in 2009, to support immediate action on climate change in developing countries.

The GCCA is supporting programmes to address climate change in more than 35 countries and four regions across the globe. Almost 200 million EUR have been committed to national programmes, and the GCCA supports the mainstreaming of climate change into national development planning in a majority of these 35 countries. Support is being provided to adaptation programmes in climate-sensitive sectors such as: agriculture; coastal zone management; as well as land and water management. The GCCA is also active in the fields of forest management, disaster risk reduction, and clean energy.

In addition to country level programming, the GCCA is active at the regional level, supporting programmes that tackle climate change issues that cut across international borders. This means pooling resources, strengthening capacities, sharing knowledge and working in partnership with those regional organisations already in place to build on existing activities and past successes. As of October 2014, 58.9 million EUR have been committed to regional programmes[[4]](#footnote-4), including a 37.5 million EUR contribution from the European Development Fund (EDF)-funded Intra-ACP (African, Caribbean and Pacific group of states) budget. The latter funding has resulted in a technical and financial support programme known as the Intra-ACP GCCA programme, comprising five regional components and Technical Assistance.

*Coordination and implementation*

The GCCA initiative is coordinated by the European Commission (EC), in particular by the Directorate General for Development and Cooperation (DG DEVCO)’s C2 Unit (Climate change, environment, natural resources). Overall technical and financial support is led by this same Unit, while the ACP-Secretariat (acting as the Contracting Authority) and DEVCO E3 (Regional programmes sub-Saharan Africa and ACP-wide Unit) are responsible for management of the 37.5 million EUR allocation of Intra-ACP budget to the initiative, commonly known as the Intra-ACP GCCA programme. A Global Support Facility (GSF) and a Climate Support Facility (CSF) provide technical assistance to the global and regional programmes.

The combination of financial instruments contributing to the same global initiative requires careful tailoring of institutional arrangements, structuring of the technical support services and of the national, regional and multi-country programmes in a coherent manner. The graph in *Annex 5* presents the overall GCCA organisational structure.

Given the organisational structure of the GCCA described above, it was decided to undertake one combined evaluation for the initiative, including the various funding sources.

## 1.2 Methodology

### 1.2.1 Evaluation questions

As reflected in the Desk Report’s section on methodology and approach to the assignment, the Evaluation Framework is built around ten evaluation questions (EQs) to provide structure to the evaluation process. The EQs are primarily based on the evaluation questions, sub-questions and ‘issues’ contained in the ToR (Terms of Reference), complemented by questions emerging from a first review of documentation. They have been grouped according to the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (although relevance and design have been separated) and re-formulated as follows:

On **relevance**:

1. To what extent are the climate change interventions aligned with the needs of beneficiaries (final beneficiaries, partner country governments and regional organisations) and with the stated policies, needs and priorities of the GCCA, EU and EU Member States?

On **design**:

1. To what extent is the intervention logic internally consistent and valid, coherent across different intervention levels, is it formalised in a logframe or other format, and is it actively used?

On **effectiveness**:

1. To what extent does the GCCA function as a platform for (political) dialogue and exchange between the EU and poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change[[5]](#footnote-5)? (= pillar 1 in the GCCA’s objective)?
2. To what extent does the GCCA constitute a viable instrument for practical cooperation to tackle the combined challenge of the fight against poverty and climate change? (= pillar 2 in the GCCA’s objective)?
3. To what extent has the programme contributed to effective capacity building (= an intermediate result contributing to achievement of objectives)?

On **efficiency**:

6. To what extent are institutional arrangements and implementation modalities for management of the interventions appropriate (i.e. based on realistic assessments of contexts and driven by principles of aid effectiveness) and functional?

7. To which extent has the programme established linkages and created synergies (at national, regional and ACP/global levels) with other, related actions, including EU instruments and actions, in line with the harmonisation principle?

On **impact**:

8. To what extent has the programme contributed to achievement of the overall objective, to help poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change, in particular LDCs and SIDS, to increase their capabilities to cope with the effects of climate change, in support of the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); and where it benefits their poverty reduction objectives, the alliance will also help such countries to participate in the global climate change mitigation effort, even if, as in the case of LDCs, they will not be required to make emission reduction commitments under a post-2012 agreement.

9. To which extent does the programme contribute to visibility and a good reputation of the EU’s and ACP’s actions in the field of climate change?

On **sustainability**:

10. To what extent are the conditions met and mechanisms in place to sustain programme results and ensure a continued flow of benefits to beneficiaries?

### 1.2.2 Evaluation Matrix

The ten Evaluation Questions were further broken down into sub-questions, as reflected in the evaluation matrix presented in *Annex 4A*. For each of the EQs, two to five judgement criteria were formulated (column 5), with corresponding indicators (column 6). Column 7 mentions the data and research actions required to answer the questions. Column 8 reflects the elements from the ToR that have been incorporated; It is also indicated when the evaluation team has added criteria that were not explicitly mentioned in the ToR.

The questions and sub-questions contained in the ToR were found to be of different orders; some were major evaluation questions and have been maintained as such; others have been converted into judgement criteria under the relevant EQ. In this way, all questions were classified and found their place in the evaluation matrix. Cross-cutting issues such as gender, and ‘horizontal issues’ such as technical cooperation and capacity development were also integrated into the EQs, in the form of judgement criteria.

The first two columns indicate whether the questions and criteria apply to the GCCA initiative, to the Intra ACP GCCA programme or to both. Where appropriate, separate questions and judgement criteria were formulated for the global and the Intra-ACP GCCA programme, in order to respond to their specific evaluation needs. Furthermore, the questions were tailored to the global/macro level and to the level of individual programmes (the ‘micro-level’), as appropriate.

Since no logical framework exists for the overall GCCA initiative to which the evaluation could refer, the evaluation team reconstructed a results chain, presented in *Annex 6,* which supported further elaboration of the evaluation matrix.

### 1.2.3 Scoring table

A third tool used for processing the large amount of data collected during the field phase is a scoring table, in which the various components and interventions evaluated across the 13 countries visited are reported, grouped by funding source, programme, region and/or component. The scoring table is presented in Annex 4B. For each of the EQs, a score was attributed, analogous to the scoring system in the Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) methodology (a score ranging from ‘A’ (very good) to ‘D’ (serious deficiencies). The resulting tables allow, on the one hand, for a synthesised overview of the performance of the various interventions in the different regions, and of evaluation questions and criteria for the Intra- ACP GCCA programme and the global GCCA and their various components, on the other. These are presented in Tables 1 and 2 in Chapter 3. Ratings are not to be considered ‘absolute’; they are meant to provide a broad sense of achievement. Their main purpose is to draw conclusions at the level of the overall GCCA initiative.

### 1.2.4 Synthesis

Following the field phase, the evaluation team had an opportunity to attend the second (annual) regional technical meeting of the GCCA Intra ACP Programme, organised in Brussels from 5-7 May 2014. This provided an excellent opportunity to fill a number of information gaps, to meet with more beneficiaries and stakeholders and to exchange initial findings with the evaluation managers.

Furthermore, a synthesis meeting was organised in Montreal (10-11 June, 2014), in order to summarize main issues (two to four) from each of the country and regional project and programme missions, to draft answers each of the evaluation questions, to distil preliminary conclusions and recommendations and to verify remaining information gaps. This laid the basis for the subsequent drafting of the two final reports.

### 1.2.5 Reflections on the methodology

During the evaluation and the field missions, the evaluation team encountered a number of difficulties and challenges, and several lessons were learned. The main ones revolve around the difficulties and challenges of attempting to draw important conclusions and recommendations on interventions within the very short amount of field time available per intervention. Typically, the evaluators would spend two to four days in the field for the country programme evaluations, sometimes combining the evaluations of country-level projects with that of regional programme components. While for some of the ‘simpler’ projects a four days’ visit did suffice (Rwanda, Benin, Jamaica) for some of the more complex programmes (Nepal, for example) programmes it was found to be insufficient. Consequently, in several cases (Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Bhutan), the team had to forsake actual field visits in order to be able to meet with stakeholder groups in the capital.

The time constraint is also due to the request that the evaluation cover both macro- and micro-level aspects of the interventions. It is indeed difficult to arrive at macro-level conclusions on each of the evaluation questions without proper understanding of the micro-level issues at hand. This implies that, in reality, the evaluators also undertook ten near-comprehensive evaluations of ongoing GCCA interventions. Many of the conclusions and recommendations actually apply to the micro-level and were found to be of great interest to the concerned EU Delegations and project implementers, but were not necessarily directly relevant to the overall GCCA evaluation. In future, for an evaluation involving the two levels, sufficient time should be allocated if both objectives are to be satisfied. As it was, national and regional interventions demanded and received a post-visit draft Aide-Memoire with, where relevant, recommendations at the intervention level. These drafts formed the basis of discussion and re-drafting following the active involvement of stakeholders. While this was not the intention initially - as project visits were seen as inputs into the overall programme evaluation rather than stand-alone outputs - additional days ended up being allocated to also elaborate on the Aide-Memoires so that they could also serve as inputs supporting the interventions visited, with recommendations made also at the intervention level.

For evaluators, there is a professional obligation to ensure that standard evaluation procedures are followed such as the triangulation of information. In this evaluation, due to the aforementioned time constraints, this was not sufficiently possible. This is why recommendations were made, to undertake more comprehensive evaluations for a number of the interventions studied, for example in the respective aide-memoires for the Nepal and the Benin programmes, as this was deemed the only way to properly understand what is taking place within these programmes. Nonetheless, while more information could have been gathered at intervention level to enrich individual Aide-Memoires, more than enough information was gathered during the field visits to provide inputs at the overall global programme level - which was always the objective of the field visits. The recommendations included in each Aide-Memoire, focussing on the actual intervention case studies, should be seen as an additional and somewhat unforeseen outcome. All the Aide-Memoires with their intervention level recommendations are included as Annex 3.

# 2 Main findings

In this chapter, the main findings and observations that together constitute answers to each of the ten Evaluation Questions, are presented, together with evidence and reasoning. Most of the findings refer to the judgement criteria and/or indicators that compose the evaluation matrix in *Annex 4.A*.

## 2.1 On relevance (problems and needs):

***EQ1. To what extent are the climate change interventions aligned with the needs of beneficiaries (final beneficiaries, partner country governments and regional organisations) and with the stated policies, needs and priorities of the GCCA, EU and EU Member States?***

* The GCCA-supported projects and programmes were by and large found to be relevant (50%) to highly relevant (40%) in relation to country and donor policies and/or needs of target groups. Only one out of the ten national programmes sampled was found to be less relevant – from the perspective of meeting GCCA objectives - and this seems to be related to the implementation modality of general budget support. While budget support is a good tool for alignment with country systems, reduced transaction costs and increased ownership, good indicators are required to ensure the achievement of planned results and coherence with other policies/strategies. In some of the countries visited that use budget support (Rwanda, Mauritius) it was found that the GCCA-supported climate action was not too well-targeted. In some cases, clear climate change strategies and action plans – from which appropriate indicators could be derived – are not in place. A good solution was adopted in Bhutan, where indicators for transfer of second or third tranche payments are defined in the course of the intervention. This is further discussed under EQ6 dealing with the question of implementation modalities.
* Where the interventions evaluated were considered to be highly relevant (Mozambique, Jamaica, Nepal, Bhutan) this was generally due to a good articulation of the intervention in terms of the needs both of the populations most vulnerable to climate change, as well as to national policies, strategies and priorities. The interventions would link to community adaptation plans and income generating activities, for example. In most other countries visited as part of the evaluation, while the linkage to national policies and strategies was generally clear, the actions would not always have clear benefits for final beneficiaries. In other words, while from a climate change policy point of view the programmes are generally relevant, not all generate direct tangible benefits for most vulnerable populations.
* Examples are the REDD programme in Burkina Faso or the energy efficiency and sustainable building programme in Mauritius. Both these programmes aim to improve legislation and/or the institutional framework that are supposed to generate positive impacts on vulnerable people on a longer term. In the case of Burkina Faso, the forestry sector supported by the GCCA is highly relevant for actions on CC and important for rural livelihoods, but forest governance is weak. The GCCA support aims to strengthen governance in this sector, but as the programme deals with institutional processes, benefits for vulnerable people are expected on a medium-long term. In the case of Mauritius, GCCA support for moving towards energy efficiency will contribute to help vulnerable households reduce their spending on energy utilities (as energy costs constitute a high expenditure for households including vulnerable households) and help reduce GHG. However, in the evaluator’s view, other actions addressing more specifically climate change-related threats to vulnerable households would have more direct and clearer benefits for the same households.
* All countries supported meet the general selection criteria, as specified in the GCCA implementation framework (the staff working document, 2007); they are LDCs and/or SIDS and show an interest in policy dialogue and cooperation on climate change with the EU. The degree to which national or sectorial policies on climate change are in place obviously varies, as does the political support for climate action. The capacities of EU Delegations for follow-up of the actions were generally adequate, but this was found to be much more of a constraint with regard to the regional programmes (as pointed out in the report on the Intra ACP GCCA) managed from a national EU Delegation.
* All interventions are built on existing actions, either by increasing funding for an existing climate action or by adding in a climate change component in another programme. In terms of aid effectiveness, GCCA’s role in enhancing funding for climate action of other agencies and building on existing initiatives clearly helps reduce transaction costs for the countries and reduces fragmentation of donor interventions. In a number of cases, there is specific added value of the GCCA-funding to an ongoing MS or multilateral organisation (DFID, DANIDA, UNDP or WB) as the GCCA funds add climate change objectives to an ongoing action or budget support (case Ethiopia, Bhutan) or allow for undertaking pilot projects on climate change (case Mozambique). The Ethiopian project, for example, clearly benefited from the structures (Sustainable Land Management programme) the GCCA action was grafted onto. In other cases, the GCCA funds essentially reinforce climate action interventions lead by other donors (MS and others), increasing the financial means (case Nepal, Burkina Faso, Mauritius). In all cases, it was found that GCCA programmes, since they build on existing programmes – even in cases where they bring in a specific climate focus - tend to produce relatively quick and convincing results. This has resulted in the national GCCA programmes producing results in a fairly short period of time, generally speaking. The GCCA programmes are building on successful networks, working relationships, and previous capacity building. This does not mean they are simply extending previous project activity. For example in Belize, the UNDP had worked hard to establish relationships with the Government of Belize. This enables GCCA Belize to, in turn, play a critical role in creating a national climate change office in that country.

**Lesson learned 1: Grafting national-level GCCA-support onto existing projects and programmes (in agriculture, water management or other sectors) rather than identifying new projects is found to be an effective strategy for quick and good results.**

* In general, it was found that a key success factor is the identification of the right organisation to lead or undertake the GCCA intervention, and then supporting it so that it is capable of achieve the expected results. However, in many cases, responsibilities for climate action would not yet have been so clearly defined at the time of GCCA funds coming in. Moreover, the political situation and priorities in “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change” tends to evolve fast. In most cases, important organisational issues needed to be addressed before meaningful climate action plans could be made and implemented. This resulted in considerable time being consumed before some national programmes became operational ‘on the ground’. Identification of the right entry point for EU-supported climate action was most challenging in Mauritius and Rwanda, and to some extent in Mozambique: all countries where the budget support modality was applied.
* The examples of Belize and Jamaica show that having a ‘champion’ is highly instrumental; through different GCCA means, the CCCCC and UNDP helped create the Climate Change Office in Belize. The Climate Change Division in Jamaica came into existence after the GCCA programme had started, and some of the programme’s activities were then adopted by the Climate Change Division. Once a climate change office is established, climate change action can then be properly coordinated and resources mobilised. This, in turn, points to the general need for climate change to be sufficiently high on the political agenda, which is still not the case in some of the target countries; high level political support for climate change action was found to be one of the key success factors for the national GCCA programmes.
* Also, GCCA supported action was found to be most effective in those countries where a long-term Strategy or Plan for Climate Change is in place, to which GCCA support can be linked. However, not all target countries have such climate change plans or strategies in place. Where they do not exist or are not operational, the GCCA has tried to present itself as an opportunity to support the development of an institutional framework and local capacities. In some countries, stakeholders referred to a need for a ‘change in culture’, the development of a long-term vision and the creation of proper structures for undertaking climate action as basic conditions for successful action.
* Joint programming with Member States is also acknowledged by the MS as being a positive result at national and regional levels, with considerable value added. In addition, the point made by a number of MS, namely that channelling funds through the GCCA enables MS - even those with their own bilateral/regional programmes - to also contribute to interventions in those countries very vulnerable to climate change where the MS does not have bilateral interventions.

**REC: It is recommended that the EU (as part of the implementation of their regional and national programmes) support long-term strategic planning and institutional capacity building for climate action at national and regional level in EU beneficiary countries.**

* *The objective of this recommendation is to ensure stronger regional and national ownership of the climate-change agenda. This should include: support for the establishment of National Climate Change Office/Departments with sufficient authority to define and influence national strategies and to influence the development of regional (climate-action) strategies; and, in parallel, provide support for capacity building in these institutions to ensure adequate capabilities over the long-term. Additional technical assistance support - either long-term or as a series of short-term inputs using, for example, the Framework contract mechanism - could also be considered to increase support for national capacity building; also in some cases GCCA support can be provided in the form of budgetary support. This could include technical assistance to facilitate budget support.*

## 2.2 On design:

***EQ2. To what extent is the intervention logic internally consistent and valid, coherent across different intervention levels, is it formalised in a logframe or other format, and is it actively used?***

* Logframes exist for each of the Programmes. In 30% of the national GCCA Programmes, there are issues with the consistency or completeness of the logical framework or specific intervention logics. But in general, the design of the programmes is appropriate, and well in line with global GCCA objectives and expected results. The evaluation team notes that ROM missions have sometimes focused strongly on inadequate logical frameworks and implementation delays, without proper acknowledgement of the initial investments required for starting up meaningful climate activities.
* The effective use of logical frameworks as a basis for result-oriented management and reporting also varies. In the case of Benin, the logical framework was found to require a major revision and update for it to serve as an instrument for planning and monitoring. In the case of Mozambique, linkage of the logical framework for the GCCA action – which has indicators for the outcome/impact level - to a national reporting system that focuses more on inputs and outputs only, was found to be another challenge. Reconciliation and integration of the two monitoring approaches, however, is ongoing.
* The main design issue, however, relates to use of the budget support modality, in which case indicators used are not always fully relevant to measure effects of climate action (case Rwanda, Mauritius, Mozambique). While budget support is centred on the establishment of a performance monitoring system, the related disbursement criteria are not necessarily appropriate to facilitate tangible results or policy dialogue on climate change. According to the EC, the variable tranche indicators are supposed to be selected in agreement with the authorities, and in co-ordination with other budget support development partners, using the indicators from a Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) of the public policy[[6]](#footnote-6). However, PAFs do not necessarily contain useful indicators related to climate change action or appropriate to measuring progress in this field. In such cases, it should be considered to formulate relevant indicators, even if they are not yet part of the formal PAF, which could eventually be incorporated in the public policy PAF.

**REC: It is recommended that, when budget support for climate-change related interventions is provided, it should be tied to a clearly formulated procedure with corresponding climate related milestones monitored on a regular basis, which trigger further disbursements.**

* In this regard, the mission found the phased approach to identification of performance indicators, as applied in Bhutan, useful; only indicators for release of a first variable tranche were established at the start of the intervention, with indicators for subsequent disbursements left to be established in the course of the action. As institutions responsible for climate change action are often not fully geared to work on climate change, and capacities are not always in place, it was found to be useful to make identification of appropriate indicators part of a joint review mission, one or two years after start of the action.

**Lesson learned 2: In the context of budget support, given that it is often not well understood how an activity results in improved circumstances relative to climate change, realistic indicators for achievement of relevant results and disbursement may best be identified in the course of the action, as structures and systems materialise and the action evolves.**

* Gender concerns are generally adequately incorporated into the project design. The programmes in Ethiopia, Rwanda, Mozambique, Belize, Jamaica, Nepal and Bhutan (70% of the programmes evaluated) were found to be sufficiently gender-specific in their design. This statement does not refer to actual implementation where it was more difficult to assess in the absence of gender disaggregated monitoring data. Positive examples which can be mentioned are, for example, the experience from Jamaica. There was strong female participation in the Jamaica GCCA with women playing critical roles throughout its implementation. Moreover, most key posts with government partners were occupied by women.

## 2.3 On effectiveness (achievement of purpose):

***EQ3. To what extent does the GCCA function as a platform for (political) dialogue and exchange between the EU and poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change? (= pillar 1 in the GCCA’s objective)?***

* All national programmes evaluated have made a satisfactory to significant contribution to dialogue on climate change and to exchanges of experience within and between countries, and between countries and the European Union. Overall performance on this evaluation question criterion is good. All programmes have served as an opportunity for discussion, between the EU Delegations and concerned countries and have led to identification of appropriate actions. While in most cases, climate change was already well on the agenda (Ethiopia, Mozambique) with actions ongoing, in a number of cases (Jamaica, Belize, Bhutan, Burkina Faso) the GCCA has clearly contributed to raising the priority of climate change – or related action, such as REDD – as an issue on the political agenda.
* In Belize, this contribution was found to be most explicit, which is in all probability linked to the existence of Climate Change offices benefiting directly from GCCA support. Obviously, in most national programmes, the focus is on national-level awareness, processes for dialogue and strategy processes. In several cases (Nepal, Mozambique, Mauritius), such dialogue is led by one of the EU Members States, on behalf of the Development Partners, with the EU Delegation in a secondary or ‘silent’ role. Even then, it has allowed the concerned EU Delegation to take part in the climate change dialogue and debate, and bring its specific concerns to the fore (as was the case of Rwanda and Mauritius, for example).
* An issue that emerged relates to the coordination of GCCA support for climate change negotiation actions, between the various national and regional actors. There appears to be limited coordination of actions concerning (climate-related) political dialogue and negotiations. This was very prominent in the review of the Intra-ACP programme, and this is discussed in more detail in the report on the Mid-Term Evaluation of the GCCA Intra-ACP programme.

**REC: It is recommended that the EU uses its position on the European and International scene to mobilise high level policy support for global climate change action.**

* *This includes improving* ***coordination of the support*** *provided to climate change negotiations, mainstreaming of climate change and knowledge management between national, regional and global programmes, and between regional programmes. Particularly the EU needs to maximise the benefits of its unique position on both the European and the International scene, and its access to policy makers at high levels, to lobby for the coordination and streamlining of support.*
* The GCCA learning events, in particular the two global learning events held in September 2012 and September 2013, have played a very important role in linking the national experiences to regional and global policy processes. The people met in the countries, who had participated in one of these events, reported enthusiastically about the benefits from their participation in terms of networking, motivation and inspiration. Likewise, organisation of four regional dialogue events on climate change between the European Union and target countries has clearly generated knowledge and allowed for the development of networks between national and regional actors, encouraging linkages with EU structures.
* The networks established through these events are solidifying further thanks to the functioning of the Capacity 4 Development public group on the GCCA Community Forum and the private GCCA Community group[[7]](#footnote-7). This group is an initiative of the Directorate General for Development and Cooperation – EuropeAid Unit C2 - Climate change, environment and natural resources, with the objective to share information about environment, climate change, green economy and to exchange experiences and good practice. The group has 245 members from across the globe, with extensive blog posts and serves as a platform for exchange of tools and methods, training materials as well as facilitating useful links among its members.
* Nonetheless, there is clearly scope for more exchange between the programmes in the various countries. Lessons learnt in one country do not always feed into the development of action in other countries[[8]](#footnote-8). There have been some contacts between countries for an exchange of approaches, but in some cases projects could benefit more from existing experience, or put their experience to the benefit of others. In the case of mangrove plantation and management, as a practice for coastal protection and climate adaptation, for example, exchanges between the GCCA-supported programmes in Jamaica and Guyana would seem highly beneficial to both. In other countries (Bhutan, Nepal), an interest in increased opportunities for exchange of experience was clearly expressed. Such exchange requires that the global or regional learning events to be accessible to interested stakeholders, and a strengthening of such events is therefore recommended. In view of a follow-up phase (GCCA+), increased use of existing experience to feed into identification of new interventions is considered essential.

**REC: It is recommended to intensify the facilitation of climate change learning communities and learning events (globally, regionally and nationally)**

* *The GCCA and its Support Facilities (GSF and CSF) should strengthen* ***facilitation and promotion of exchange of experience on climate action*** *across the GCCA-supported and other EU-funded projects working on climate change, through the organisation of global learning events and facilitation of learning communities. It would seem appropriate to complement global level events with regional events and foster participation of less involved target groups, notably of non-state actors including the private sector. National and regional EU delegations are key actors, interlocutors and facilitators to achieve this.*

***EQ4. To what extent does the GCCA constitute a viable instrument for practical cooperation to tackle the combined challenge of the fight against poverty and climate change? (= pillar 2 in the GCCA’s objective)?***

* It is important to note, as an overall comment, that the conclusions addressing the extent to which GCCA tangible benefits have been achieved needs to be placed within the context of how the choice of field visits was arrived at. While conclusions are based on a sample of countries visited during the fieldwork; and while the sample was as representative as possible, it cannot be characterised as being truly “random” in the statistical sense of the word, as - on the advice of DEVCO and of the Delegations - a number of initially selected projects/countries had to be changed for various reasons. Nevertheless, the evaluators are able to refer to cases that showed ‘satisfactory or good performance scoring’ where the tangible benefits for the most vulnerable groups criterion was most directly measured. Six out of ten (60%) of national programmes performed well, four (40%) less well. Three out of five (60%) regional programmes performed well, two (40%) less well. Hence, in most cases - even taking into account that the sample *senso stricto* was not scientifically “random” - the overall GCCA programme was seen as providing tangible benefits for the most vulnerable populations. (See also Tables 1 and 2 in Chapter 3)
* While the programme performed well in terms of contributing to dialogue and exchange on climate change (ref: EQ3), its overall effectiveness as an instrument for practical cooperation to tackle both climate change and poverty alleviation simultaneously is less evident. Most national-level GCCA-supported actions projects are still in an initial stage and longer-term benefits in terms of reduced poverty have yet to materialise. Nonetheless most, but not all, project activities make, or are expected to make, a contribution to poverty alleviation.
* Several projects contribute very clearly to poverty alleviation (Ethiopia, Jamaica, Bhutan), as they are directly linked to structures representing groups affected by climate change, focus on adaptation or disaster risk reduction and/or include income generating activities. Other programmes have less direct or less automatic linkages to poverty alleviation, especially when they focus on mainstreaming of climate change into policies, on promoting climate mitigation action (example Mauritius), CDM or REDD (example Burkina Faso). Nonetheless, in all GCCA priority areas of action, there is sufficient scope for poverty alleviation provided that linkages to vulnerable groups are properly established.
* Four out of ten actions perform below the mark, on this criterion. Lower effectiveness is not necessarily linked to the area of action – though REDD appears to contribute less obviously to poverty alleviation – nor is it linked to a specific implementation modality (budget support versus project approach or sector programme modality) or management mode (centralised versus joint management). It is primarily explained by a failure to establish effective linkages to the final beneficiaries of the action. This can be due to a variety of reasons. In Benin, for example, the expertise required for proper community involvement had not been fully mobilised while actions were already being conducted on the ground; such an approach, where activities are implemented without community support is considered to be full of risks. In Mauritius, the focus was on energy efficiency and sustainable building construction and design, themes with a rather remote connection to poverty reduction, in general, and vulnerable populations, in particular. In Nepal, the programme has a great potential to alleviate poverty, as it is very well rooted in local government and community structures, with strong support from local NGO’s, but institutional implementation arrangements have so far prevented effective action on the ground. In Burkina Faso, the REDD action has a potential to benefit poor groups affected by climate change as well, but the programme has only just started.
* In cases where the actions do not make a clear contribution to poverty alleviation, this is often due to limited or non-involvement of relevant non-state actors, be it community-based organisations or other civil society actors. In most cases, effective involvement of poor groups affected by climate change requires the involvement of an intermediary organisation that can help organise communities or vulnerable groups. Therefore, the evaluation team concludes that the capacity-building objective of the GCCA programme needs to be followed through with a long-term perspective starting with a next phase of the GCCA, and needs to involve relevant NSAs in order to bear fruit.
* Limited effectiveness, in terms of GCCA as a practical cooperation instrument, is also explained by slow start-up phases, even though most programming activities were integrated into existing projects and programmes. This was mostly due to a need to define the right mechanisms for dealing with multiple funding sources, multiple sectors and/or multiple implementing partners, and should not necessarily be seen as time lost; instead it is supposed to contribute to proper preparation for implementation. There are no easy short-cuts around these constraints, but the programme could learn from the experiences in other sectors such as water or energy, which are also cross-sectoral in nature. Sector working groups, which work towards joint programming and harmonised approaches, and which have a lead donor chairing the donor working group, can contribute to development and use of a single set of monitoring and financial procedures, including joint-evaluations. However, donor platforms do not exist in all GCCA countries, and when they exist they are not necessarily operational.
* Private sector involvement in the programme is relatively weak. This is partly due to the weakness of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), one of the GCCA’s priority areas of action; none of the national programmes visited used GCCA support to strengthen participation in the CDM, though some of the regional, Intra-ACP GCCA supported programmes do.[[9]](#footnote-9) Clearly, conditions in the carbon markets do not provide strong incentives for CDM-related action. However, the private sector does often come in as a service provider in the development of community infrastructure (for example in Nepal, Burkina Faso), rather than as a direct target group.
* Stronger engagement of the private sector seems to require the development of climate change Funds using Calls for Proposals that allow for eligibility for private sector operators. A good example of such a Fund is the FONERWA (a national climate change and environment fund) found in Rwanda, established in 2012. It is a well-developed mechanism for the allocation of climate funds[[10]](#footnote-10) to the most competitive proposals, including from governmental, civil society organisations and the Private Sector. It applies an innovative approach whereby government institutions need to compete on an equal basis with private sector and civil society organisations for limited funds in a fully competitive process. At the time of the conception of the GCCA action in Rwanda it was considered to be still insufficiently defined to qualify for GCCA funding support, but future support to such National Funds is seen as being a feasible approach to strengthen private sector engagement in climate action.

**REC: It is recommended to promote stronger involvement of non-state actors and the private sector in GCCA-supported activities.**

* *It is important to promote stronger* ***involvement of relevant non-state actors*** *in GCCA-supported action (at both national and regional levels, as well as with NSA’s based in the North), in order to ensure proper engagement with, and capacity development of, the populations most vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Likewise, where possible,* ***engagement with the private sector*** *should be strengthened, for example through increased support for national climate action funds that include private sector support, such as the FONERWA in Rwanda. Where relevant, GCCA-supported actions should also link up with the private sector support programmes funded by MS but which, thus far, have not developed a strong climate change focus.*
* In terms of GCCA priority areas and sectors, all interventions except the one in Mauritius, concern the sectors (agriculture, water, natural resource management and disaster risks) most relevant to vulnerable populations, with a clear scope to alleviate poverty. The REDD actions (case Burkina Faso) require specific attention to ensure REDD-benefits would indeed accrue to the most vulnerable populations, and corresponding recommendations were made in the relevant Aide Memoire (*Annex 3.4*).
* The national programmes visited did not include any action focusing on CDM or other carbon trade, but the West-African regional GCCA programme (managed by ECOWAS/CILSS) has trained and accompanied twenty six (26) proponents of carbon projects to submit their Project Idea Notes (PINs) for funding. It is recommended (in the concerned Mission Aide Memoire) that sufficient financial and human resources be made available to maximise chances for these projects to be financed and implemented, since they can make a direct contribution to poverty alleviation. To this end, a partnership was established between CILSS and the UNFCCC/CDM Secretariat based in Bonn.

***EQ5. To what extent has the programme contributed to effective capacity building (= an intermediate result contributing to achievement of objectives)?***

* The overall picture emerging is that most of the programmes visited (representing one third of all programmes) make some contribution to the development and use of new capacities for climate action, but that only a few make a significant contribution. In some cases (Ethiopia, Jamaica) this contribution was very convincing, at all levels from national-level government down to the community level, thanks to explicit training activities for project partners by experts, organisation of target groups, and preparation of information and technology packages targeting communities. In the case of Belize, the national Climate Change Office has been made operational due, in large part, to the contribution of the national GCCA programme working in collaboration with the regional Intra-ACP Regional Programme for the Caribbean. The Belize Climate Change Office, for example, is staffed by competent professionals with climate change backgrounds. In a short time, the office has been able to become the focal point for climate change activity in the country and is relied upon by the Minister of the Environment for guidance.
* The GCCA Capacity Building objective strongly benefits from activities undertaken from the central level (GCCA) and under the Intra-ACP GCCA programme. In particular, mainstreaming of climate change into national policies and strategies has been fostered by the Global Support Facility (GSF) and by Climate Support Facility (CSF) of the Intra-ACP GCCA programme for the West-African countries. This is extensively discussed in the report on the mid-term evaluation of the Intra-ACP GCCA programme. As mentioned under EQ3, EC and GSF lead global policy events and the Capacity 4 Development network and platform also make important contributions to the capacity development objectives of the programme. Their actual impact has not been measured, though.
* In Mozambique, the mobilisation of a high number of actors (> 200) through the small grants programme also contributes indirectly but importantly to development of capacities of many actors for undertaking climate action.

**Lesson learned 3: Small grants programmes are capable of contributing significantly to the GCCA’s capacity building objective thanks to mobilisation of a high number of civil society and/or governmental actors.**

* In two countries of the ten country interventions evaluated, the capacity building objective was less effective. This was partly due to the nature of the instrument chosen (budget support, in the case of Rwanda), even though this would not preclude a separate capacity building or technical assistance component. Capacity building to the concerned (Land Reform) programme was being delivered through UK-funded technical assistance, but was not focused on capacities for climate change adaptation. In the case of Benin, provisions for capacity development were made, but due to implementation constraints the related activities had not started.
* The technical assistance provided under the programme to country programmes (cases Bhutan, Ethiopia, Mauritius) and as part of the GSF, was generally much appreciated, well adapted to local contexts and complementing national expertise, in line with principles of the EU Backbone Strategy on technical assistance. In one case (Burkina Faso), it was felt that the World Bank (WB) could have made better use of nationally available experts. For Mozambique, a recommendation to use the Climate Support Facility to greater advantage was made.
* That said, capacity development still remains a major challenge in most target countries. Capacities for integration of climate change in sectoral plans or into projects are generally still weak, in particular at local level. In most cases, technical assistance is required and foreseen to upgrade existing capacities, including in situations where GCCA funding is provided as budget support.

**REC: It is recommended that the EU (as part of the implementation of their regional and national programmes) support long-term strategic planning and institutional capacity building for climate action at national and regional level in EU beneficiary countries.**

* *The objective of this recommendation is to ensure stronger regional and national ownership of the climate-change agenda.[[11]](#footnote-11) This should include: support for the establishment of National Climate Change Office/Departments with sufficient authority to define and influence national strategies and to influence the development of regional (climate-action) strategies; and, in parallel, provide support for capacity building in these institutions to ensure adequate capabilities over the long-term. Additional technical assistance support - either long-term or as a series of short-term inputs using, for example, the Framework contract mechanism - could also be considered to increase support for national capacity building; also in some cases GCCA support can be provided in the form of budgetary support. This could include technical assistance to facilitate budget support.*

## 2.4 On efficiency (sound management and value for money):

***EQ6. To what extent are institutional arrangements and implementation modalities for management of the interventions appropriate (i.e. based on realistic assessments of contexts and driven by principles of aid effectiveness) and functional?***

* At first sight, institutional modalities and/or management modes/arrangements seem to constitute the most problematic aspect of the GCCA programme. This is due to the involvement of a multitude of sectors and actors, and the presence of several administrative layers. Most country programmes have suffered considerable delays due to complex institutional and implementation arrangements requiring clarification. In some cases, use of local systems has also implied delays in delivery of the programmes. This is, in part, a consequence of the approach adopted by the EC whereby GCCA funds are linked to existing projects and programmes, rather than new programmes, involving other donors and implementers. While this results in initial delays, in the end, the approach adopted does foster national ownership.
* In most national programmes, the phase of developing appropriate implementation arrangements has been overcome, though, and the basis for longer-term support for climate action has been laid. In 70% of the projects evaluated they do not pose major problems anymore. In the evaluator’s view, the clarification of institutional arrangements and management modes should be seen as an investment that should be further capitalized upon. In order to achieve significant impact, and to continue and increase support for GCCA climate action (GCCA+) in a long-term perspective, it will be necessary to build on coalitions, institutional bases and collaborative arrangements as well as pilot projects established during the first phase.
* While in many countries the GCCA develops partnerships with other agencies, in order to reduce fragmentation and improve harmonisation of practices, in some of the programmes institutional or management issues seriously hamper progress. This is especially the case when several donors and implementing organizations are involved in delivery of the action. The roles of each of the partners are often not clearly defined and still need to be agreed upon. Financing arrangements as well as accountability and reporting requirements of donors and implementing agencies often differ, despite adherence to the principles of the Paris Declaration. In Nepal, for example, use of EU funds for Calls for proposals was constrained by the EU requirements for such calls, which differ from DFID/UK requirements, and better alignment is still required. Similarly in Mozambique, considerable effort has been made to adhere to the Paris Declaration and this has not happened without considerable challenges.

**Lesson learned 4: Despite common adherence to principles of the Paris Declaration, EU-based donor requirements still require further alignment to make delegated management work properly.**

* Of the projects visited, implementation challenges were most obvious in the Nepal and Benin projects. In the case of Benin, where programme management is delegated to UNDP, the layer of UN administrative complexity additional to that of the national government resulted in serious delays. Slack project management and a degree of inefficiency in solving problems between UNDP and the government were also observed. The same applies for Nepal, where UNDP is involved in delivery of the action in collaboration with national authorities. It was also found that the UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality sometimes constrains UNDP in recruiting the required human resources at competitive conditions. Moreover, in the case of Nepal, the action has been delegated for management to DFID as the lead donor, which adds one more administrative layer.
* In cases of important institutional or management constraints, such as Benin or Nepal, the evaluation team has recommended that external mid-term evaluation missions be undertaken focusing on these issues.
* The principle of using the project implementation modality – for delivery of GCCA support - only when conditions for Budget Support are not in place, is fully justified from an aid-effectiveness point of view. However, as the Mauritius and Rwanda examples illustrate, the use of budget support also implies certain constraints. The main implication is the use of agreed performance indicators, in situations where appropriate indicators for climate change action do not necessarily exist, within the Performance Assessment Frameworks. This was discussed under EQ 1 and a corresponding recommendation has been formulated.
* It was observed that, in several cases, the GCCA actions had been identified and formulated in a relative hurry, compromising on the identification of the most appropriate action, intervention logics or indicators. While this could be justified for the first phase, with availability of Fast Start Funds, this should not be the case for identification and formulation of follow-up action.
* The evaluator also noted – in particular on missions to Mauritius and Rwanda – that timing of the evaluation mission would overlap with that of identification or formulation missions for follow-up action. As a result, recommendations from the evaluation could not be fully considered for formulation of the next implementation phase. Such situations should be avoided as much as possible, so lessons learned can properly feed into the formulation phase.

***EQ7. To which extent has the programme established linkages and created synergies (at national, regional and ACP/global levels) with other, related actions, including EU instruments and actions, in line with the harmonisation principle?***

* Harmonisation and linking of GCCA support with other (climate) action is generally satisfactory to very good, in particular in those countries –such as Burkina Faso or Rwanda - where government takes active charge of donor coordination. In 30% of the countries visited (Ethiopia, Rwanda, Burkina Faso) linkages and synergies were found to be very good.
* Linkages and harmonisation are especially good in countries where a particular donor takes a clear lead in the relevant sector. In Rwanda, for example, DFID is the lead donor on the (land reform and registration) programme that benefits from GCCA support in the form of budget support, alongside Dutch and Swedish support for specific programme components. Likewise, in Ethiopia, the action clearly benefits from the long-term BMZ[[12]](#footnote-12)-supported Sustainable Land Management Programme (2005-2014) that the GCCA action was grafted onto.
* In Burkina Faso, the government strives for a clear labour division and complementarity of donor support (EU/World Bank, African Development Bank) through an active sector coordination group and the creation of a single steering committee for different projects within the same sector. Still, the linkage with regional actions, and in particular activities aimed at mainstreaming climate change into policies and strategies, and the exchange of knowledge and experience, could be better aligned with regional and global level initiatives - in this case the CILSS[[13]](#footnote-13) regional programme and the Climate Support Facility (CSF). A recommendation related to this concern has been formulated as *REC.2* concerning the collaboration between GCCA-supported projects and programmes.
* In most GCCA countries, the division of labour among donors - in line with the Paris Declaration - has allowed the programme to build upon existing initiatives lead by one of the Member States (examples Mozambique, Nepal, Belize) or another Development Partner such as UNDP (case Benin) or World Bank (case Burkina Faso). This has resulted in projects becoming operational in a relatively short time – even if identification of appropriate management arrangements would still consume considerable time and energy. But in several cases (Ethiopia, Mozambique), this gave the programme a head start and allowed for rapid achievement of tangible results.
* At the same time, however, the Delegation Agreements with Member State agencies or multilateral agencies result in a reduction of oversight and control on the part of the EU Delegations. This was found to be an obstacle to progress of the actions in Nepal and Benin, for example. This seems to be a dilemma that is hard to get around, other than through improved communication between partners involved.
* Still, there is room for improved harmonisation in another 30% of the projects visited, in particular in Nepal and Bhutan. In Nepal, many EU Member States (Finland, Netherlands, Denmark, and Germany, among others) have programmes and projects, but in the field of climate change their initiatives are hardly harmonised or aligned. Furthermore, other donors (USAID, ADB and others) also have important climate change programmes. An exchange of experience is happening but proper coordination is still lacking. In Bhutan, there is room for an increased role of the GCCA action in triggering active donor coordination in the renewable natural resources sector.
* At the same time, it was found that there is very limited interaction between the national GCCA programmes and the respective regional GCCA programmes, supported under the Intra-ACP funding. The evaluators have come across national and regional programmes operating from the same capital (Ouagadougou, Addis Ababa), which had had virtually no interaction or any joint planning. Likewise, lessons learned from pilot experiences developed in national programmes rarely find their way into regional programming. This seems partly due to a limited focus, in national programmes, on promotion of initiatives that could address needs of multiple countries. In part, it also seems due to a limited interest, from regional programmes, for pilot or demonstration activities in country programmes that could inspire regional pilot activities.
* Greater interaction and synergy between the national and the regional GCCA programmes is therefore required. National programmes can rarely satisfy all needs, in particular when it comes to technical capacity building of national partners. Regional programmes should better identify those gaps and needs in national programming that are of regional interest, and pick up those successful interventions that have a potential for up-scaling at regional level.
* At central (DEVCO Headquarters, ACP Secretariat) and de-central (EU Delegations) management levels, efforts are clearly being made to ensure the various GCCA related initiatives, in particular the global and Intra-ACP strands of the overall GCCA initiative, do communicate and are properly coordinated. An important achievement is participation in each other’s Steering Committee meetings and other relevant events. This has started to result in increased exchanges and coordination of activities, and a strengthened network of climate action practitioners. Details on tangible cooperation results are reported in the Aide Memoire on the CSF and Technical Assistance to the ACP Secretariat, included in the report on evaluation of the Intra ACP GCCA.

**REC: It is recommended that stronger linkages between national and regional GCCA programmes be established.**

* *The EU, as one of the few development partners that works with both Regional and National Programmes under its various funding mechanisms, is in a position to use its unique situation to ensure coordination and complementarity within regions and between development partners (EU MS and other partners working on climate change). The EU’s added advantage, over and above the regional programming, is its role as an actor on the global environmental stage and, hence, the unique role of being able to foster linkages between national, regional and global levels. Linkages can go both ways - up-scaling from national to regional; and replication across the region. Pilot and demonstration activities supported by national GCCA programmes need monitoring for their suitability at the regional level. They should be used as sources of inspiration, actively promoted by the respective regional programmes, and, where possible, integrated into other national programmes. In this regard, the Regional Delegations would benefit by having a member of staff (preferably one already working at the Delegation on the environment and/or climate change portfolio) to formally include GCCA in their terms of reference, with the mandate to liaise both with the national programmes in “their” region as well as globally and with other EU regional climate change interventions.*
* *The elaboration of comprehensive regional climate change strategies - which some regional programmes currently lack – should benefit from Intra-ACP GCCA support. For example, the CSF could make an important contribution to this end, as well as drawing support from the regional strategies of other development partners, where such strategies or programme initiatives exist.*

## 2.5 On impact (achievement of wider effects):

***EQ8. To what extent has the programme contributed to achievement of overall objectives?***

* The overall GCCA objective is *to help poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change, in particular LDCs and SIDS, to increase their capabilities to cope with the effects of climate change, in support of the achievement of the MDGs; and where it benefits their poverty reduction objectives, the Alliance will also help such countries to participate in the global climate change mitigation effort, even if, as in the case of LDCs, they will not be required to make emission reduction commitments under a post-2012 agreement.* Since this objective is rather generally formulated, country programmes and projects have been assessed against their individual overall objectives, which were more specific than the overall GCCA objective, and would usually related to one of the specific priority areas (adaptation, REDD, CDM, DRR or mainstreaming of climate change into poverty reduction).
* At the time of the evaluation, the country-level actions have not yet resulted in the desired impact, with four out of the ten programmes evaluated performing unsatisfactorily, in terms of impact. This is due to the fact that they are not yet fully operational or functional (cases of Nepal and Benin) or due to a limited focus on climate change impact (cases of Rwanda and Mauritius). As far as operational and implementation problems are concerned, these have already been discussed as part of EQ6; they are expected to be solved in time. A limited focus on climate change, on the other hand, is mostly due to challenges in identifying climate specific indicators under the budget support modality, as discussed under EQ2. Otherwise, prospects for impact are generally speaking good, with most tangible impacts at this point in time noticeable in the Ethiopian action. This is explained by the fact that the Ethiopian action is built on a well-established (BMZ-supported) programme that has been ongoing since 2004 (refer to EQ.7), with extensive technical assistance facilities.
* It was found that monitoring systems that would allow assessing impact are, in most cases, weakly developed. While this is not a GCCA-specific issue, more attention should be given, in a next phase, to the development of appropriate monitoring systems, in particular at outcome level. There is also a general need to get baseline data in place in order to assess impact. In this regard, the evaluator recommends the provision of a dedicated monitoring service for the GCCA programme, with specific climate change expertise, to provide technical and backstopping services for monitoring. This could possibly be integrated with the services provided by the existing Global Support Facility.
* The relative impact of the GCCA programme in each of the targeted countries also depends on the size and nature of existing initiatives on climate change that the GCCA comes to strengthen. In some instances, the GCCA contribution is relatively modest in comparison to other donor support for climate change (case Bangladesh, Nepal); in other cases it can be rather significant. In Jamaica, for example, the GCCA support was the first of its kind; it helped create the institutional basis for Climate action and thereby helped access other funding sources and ensure a more sustainable impact. In Belize, important steps have been made in mainstreaming climate in government departments that are key over the long-term in addressing climate change and risk reduction.
* Nevertheless, in virtually all of the targeted countries, while the GCCA-supported programmes have provided and are providing valuable experience, there is a need for extending in time or for geographic up-scaling to achieve more significant impacts. Addressing climate change effectively requires long-term commitments beyond a three-year programming cycle. In most cases, GCCA support has served to develop pilot activities or develop actions in a pilot area. Experience gained is sufficiently positive to warrant replication or further extension. In order to achieve a significant impact from a global climate alliance point of view, a continuation of GCCA-support has therefore been recommended, building on the institutional bases established.
* As pointed out under EQ5, global level activities, global learning events, have played an important role in learning from ongoing experience, developing knowledge and exchanging good practice, thereby strengthening capacities and enhancing impact of the programme as a whole.
* An interesting finding is that several of the countries participating in the GCCA do not only have adaptation objectives, but also articulate ambitions to contribute to global Green House Gases (GHG) mitigation objectives. This was clearly observed in countries such as Nepal, Bhutan, Mauritius, Burkina Faso, Benin and Ethiopia. In a few cases, there is a clear focus on mitigation (Mauritius, Burkina Faso) but in most cases, the adaptation actions have secondary mitigation benefits. Considering this ambition, even if most of the GCCA support to date concerns adaptation action, a continuation of GCCA support for mitigation actions seems justified as well. Should a country prefer to use GCCA support for mitigation, it should qualify for support, provided the mitigation action contributes to poverty reduction objectives as well.
* The evaluation team has not come across any unforeseen negative impacts. On the other hand, several country programmes clearly have unintended positive impacts, in particular in terms of biodiversity conservation (case of Benin), good governance (Nepal, Rwanda) or in establishing the groundwork for the creation of a Climate Change Division (Jamaica).

**REC: It is recommended that the monitoring framework for the programme be strengthened.**

* *It is important to enhance monitoring of regional and national programmes, especially for more problematic programmes. Options for strengthened monitoring include (1) a more pronounced role of the EU Delegations, (2) increased use of GSF and CSF services, and (3) procurement of technical backstopping services for the development and implementation of an impact monitoring system for the GCCA programme. The latter should include the development of an overall monitoring framework for the programme with - possibly - a number of compulsory indicators for all interventions.*

***EQ9. To which extent does the programme contribute to visibility and a good reputation of the EU’s and ACP’s actions in the field of climate change?***

* Visibility of the GCCA programme at global level is considered to be good. The website is highly informative, with many links to relevant documentation, training materials and up-to-date information on news and events. It was found, though, that the information on the national and regional programmes provided is often not up-to-date. While the GCCA website is highly informative, an effort should be made to provide links to relevant reports and outputs on the supported projects and programmes, either directly or through the projects’ websites.
* Most but not all projects have developed websites where basic information and updates on the projects are posted. These websites do not always properly acknowledge EU or MS contributions, and do not use EU logos in most cases.
* With the exception of Jamaica, in the countries visited, visibility of GCCA action was generally found to be on the low side. This is partly due to implementation modalities, in particular budget support (case of Rwanda, Mauritius, Mozambique), partly to the relatively small role of GCCA funding in jointly managed or delegated actions, for example in Nepal. In the view of the evaluation team, this should not be perceived as a problem but is a ‘natural’ consequence of increased donor cooperation, and in line with principles of the Paris Declaration. Belize was seen as having adequate visibility of the programme in that country.

**REC: It is recommended that the GCCA website become a more pro-active and inter-active tool in the GCCA communication strategy.**

* *The website should be seen as a proactive tool to increase GCCA visibility. The website could be a key platform for knowledge management in respect of regional and global learning events by adding a knowledge management function that makes best use of the electronic media to also encourage and incorporate feedback on an ongoing basis. The GCCA website is supposed to provide a platform for dialogue; however much more work can be done to ensure that feed-back “from the field” is incorporated. This includes, for example, capturing the follow-up from the “GCCA+ side-event” at the December 2014 COP 20, and building on this. The GCCA website should provide more up-to-date links to relevant outputs and documentation on the interventions supported under both the national and regional programmes.*

## 2.6 On sustainability (likely continuation of achieved results):

***EQ10. To what extent are the conditions met and mechanisms in place to sustain programme results and ensure a continued flow of benefits to beneficiaries?***

* Most GCCA supported actions are still in an initial stage; an assessment of impact and sustainability is therefore rather premature and would, in most cases, be speculative. Nonetheless, prospects for sustainability of GCCA project results appear to be generally good, in 90% of the countries visited. This is largely due to the fact that the support is linked to integration of climate action into national and local planning and development processes. Especially when there is strong political support for climate (or environmental) action (for example Bhutan), results are likely to be sustained. However, even if there is limited ownership at national level, strong local ownership can still create the right conditions for a sustainable impact of the action, as was found to be the case in Mozambique, for example.
* In one case only, the evaluators had concerns about the prospects for a sustained impact. In Rwanda, staff, skills and equipment at the decentralised (District) level still were considered to be insufficient to sustain the investments made (i.e. the Land Administration Information System). As this concerns a country-specific situation, the related recommendation was made in the appropriate Aide Memoire only (re. *Annex 3.6*).
* The programme as a whole has given proper attention to partner's individual and organizational capacity building, even if limited capacities to effectively address climate change continues to be a challenge (refer section on *EQ5*). By maintaining its focus on capacity building, an adequate level of qualified human and institutional resources is likely to become available in the near future, which can continue to deliver GCCA’s expected outcomes.
* Most of the GCCA actions have had to address difficult institutional situations, and identify or help create the right entry point for climate action; this has been discussed under *EQ6*. In most cases, this stage has been overcome, though, and proper institutional structures and systems have been developed as a basis for longer-term support for climate action. In the evaluator’s view, the clarification of institutional arrangements and management modes should be seen as an investment that should be further capitalized upon during a follow-up phase of the GCCA.
* In several countries, such as in Jamaica, the programme has contributed to mobilisation of additional resources for climate action. Yet, in most cases, continuation and sustainability of the actions undertaken will, for years to come, still depend on GCCA support. In the evaluator’s view, given the overall good results of the programme and Europe’s commitment to supporting LDCs and SIDS in undertaking climate action, follow-up funding for the GCCA programme is fully justified.

**REC: Continued and increased support for GCCA climate action (GCCA+) is recommended*.***

* *This recommendation is based on promising results and good overall performance of GCCA interventions, the realisation that climate action needs to be seen in a long-term perspective, as well as acknowledging the unique role that the EU can play in creating support for global climate change action. Continued support will need to build on existing experience, progressively improving institutional strengths, linkages and collaborative partnerships and encouraging innovative practices.*
* *Continued support will also need to build on the pilot projects established during the first phase and, more importantly, the elaboration of a long-term strategy which specifies the roles of the various programme components (national and regional programmes; and support functions) and how they connect with, complement and reinforce each other.*
* *This applies in particular to the Intra-ACP supported regional programmes, to ensure that they address the ACP regional climate change concerns while strengthening the global alliance between ACP countries, through shared and synergetic programming in line with article 32A of the Cotonou Agreement.*

# 3 Overall Assessment

Overall, the global GCCA programme is found to be performing well. The evaluation team has assessed a sample of 10 country programmes, six regional programmes which are discussed in the report on the evaluation of the Intra-ACP programme, as well as other programme components, in particular the Global Support Facility and the Climate Support Facility, as well as other DEVCO background information. An overview of performance of each of the Programmes visited during field missions, for each of the criteria, is provided in *Table 1* at the end of this chapter. For the sake of a complete overview of performance of individual programme components, in *Table 2* the scoring of Intra-ACP funded regional programmes is provided as well.

Six out of the ten national programmes evaluated were found to be performing well, with one performing very well. Three programmes were found to have problems constraining their performance. Reduced performance of these programmes appears to be related to the selection of not sufficiently appropriate indicators (in the case of the budget support modality), and to complex institutional arrangements between various national and development partners, slowing down field-level operationalisation.

In terms of the ten evaluation questions (related to the five OECD and the two EC specific evaluation criteria), the overall assessment is that the average score on each of the evaluation questions is ‘good’; there are no particular areas of systematic under or over performance. While for each of the evaluation criteria, there are issues to be addressed, two areas appear to be more problematic, namely (1) the function of the GCCA as an instrument for practical cooperation to tackle the combined challenges of climate change and the fight against poverty; and (2) the institutional arrangements and implementation modalities developed for management of the GCCA interventions. Both issues will be discussed hereafter.

All actions undertaken, except for one, were evaluated as being **relevant** to **highly relevant** in the context of the GCCA programme and of national policies. Most projects focus on adaptation action and, obviously, clear climate change strategies and action plans facilitate identification of well-targeted GCCA support. Most projects build on existing projects and programmes, which is considered a very valuable approach for achievement of quick and good results. Nonetheless, it was not always obvious to identify the right organisation for leading the actions, as more often than not there are no dedicated climate change offices established and functioning. In countries such as Belize and Jamaica, Climate Offices are now in place and this bodes well for the future; however, the ongoing absence of such departments in other countries is a real detriment. Consequently, working out collaborative arrangements across institutions to lead the climate change action often takes considerable start-up time.

The design of the GCCA National Programmes was found to be generally appropriate and consistent, even though several of the logical frameworks could do with improvements. Linkage of these logframes to national planning and reporting systems – in line with the idea of climate change mainstreaming - can be challenging but is gradually being addressed. As regards budget support, it was found that identification of appropriate indicators for measuring climate action results is a challenge, and it is therefore important to take sufficient time to formulate appropriate indicators.

All projects and programmes evaluated have made a **satisfactory** to **significant** contribution to dialogue on climate change and exchange of experience within and between countries, and between countries and the European Union. However, the concerned activities are not always well coordinated with regional and global activities, and there is room for increased coordination. The global level activities, in particular the learning events, have also made a very significant contribution to exchange of experience and to the development of the international dialogue.

Many of the project activities of the various GCCA national programmes evaluated show that climate change adaptation and mitigation actions have a good potential to reduce poverty; at the same time, though, these benefits still need to materialise in most projects. In cases where no poverty reduction benefits were achieved, this was mostly found to be due to a lack of connection with community-based organisations representing the populations most vulnerable to climate change. Involvement of non-state actors can, in such cases, help address this constraint. In some other cases, this was due to the aforementioned problematic management arrangements slowing down delivery of the action on the ground. Lastly, in some cases, the choice for mitigation rather than adaptation action limited the scope to reduce vulnerability and poverty.

Development of capacities to address climate change is a main objective of the GCCA initiative, and most of the projects contribute to this objective to some degree. At the same time, limited in-country capacities continue to be a challenge in most cases; therefore, a continued focus on capacity development, during a follow-up phase, seems fully justified. Technical assistance linked to projects and programmes can play an important role in development of such capacity.

Institutional modalities and management arrangements appear to constitute the most problematic aspect of the GCCA programme. Most actions have suffered considerable delays due to complex institutional and implementation arrangements, related to involvement of a multitude of funding sources, sectors and actors, and the presence of several administrative layers. In most cases, though, the stage of clarifying roles and institutional and management arrangements has been overcome, and a basis for longer-term support for climate action has been laid. This leads the evaluator to emphasize the necessity of building on the newly established collaborative partnerships and arrangements.

Nonetheless, in a number of cases institutional or management issues still seriously hamper progress, especially when several organizations and donors are involved in delivery of the action, and management of the action is delegated. In these cases, oversight and control tend to be limited, and a more pro-active role of the EU Delegations involved seems required in order to arrive at workable implementation arrangements. For those programmes, mid-term review missions are recommended, with a particular focus on the institutional and management arrangements.

Otherwise, harmonisation and linking of GCCA support with other climate action is generally satisfactory, in particular in those countries where governments take active charge of donor coordination. In many cases, GCCA support is grafted onto and strengthens projects or programmes managed by a Member State, acting as lead partner on climate change or by a multilateral agency (UNDP, World Bank). Yet, in a few cases, there clearly is room for increased coordination and harmonisation of European-funded activities on climate change; EU Delegations could generally play a more active role in making this happen.

A proper assessment of impact and sustainability is rather speculative, as most GCCA supported actions visited are still in an initial stage. In some instances, the GCCA contribution is modest in comparison to other donor action on climate change (for example Bangladesh and Nepal) while in other cases it is very significant, especially when it contributes to creating the institutional basis for climate action and helps access other funding sources (such as in Jamaica). In some cases, prospects for a significant impact on climate adaptation or mitigation are bleak, as the actions do not have a clear climate change focus, in particular in some cases involving the budget support modality. Nonetheless, in most of the countries, the GCCA actions generate valuable experience, and there is a need for extending or up-scaling the action in order to achieve significant impacts.

Prospects for sustainability of GCCA project results appear to be generally good, which is largely due to the fact that the support is linked: (i) to integration of climate action into national and local planning and development processes (mainstreaming); (ii) to the efforts made to clarify appropriate institutional arrangements for delivery of GCCA support; and (iii) to the programme’s general focus on capacity development. In some cases, the programme has contributed to mobilisation of additional funding for climate action, but for the time being, a continuation of GCCA support is required to sustain the very initial but promising results. In this context, better coordination of evaluation and formulation activities is desirable, in order to maximise benefits from the evaluation exercises.

Overall visibility of the GCCA initiative is considered to be satisfactory. At global level, there is good visibility thanks to the global events, and to a well-resourced and maintained website, as well as an active web platform for exchange of experiences and ideas (capacity4development). At country level, however, visibility was generally found to be rather low. This is related to the budget support modality, in a number of cases, or to the relatively limited GCCA contribution to large actions, in other cases. Notwithstanding, most projects could improve acknowledgement and visibility of EU contributions, on their websites and deliverables.

While visibility of the GCCA is considered to be satisfactory, certainly in “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change”, and probably also in global fora (for example, through organisation of “side events” at the UNFCCC conference of parties, etc.), the same visibility is not necessarily there with representatives of Member States back in Europe, dealing with or having portfolio responsibility for, climate change. In response to the questionnaire sent to MS at headquarters level[[14]](#footnote-14), respondents replied that they were only “somewhat aware” of the GCCA in their Departments. This has led the evaluators to conclude that significant lobbying work by the EU is necessary in order to raise the GCCA profile with MS.



***Table 1****. Scoring of the national GCCA programmes (global funding) evaluated on the respective evaluation criteria and questions.*



***Table 2.*** *Scoring of regional programmes (Intra-ACP GCCA and global funding) on evaluation criteria and questions*

# 4 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

In this section, the main conclusions from the evaluation are reported, leading into corresponding recommendations. The recommendations have been extracted from the main text, as they emerged as part of answering the various evaluation questions, and elaborated or reworded as self-standing recommendations. Since, in a number of cases, similar recommendations would emerge from different evaluation questions, in this chapter they have been merged and synthesized.

Furthermore, regarding the recommendations for the overall GCCA initiative, conclusions and recommendations for the Intra-ACP GCCA programme – which constitutes an important component of the overall GCCA programme - have also been taken into consideration and integrated. For a full justification of the recommendations in as far they refer to the Intra-ACP GCCA programme, we refer to the Main Report on Mid-Term evaluation of the Intra-ACP GCCA programme and its Annexes - prepared as a separate and stand-alone report.[[15]](#footnote-15)

An effort has been made to keep the number of recommendations manageable (=<10). The recommendations are policy level recommendations and have not been prioritised, as they are considered to be of similar relevance and urgency, but have been put into a logical order. They are directed to the evaluation managers at the European Commission, who are expected to share them with the appropriate audiences.

While a number of action-oriented recommendations were made for each project visited - included in the Aide-Memoire completed for each project (see Volume 2 Annex 3) - the policy recommendations focus on the GCCA at the programme level. The supporting text for each recommendation expands on the recommendation and attempts to outline, in more detail, suggestions for the way forward. However it remains outside the scope of the evaluation to develop a detailed work plan on how to transform the recommendations into actual financed interventions.

Finally, lessons learned in the course of the evaluation are provided in Section 4.3.

## 4.2 Conclusions and Recommendations

The GCCA mandate is to provide learning and public awareness on global climate change affecting “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change” and hence is primarily focussed on providing assistance to Least Developed Countries (LDC’s) and Small Island Development States (SIDS) in undertaking climate change adaptation or mitigation actions. However, other countries are equally included in GCCA communications, which makes it a global initiative indeed. The combination of global, regional and national foci differentiates the GCCA from Member State-led climate actions and the endeavours of other donors. As such, the initiative is of special value in terms of what it is contributing to combating climate change at all levels.

In all instances, GCCA has responded to an actual demand for support as expressed by beneficiary countries, both in terms of promoting dialogue and enabling negotiations, as well as supporting tangible action. In most cases, the GCCA funds have helped strengthen actions led by EU MSs (DFID, Danida, GIZ and others) and Multilateral Agencies, often benefiting from existing structures and systems, and resulting in relatively quick results. At the same time, the MS have often seen their climate initiatives strengthened by the funding and policy support provided through the GCCA. Moreover, fragmentation of support for climate action has been avoided and, in some countries, a basis for joint ‘European’ climate action is emerging. For the Member States that have provided Fast-Track funds (such as Ireland, Estonia or Cyprus), the GCCA has provided a good opportunity to support climate action (in, for example, Nepal or Bhutan) with low transaction costs. While GCCA funds have contributed to strengthening actions led by EU MS, in “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change”, the EU has been less successful in involving MS to develop a joint European approach through the global alliance. While MS with a shorter history of international (development/­environmental) cooperation appear more willing to pool their limited funds into the GCCA, this is less the case for the MS with a long history of involvement with “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change”. The latter group of MS have a tendency to assume that they are supporting the GCCA through their “contribution to the EU budget and to the EDF”[[16]](#footnote-16) while continuing to provide the bulk of their assistance to other climate-related funds and initiatives (either their own bilateral programmes or other multilateral initiatives). This seems to be reinforced by MS responses which suggest that they are only “somewhat aware” of the GCCA. As such, the evaluation has also concluded that there are opportunities to raise the profile of the GCCA with the MS, but that this will require lobbying efforts at the strategic policy level - such as the Climate Diplomacy Network[[17]](#footnote-17) - by more directly involving the respective portfolio ministries dealing with climate change and/or foreign affairs[[18]](#footnote-18). Notwithstanding, the responses also show an openness and willingness on the part of the MS to enter more fully into a climate-related dialogue with the Commission.

In parallel, and as already mentioned above, the good experiences of joint “European” climate action and dialogue with host countries, and in the regions, is a solid experience that can continue to be built on within the context of both the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, as well as the development of joint assistance strategies.

Overall performance of the components and interventions evaluated has been found to be good, on all evaluation criteria (refer to Tables 1 and 2, included under Chapter 3). Prospects for a positive impact by the programme are generally good, but at this point in time, impacts in terms of adaptation and mitigation effects, as well as poverty reduction are still very limited. Most of the programmes are still at an initial stage - the oldest programmes have only been operational for a few years – and require sustained support over a longer period of time. The current phase (287 million EUR funding since 2008) has required considerable investments in developing coalitions, partnerships and institutional arrangements to facilitate the delivery of the individual interventions. These have started to produce promising results, which now should be further capitalised upon.

***Recommendation 1:***

Continued and increased support for GCCA climate action (GCCA+) is recommended*.*

*This recommendation is based on promising results and good overall performance of GCCA interventions, the realisation that climate action needs to be seen in a long-term perspective, as well as acknowledging the unique role that the EU can play in creating support for global climate change action. Continued support will need to build on existing experience, progressively improving institutional strengths, linkages and collaborative partnerships and encouraging innovative practices.*

*Continued support will also need to build on the pilot projects established during the first phase and, more importantly, the elaboration of a long-term strategy which specifies the roles of the various programme components (national and regional programmes; and support functions) and how they connect with, complement and reinforce each other.*

*This applies in particular to the Intra-ACP supported regional programmes, to ensure that they address the ACP regional climate change concerns while strengthening the global alliance between ACP countries, through shared and synergetic programming in line with article 32A of the Cotonou Agreement.*

At the same time, it was found that there is very limited interaction between programme components, in particular between national programmes and the concerned regional programmes. Lessons learned from pilot experience developed in national programmes rarely find their way into regional programming. This seems partly due to a limited focus, in national programmes, on promotion of initiatives that could address needs of multiple countries. In part, it also seems due to a limited interest, from regional programmes, for pilot or demonstration activities in national programmes that could inspire regional pilot activities.

Greater interaction and synergy between the global and the regional GCCA programmes is therefore required. National programmes can rarely satisfy all needs, in particular when it comes to the technical capacity building of national partners. Regional programmes should better identify those gaps and needs in national programming that are of regional interest, including identification of those successful interventions that have a potential for up-scaling at regional level.

Responses, including those from MS, underline the importance of long-term support to climate change adaptation and/or mitigation to LDCs/SIDS focussing both on capacity building, on long-term investment, and on policy-level ownership. In addition, providing financial support to GCCA has the advantage of supporting actions in those countries vulnerable to climate change where the MSs do not have bilateral programmes. This is an area where the EU is in a position to emphasize its comparative advantage vis-à-vis the MS.

Cooperation with MS in MS programme countries also shows evidence of adding value to MS contributions, particularly where EU and MS develop joint assistance strategies that mainstream climate change into the development cooperation programmes of Member States. This needs more than a single implementation cycle to really bear fruit and calls for a commitment over a longer period of time.[[19]](#footnote-19)

***Recommendation 2:***

It is recommended that stronger linkages between national and regional GCCA programmes be established*.*

*The EU, as one of the few development partners that works with both Regional and National Programmes under its various funding mechanisms, is in a position to use its unique situation to ensure coordination and complementarity both within regions and between development partners (EU MS and other partners working on climate change). The EU’s added advantage, over and above the regional programming, is its role as an actor on the global environmental stage and, hence, the unique role of being able to foster linkages between national, regional and global levels. Linkages can go both ways - up-scaling from national to regional; and replication across the region. Pilot and demonstration activities supported by national GCCA programmes need monitoring for their suitability at the regional level. They should be used as sources of inspiration, actively promoted by the respective regional programmes and, where possible, integrated into other national programmes. In this regard, the Regional Delegations would benefit by having a member of staff (preferably one already working at the Delegation on the environment and/or climate change portfolio) to formally include GCCA in their terms of reference, with the mandate to liaise both with the national programmes in “their” region as well as globally and with other EU regional climate change interventions.*

*The elaboration of comprehensive regional climate change strategies - which some regional programmes currently lack – should benefit from Intra-ACP GCCA support. For example, the CSF could make an important contribution to this end, as well as drawing support from the regional strategies of other development partners, where such strategies or programme initiatives exist.*

At country level, GCCA support and interventions are generally well harmonised with and linked to other climate change actions, in particular in countries that actively coordinate donor actions themselves, or where a donor takes a strong lead in the relevant sector. Still, in several cases, such as Nepal, limited harmonisation of approaches and implementation requirements posed serious constraints to progress of the actions, and improved communication and harmonisation are required. Also, alignment of EU Member State funded climate action was found to be weak in several countries, including Nepal. One of the reasons for the existence of the GCCA is to foster more of a joint European approach on climate change in targeted countries, and this objective requires a stronger effort.

***Recommendation 3:***

It is recommended that the EU (at Commission and Delegation Level) intensify their lobbying efforts with policy makers in the MS, and with MS interventions in MS programme countries to raise awareness of the GCCA and develop joint intervention strategies focussing on climate change-related activities.

*While in some GCCA target countries a clear European response to climate change is emerging, EU services and Member States should, through the GCCA and other climate initiatives, play a more active role in* ***aligning, coordinating and harmonizing*** *European (EU and MS) support for climate action. The objective is to limit fragmentation.**Such a response should not be limited to involvement only at the national level in target countries of local representations, but should incorporate a regional vision - as well as targeted follow-up from GCCA/DG DEVCO with MS development partners back in Europe****.*** *Presently, levels of awareness of the GCCA among EU member states is not as well developed as it could be, pointing to the need for stronger lobbying efforts both at senior levels of the Commission with high level climate policy counterparts in the member states, as well as through the Delegations partnering in and/or jointly funding climate change interventions at national and regional level.*

*There is a tendency for newer MS, with a shorter history in international development/climate and more limited funds for such activities, to more closely align themselves with flagship programmes such as the GCCA. On the other hand, MS with a long history of interventions in the development/environment/climate change sectors are more likely to opt for continuing to support their own initiatives, while also continuing to contribute to multilateral agencies (dealing with climate-change and environment) which they have been supporting in the past.*

*In order to increase MS involvement with the GCCA, it is clear from the responses that the EU needs to raise the profile of the GCCA with MS, as* ***none*** *of those responding to the questionnaire sent to MS claim to be “****well aware****” of the GCCA.[[20]](#footnote-20) This will need to change through EU lobbying initiatives at EU-MS policy levels in Europe (such as the Climate Diplomacy Network, etc.); as well as at the level of the national/regional Delegations in their liaison with the national/regional programmes of MS.*

The GCCA has made a very significant contribution to dialogue on climate change at the national and regional levels. This includes exchanges regarding good practice between countries, regions and the EU. In most cases, the grants provided fulfil a useful purpose in promoting and supporting policy debate on climate change, and in a number of instances, they have helped raise the priority of climate change on the political agenda. However, GCCA support for climate change negotiations, in particular, is spread over various national, regional and global actions, and there does not seem to be a clear division of responsibilities. This was most prominent in the evaluation of the Intra-ACP GCCA component (for details, please refer to the Intra ACP evaluation report).

Member States - in their responses - also underlined the important role of the EU in mobilising policy level support within Europe through linking with the appropriate MS climate/development agencies; as well as ensuring that scientific research is integrated into the policy level discussions both in Europe and in “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change”.

***Recommendation 4:***

It is recommended that the EU (as part of the implementation of their regional and national programmes) support long-term strategic planning and institutional capacity building for climate action at national and regional level in EU beneficiary countries.

*The objective of this recommendation is to ensure stronger regional and national ownership of the climate-change agenda. This should include: support for the establishment of National Climate Change Office/Departments with sufficient authority to define and influence national strategies, and to influence the development of regional (climate-action) strategies; and, in parallel, provide support for capacity building in these institutions to ensure adequate capabilities over the long-term. Additional technical assistance support - either long-term or as a series of short-term inputs using, for example, the Framework contract mechanism - could also be considered to increase support for national capacity building; in other cases GCCA support can be provided in the form of budget support. This could include technical assistance to facilitate budget support.*

It was found that, sometimes, effective programme design had suffered from time pressure, especially in cases of budget support.[[21]](#footnote-21) As a result, insufficient time was available to identify the most appropriate result indicators. In cases where GCCA support was provided using the budget support modality (the preferred modality for GCCA support), indicators used for disbursement were found to not always be relevant in terms of measuring the targeted climate change and/or poverty reduction effects, and greater effort is required to identify indicators that align with GCCA objectives. Reconciliation of project monitoring and national performance systems was also found to be a challenge in a number of situations, especially in cases where national programmes work through a general budgetary support system.

Also at the national and regional levels, identification of the right point of entry was seen as being important, as also was linking with the appropriate organisations to lead the interventions. Organisational issues need to be addressed before proper action can be undertaken, and not doing so has shown to result in considerable delays. Most programmes have only become operational on the ground in the second half of their lifetime. It was found that political support and the presence of a Climate Change Office coordinating climate action were among the key success factors in the enabling environment, as is the presence of long-term strategies or plans for climate change action.

Many Member States have a long track record working through a number of multilateral programmes dealing with Climate Change providing both financial as well as technical support[[22]](#footnote-22) and, in this context, have underlined the importance of a multi-stakeholder approach, working at all levels (from global to local). The challenge for the GCCA is to build on existing experience - both in the Commission as well as in MS - in the second and in subsequent phases of the GCCA.

***Recommendation 5:***

It is recommended that, when budget support for climate-change related interventions is provided, it should be tied to a clearly formulated procedure with corresponding climate related milestones monitored on a regular basis, which trigger further disbursements.

*In cases where interventions are delivered through* ***budget support****, greater effort is required to identify the most effective ways to achieve results. Key to this is the establishment of corresponding indicators, that meet both climate-related and, where directly applicable, poverty reduction objectives, in line with GCCA objectives.* *In cases of a relatively undefined operating environment, the role of indicators related to disbursement will be even more critical. Performance indicators should be developed for each individual action that maps out the evolution of that particular intervention. Where relevant, the experience with budget support from MS should be drawn on, as the EU is already involved, with other development partners in numerous Joint Assistance Strategies, many of which use the budget support modality. One key indicator of success will be the degree to which budgetary support contributes to long-term sustainability in the form of beneficiary countries progressively assuming financial responsibility for climate change related activity.*

***Recommendation 6:***

It is recommended that the EU uses its position on the European and International scene to mobilise high level policy support for global climate change action.

*This includes improving* ***coordination of the support*** *provided to climate change negotiations, mainstreaming of climate change and knowledge management between national, regional and global programmes, and between regional programmes. Particularly the EU needs to maximise the benefits of its unique position on both the European and the International scene, and its access to policy makers at high levels, to lobby for the coordination and streamlining of support. The EU also needs to use its unique position to ensure that advances made in research are integrated both into programmes working with CC in “poor countries and regions most vulnerable to climate change”, as well as integrating research results into the climate change policy dialogue at the International and Global level.*

The GCCA has proven to be a viable instrument for practical cooperation on climate action. In most cases, the national GCCA programmes are expected to generate tangible benefits for the most vulnerable populations – in terms of reduced poverty and vulnerability – even if, in most cases, they have yet to materialise due to the late start-up of programme activities. However, certain interventions clearly perform better than others. Success seems mostly dependent on the presence of effective linkages to final beneficiary groups. Non-state actors (NGOs, civil society groups) appear to play an important role in facilitating such functional linkages.

While involvement of government institutions and NGOs in the programme is generally good, private sector involvement is relatively weak. This is partly due to the weakness of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), one of the GCCA’s priority areas of action; none of the national programmes visited used GCCA support to strengthen participation in the CDM, though some of the regional Intra-ACP GCCA supported programmes do. Clearly, conditions in the carbon markets do not provide strong incentives for CDM-related action. Another constraint to private sector involvement is limited access for private actors to other funding opportunities, due to their private character. More effort is required to identify mechanisms to enhance private sector engagement, for example through funds that include access for private sector actors, such as Rwanda’s Fund for Environment and Climate Change (FONERWA).

***Recommendation 7:***

It is recommended to promote stronger involvement of non-state actors and the private sector in GCCA-supported activities.

*It is important to promote stronger* ***involvement of relevant non-state actors*** *in GCCA-supported action (at both national and regional levels, as well as with NSA’s based in the North), in order to ensure proper engagement with, and capacity development of, the populations most vulnerable to the effects of climate change. Likewise, where possible,* ***engagement with the private sector*** *should be strengthened, for example through increased support for national climate action funds that include private sector support. Where relevant, GCCA-supported actions should also link up with the private sector support programmes funded by MS but which, thus far, have not developed a strong climate change focus.*

In most countries, at the time of this evaluation, impacts were still rather embryonic. This is mostly due to the fact some of the interventions had only recently started to become operational. In a few cases, however, limited impact on climate change (example Rwanda) was found to be due rather to a lack of focus on explicit climate change effects, where GCCA funds reinforced actions with some climate benefits (such as land reform action) but where these actions did not specifically target climate adaptation or mitigation effects.

Generally, in case an intervention could build on solid existing structures, such as in Ethiopia, tangible impacts and benefits have been achieved. Yet, even in circumstances where no such structures were in place, such as in Belize, where the Intra-ACP and the national GCCA programmes built a Climate Change office from scratch, first impacts were already becoming visible.

***Recommendation 8:***

It is recommended that the monitoring framework for the programme be strengthened*.*

*It is important to enhance* ***monitoring of regional and national programmes****, especially for more problematic programmes. Options for strengthened monitoring include: (1) a more pronounced role of the EU Delegations; (2) increased use of GSF and CSF services; and (3) procurement of technical backstopping services for the development and implementation of an impact monitoring system for the GCCA programme. The latter should include the development of an overall monitoring framework for the programme with - possibly - a number of compulsory indicators for all interventions.*

Though prospects for impact are generally good, monitoring systems that would allow for assessing impacts were in most cases weakly developed. This is partly due to design weaknesses, partly to limited technical assistance for the development of appropriate monitoring systems, including the establishment of baseline values. Greater attention for development of monitoring systems is required.

***Recommendation 9:***

It is recommended to intensify the facilitation of climate change learning communities and learning events (globally, regionally and nationally)

*The GCCA and its Support Facilities (GSF and CSF) should strengthen* ***facilitation and promotion of exchange of experience on climate action*** *across the GCCA-supported and other EU-funded projects working on climate change, through the organisation of global learning events and facilitation of learning communities. It would seem appropriate to complement global level events with regional events, fostering the participation of less involved target groups, notably of non-state actors including the private sector. National and regional EU delegations are seen as being key actors, interlocutors and facilitators to achieve this.*

The global services provided by the GCCA, in particular the organisation of the global policy events, the maintenance of a website and of a platform for exchanging ideas and experiences have made an important contribution to the learning and public awareness objectives of the programme. Nevertheless, though highly informative, the GCCA website could provide more complete and up-to-date information on all interventions supported.

There is generally interest in more such learning events, possibly at regional level, to benefit more stakeholders. The global events and services have also helped link national actions to regional and global policy processes, and are generally much appreciated. Nonetheless, there is a need and scope for increased exchanges between the projects and programmes in the various countries, and feeding of lessons learned into the formulation of new interventions. In this regard, proper planning of evaluation, and of identification and formulation missions, is also required to allow for evaluation experience to feed into the design of new programming. Member States have also noted the importance of global learning, especially in ensuring linkages between scientific research on climate change, and the global policy process.

***Recommendation 10:***

It is recommended that the GCCA website become a more pro-active and inter-active tool in the GCCA communication strategy.

*The website should be seen as a proactive tool to increase GCCA visibility. The website could be a key platform for knowledge management in respect of regional and global learning events by adding a knowledge management function that makes best use of the electronic media to also encourage and incorporate feedback on an ongoing basis. The GCCA website is supposed to provide a platform for dialogue; however much more work can be done to ensure that feed-back “from the field” is incorporated. This includes, for example, capturing the follow-up from the “GCCA+ side-event” at the December 2014 COP 20, and building on this. The GCCA website should provide more up-to-date links to relevant outputs and documentation on the interventions supported under both the national and regional programmes.*

## 4.3 Lessons Learned

The following highlights a series of lessons learned through the evaluation of the GCCA initiative, including both national and regional programmes and support services.

1. Working through existing structures and previously implemented project activity increases the possibility for project success. There are numerous examples from all regions where a previous investment paid dividends for the GCCA programme and helped reduce fragmentation of aid.
2. Despite common adherence to principles of the Paris Declaration, EU-based donor requirements still need further alignment to make delegated management work properly.
3. In the context of budget support, given that climate change is a relatively unknown field of action, realistic indicators for achievement of relevant results and disbursement may not be easily defined at the start of an intervention, and may best be identified in the course of the action, as structures and systems materialise and the action evolves.
4. Small grants programmes are capable of contributing significantly to the GCCA’s capacity building objective thanks to mobilisation of a high number of private civil society and/or governmental actors.
5. Regional Programmes are complex entities implemented in very challenging circumstances. It should not be assumed that administrative and procurement procedures will fall into place in an efficient manner. Programme designs should be developed to be able to better anticipate and respond to complicated start-ups.
6. To manage a programme on a regional scale requires experience and appropriate capacity. Once the institutional capacity is in place, the implementing partner should be guided by a clear and appropriate regional strategy.
7. The steps required to ensure successful programming are as critical today as ever. Logframes that describe achievable objectives with good indicators should be in place, and monitoring and evaluation systems are crucial.
8. The importance of flexibility in programme design was a theme that came up consistently, in particular during the Intra ACP Programme evaluation. A regional programme can respond to gaps both at the regional and national levels, and having some flexibility to do either or both is important in programme design.
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1. The Global Support Facility was visited, during the inception phase, in order to understand its functioning and role. It was not as explicitly assessed as the CSF – no separate Aide Memoire prepared - since it has less well-defined projects of its own, and is to a large extent used in identification and formulation of programmes. Indirectly, its work was assessed, for example in the form of observations on design of the programmes visited, or on its role in organising global events. The GSF received less attention than the CSF, due to the fact that there were no apparent issues related to its functioning, which was found to be overall satisfactory. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Ireland, Sweden, Estonia, Cyprus and the Czech Republic [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 37.5 mln (Intra-ACP – EDF) + 11.4 mln (SPC) + 5 mln (Mekong) + 4 (UNCDF) = 57.9 mln EUR [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The term ‘poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change’ comes from the GCCA objective as stated in Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament on Building a Global Climate Change Alliance between the European Union and poor developing countries most vulnerable to climate change (EC, 2007). It refers to those Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) most vulnerable to climate change [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Budget Support Guidelines - Executive Guide. EuropeAid Development and Cooperation Directorate-General

   European Commission, Brussels, September 2012 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://capacity4dev.ec.europa.eu/public-environment-climate> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. This observation was challenged by evaluation management arguing that programmes do exchange and that lessons learnt are feeding into the identification and formulation new programmes, through the GSF facility. The statement, however, is based on the observations of the evaluators in the sample of countries visited. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Myanmar was cited by the programme managers as being one example with private sector involvement in CDM. However, Myanmar fell outside the sample of countries, agreed with the EC for field visits. The point made, which is considered to be valid, is that conditions in the carbon markets do not provide strong incentives for CDM. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Fund is not primarily donor-oriented; it also benefits from government contributions (2 million UK£) and collects domestic proceeds from environmental levies and fines as well. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. It should be noted that this recommendation is also strongly supported by the conclusions drawn in the Intra-ACP Mid Term Evaluation report that contains the assessment of a number of key regional programmes. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. BMZ is the abbreviation of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. CILSS is the abbreviation of the Permanent Interstates Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. MS contacts were shared with the evaluators by DEVCO/C2, and supplemented with contacts from the evaluators own network. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. See: Evaluation of the Intra-ACP GCCA - November 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. For example, the response from DFID [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. As suggested by Danida. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. As suggested by the Agence Française de Développement. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. The FLEGT action plan is a good example of long-term EU commitment to a policy initiative leading to positive results and increasing the credibility of the EU (and its MS) in the sector. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See also Volume 2 Annex 9 for more details. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. This is not unique to GCCA programmes but is more a reflection on EU procedures in general. This has also been highlighted in previous evaluations. In a few instances during missions, when comments were made on design, or lack of suitable indicators for example, the argument put forward was that they (EUDs) had been under time pressure to get actions quickly identified or formulated. In this regard, GCCA is probably no different from other programmes. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. For example: UNDP, UNEP, the UNFCCC, GEF, the Mekong River Commission, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)