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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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| DEVCO | Directorate General Development and Cooperation of the EC |
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| GHGINSMETIPCC | Green House Gases Institute of Meteorology (INSMET)Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
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| ROMSADCSEISIDSSPACCSPCSPREPSRDPTAToRUNUNDPUNECAUNFCCCUNICEFUSAIDUWIV&A VCAUSPWADWMOWRI | Result Oriented MonitoringSouthern African Development CommunityStockholm Environment InstituteSmall Island Development State Special Pilot Adaptation to Climate ChangeSecretariat of the Pacific Community Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment ProgrammeStrategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the PacificTechnical AssistanceTerms of Reference United NationsUnited Nations Development ProgrammeUnited Nations Economic Commission for AfricaUnited Nations Framework Convention on Climate ChangeUnited Nations Children’s FundUnited States Agency for International DevelopmentUniversity of the West Indies Vulnerability and Adaptation Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment University of the South Pacific Wave Attenuation Devices World Meteorological OrganisationWorld Resource Institute  |

# Executive Summary

The Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) was established in 2007 through the Communication from the European Commission (EC) “Building a Global Climate Change Alliance between the European Union (EU) and poor developing countries vulnerable to climate change”. The GCCA intervenes in five priority areas: (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 global carbon market. As part of the GCCA, a specific programme to address the needs of African Caribbean and Pacific Group of States (ACP) was created. A financing agreement between the EC and the ACP was signed on 13/01/2010 funded by the 10th European Development Fund (EDF) (37.5 M Euros). The ACP Secretariat was designated as the Authorising Officer with the end of the implementation period set for 13/02/2015.

The Intra-ACP Programme covers 48 countries from Sub-Saharan Africa, 16 from the Caribbean and 15 from the Pacific. Many of these countries are considered to be the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. Forty Member States (MS) belong to the group of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and 37 MS are classified as Small Island Developing State (SIDS). Participating African countries are affected by drought, desertification and floods resulting from evolving and unpredictable climate patterns. For the SIDS, extreme weather events and sea level rise can be key concerns. There was an expectation that the Intra-ACP Programme would also contribute to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The logic behind a regional approach was that climate change is a destabilising force that threatens achieving the MDGs and is trans-boundary. At the same time, many partner countries supported by the GCCA are MS of regional organisations. One of the expectations of the Intra-ACP Programme is that it would contribute to the Cotonou Agreement that calls for the eradication of poverty while contributing to sustainable development.

Five Intra-ACP regional programmes have been established[[1]](#footnote-1) including a pan-African component known as “***Climate for Development in Africa***” or “ClimDev” that is one of three programmes in Africa. The UN Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) is the project authority for ClimDev, with the African Climate Policy Centre (ACPC) that operates under the auspices of UNECA in collaboration with the African Union Commission (AUC) and the African Development Bank (AfDB) acting as implementing agencies. ClimDev is designed to address weaknesses in both the demand for and supply of climate services and to improve the use of climate information. In Southern and Eastern Africa, three Regional Economic Commissions (RECs) were solicited to oversee the “***Programme on Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the COMESA-EAC-SADC Region.***” The contracting party is the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) with the East African Community (EAC) and Southern African Development Community (SADC) acting as partners. The Programme focus is on addressing the impacts of climate change through adaptation and mitigation measures that build economic and social resilience. In Western Africa, the project authority for the “***GCCA regional programme for Western Africa***” is the Permanent Inter-States Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), a technical branch of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). The implementing partner is the Regional Centre Agrhymet for Training and Application in Agro-Meteorology and Operational Hydrology and their Applications (Agrhymet), a specialised institute of CILSS. The programme in West Africa is designed to tackle climate change so as to achieve the MDGs.

In the Pacific there are two regional programmes that interact closely. The University of the South Pacific (USP) is the contracting party with the Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development (PACE-SD) as Implementing Unit for the “***Support to the GCCA through Capacity Building, Community Engagement and Applied Research***” Programme that focuses on capacity building (through formal and informal training), applied research and community engagement and adaptive actions. The second Pacific Programme is the “***Secretariat of the Pacific Community – GCCA: Pacific Small Island States***” (PSIS), which is funded directly from Global GCCA funds. It promotes a long-term approach to adaptation planning and works towards effective and coordinated aid delivery modalities at national and regional levels. The PSIS programme is managed by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP).

There are two programmes in the Caribbean as well; the “***GCCA CARIFORUM[[2]](#footnote-2) Support Programme***” is implemented by the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC). It aims to provide participating countries with the resources and technical support to address climate change issues. The “***Climate change adaptation and sustainable land management in the Eastern Caribbean,”*** is implemented by the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) and only became operational towards the end of 2013. It is not a focus of this evaluation and is not funded by ACP resources. Nor is the regional programme in South-East Asia, the “***Mekong River Commission’s Climate Change and Adaptation Initiative***” being assessed, for reason of incompatibility of timing of the evaluation with project planning. As well, the South-East Asia initiative is not funded by Intra ACP resources.

In addition to programming activity, the Intra ACP Programme also has a support component to ensure programme coordination, assist the ACP Secretariat in issues related to climate change and to provide Technical Assistance (TA) to ACP MS through different modalities including the Climate Support Facility (CSF), which was designed to provide short-term customised TA and training to ACP MS. There is also a climate change Technical Assistant to the ACP Secretariat who, among other duties, assists with preparing submissions to the CSF.

Since 2008, the Global GCCA has also supported country programmes in 38 MS in the same thematic areas some of which are close to or have reached their conclusion. To improve coordination and coherence between the GCCA Global and the Intra ACP GCCA Programme, it was decided to undertake the evaluations simultaneously. The expectation was that combining the evaluations would allow for the possibility to identify and analyse synergies and determine how there could be better development gains. The evaluation process began in December 2013 with all field work completed by May 2014. The first drafts of both reports were completed in June 2014 with the final reports submitted in October 2014. This report is accompanied by Aide-Mémoires of the regional programmes and the CSF.

This report presents findings and analyses on five of the Intra ACP regional GCCA programmes and the PSIS programme funded through the Global GCCA. ***The objective of this evaluation is to provide the ACP Secretariat and the relevant co-operation services of the EC with information, analyses and assessment of the past performance of the Intra ACP GCCA Programme; ascertain the added value, key lessons and to propose practical recommendations for follow-up actions as feasible during the remaining life of the various programme components; and provide recommendations for the design of a potential second phase Intra ACP GCCA to be funded under resources from 11th EDF consistent with the EC new flagship initiative to be called GCCA+.***

**Findings**

The Intra ACP GCCA has met with success in striving to assist ACP MS in their efforts to build climate change capabilities with most gains made in relation to adaptation as there is a greater demand for adaptation-related support. There have been successful results in responding to specific needs at the country and regional levels and the rationale for a regional approach was found to be justified. There are unique opportunities for problem-solving that come from encouraging collaboration between countries and ensuring countries share similar capacity for addressing climate change. However, overall, there is considerable room to further development of regional-level strategies and activities. Some of the regional programmes have been more effective than others in nurturing regional dynamics. In the Pacific, West Africa and the Caribbean, existing structures and networks are facilitating gains in establishing regional approaches or creating the basis for improved regional partnerships. This first phase of the Intra ACP Programme has laid the groundwork for a global mechanism for addressing climate change through combined efforts of a number of regional programmes.

There are many good initiatives emanating from the various regional programmes that could help shape a subsequent phase of the Intra ACP including innovative pilot activity, effective synergy between Global GCCA country programmes and regional programmes, steps towards the creation of regional-level resources and capacity such as shared meteorological services, and the development of national strategies and policies that enable countries to address national concerns while creating a stronger base for participating at the regional level. At the national level, there have been concerted efforts to provide in-depth and/or specialised training and to build capacity such as establishing national climate change offices occurring on occasion in coordination with support provided through national GCCA programmes.

It is important to put the initial success of the Intra ACP in its proper context as there is still a large gap between what has been accomplished and what is required. The success of the regional programmes is defined mostly in terms of making first strides towards putting in place critical capacity that has yet to become fully operational. Pilot and field level demonstrations brought gains in terms of learning and experimentation but the mastery of ideas and practices that can lead to scaling-up and replication of actions is still far away. The overall impact of the Intra ACP GCCA was tempered by the slow start of all the regional programmes with four (COMESA, CCCCC, CILSS and USP) requesting time extensions. There was an inaccurate expectation that the regional programmes would become operational within a short period of time. For those programmes that could build upon existing projects and relations with strong development partners this was made somewhat more possible. For programmes starting with implementing partners with limited technical and human resource capabilities to address climate change, such as UNECA and COMESA, strong early results were not possible. The administrative and procurement procedures of the EU, national governments and programme partners responsible for the Intra ACP also played a role in holding back the implementation of activities. Matters such as a country formerly signing the agreement to participate in the Intra ACP Programme and hiring staff impacted on results and financial disbursement levels.

Individual regional programmes have not performed equally well. While the two programmes of the Pacific led by the USP and SPC, the CILSS Programme in West Africa and the CCCCC programme in the Caribbean can be considered successful to varying degrees, the same cannot be said of the UNECA-managed ClimDev or the COMESA-led programmes. The most important difference between successful regional programmes and their struggling counterparts is capacity. While Agrhymet is a well-staffed and strong technical agency, the UNECA struggles with capable but minimal staff managing a highly multi-faceted programme with numerous components. While the raison d’être of the CCCCC is climate change and it has developed capacity and relationships accordingly, the three RECs in Eastern and Southern Africa are building their climate capacity while implementing the Programme[[3]](#footnote-3). In such circumstances lengthy administrative procedures have been debilitating. Key staff positions with SADC and EAC were filled in the latter stages of the programme’s existence only.

A priority should have been to ensure that the implementing partners were in a stronger position to manage regional climate change programmes. It can be argued that this still should be the priority. These two programmes required more ongoing attention from the EU and the ACP Secretariat and there appear to be organisational constraints faced by the EU in establishing better oversight beyond the Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) system and assigning country-level project officers to follow a regional programme. At the design stage, circumstances in Africa required more thought and planning. In fact, with all regional programmes a longer-term strategy was required that could have resulted in more specialised approaches for each regional programme and a more clearly defined global strategy about how the regional programmes intersect between themselves and connect with the GCCA national initiatives. This vision should be supported by strong implementing organisations with appropriate capacities and management practices in place.

Greater thought has to be put into the role the CSF plays in supporting the regional programmes. There were design and administrative issues as well as a lack of understanding regarding the CSF services. There was not an overall demand for the service. Yet, while the West Africa Programme took advantage of the CSF to support its mandate, other programmes with deeper needs abstained from using the CSF. A structured relation between the CSF and the Intra-ACP regional programmes is required to ensure the CSF is making a contribution.

Contracting authorities such as COMESA should not be absolved of responsibility for some of the problems encountered. Mistakes have been made in terms of administrative and management practices, programming decisions and matters related to communication and coordination. While the regional programmes were expected to assist at the national level and were successful in contributing to building national capacity, some national or country level activity was found to be neither strategic nor noteworthy. It was concluded that a successful regional programme should not be defined by having a number of activities spread amongst countries. Pilot activity, for example, should have regional relevance. Countries should be encouraged to undertake joint approaches to problem solving. This type of strategic thinking should come through more clearly with the Intra ACP programme.

In locations such as the Pacific, there has been strong synergy with other development initiatives. While for Africa, better coordination and clearer partnerships would be beneficial. In terms of coordinating with the national GCCA programmes; the Pacific and Caribbean have good examples of how this can work. Overall, national GCCA programmes should be seen as sources of innovation for regional programmes. The Jamaican national GCCA programme support for shoreline protection is an example of a national programme experimenting with innovations that could be of broader interest. In Africa, there also appears to be little coordination between the regional programmes, national programmes and other donors in supporting the African Group of Negotiators (AGN) in international climate change negotiations.

In order to arrive at a global understanding of the achievements of the respective regional programmes, a rating system was developed covering the ten main questions that guided the evaluation. The rating system covers issues such as relevance, design, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. Overall, it was found that the Intra ACP GCCA achieved a B score (satisfactory-good), based on the fact that out of ten questions, eight were given a B rating. Two areas were rated C, namely design and ‘achievement of overall objectives’. Levels of performance between the various programmes were found to vary, with four better performing programmes (the two Pacific programmes, CILSS, and CCCCC) that stand in contrast with the less performing ClimDev and COMESA programmes. Detailed findings are presented in chapter four dealing with the overall assessment of the Intra ACP GCCA.

Given the current situation with the global carbon markets, a reassessment of GCCA priority areas five “*enhancing participation in the global carbon market*” and - to some degree - four (*REDD*) seems necessary. The CCCCC Caribbean programme has already switched its focus away from the carbon markets towards support for Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) by securing climate funding through new sources such as the Green Climate Fund and taking into consideration the post 2015 regime(s) for new carbon finance. Most Intra ACP countries are not serious emitters of Green House Gases (GHG) and while mitigation activities and securing secondary funding will still have a place in the GCCA+, some reflection and research should go into restating a priority area (access to carbon markets) that does not exist as it used to. A possibility would be to define mitigation action in close relation to poverty alleviation as is possible through REDD related activity.

**Main Recommendations**

1. The creation of the GCCA+, a second phase of the Intra ACP GCCA programme, is strongly supported. This should nevertheless, be guided with the establishment of a long-term strategy for the Intra-ACP Programme that takes into consideration the Cotonou Agreement and anticipates EU support beyond the GCCA+. Such a strategy would allow regional programmes to address the regional climate change concerns while building towards a substantive global alliance between ACP countries through shared programming. The strategy should also establish parameters for encouraging synergy between regional programmes and GCCA national programmes as a means for furthering national, regional and global objectives. At the same time, it is imperative that each regional programme is guided by comprehensive regional climate change strategies. Currently some regional programmes cannot refer to such a document.
2. A differentiated approach to regional programming should be established that recognises that not all regional partners have the same capacity and that challenges faced by each region are significantly different. Mechanisms such as the CSF/TA to the ACP Secretariat should be employed to greater advantage to develop the capacities of regional implementing partners. To facilitate this in the Southern and East African Regions for example, this would involve direct communication between the SADC and the EAC, on the one hand, and the CSF and the TA to the ACP Secretariat on the other. In relation to this, a concerted effort should be made to ensure that each regional programme from a regional perspective is as strategic as possible, and opportunities for synergy with organisations such as the UNDP are fully explored.
3. Develop a management and administrative strategy that contributes to increased consistency of results while providing support towards, for example, a stronger embracing of the Cotonou Agreement (in particular article 32A) and synergy between regional programmes of the Intra ACP and GCCA+ National Programmes. First priorities include developing and implementing a plan to ensure a more effective use of the CSF and an improved overall monitoring and evaluation system.
4. Greater focus should be placed on promoting initiatives that have clear regional implications, in terms of addressing the potential needs of multiple countries. This could come in the form of services, information and developing shared strategies to address common problems. Pilot or demonstration activities should also be a part of a more pronounced effort to establish a strong regional dynamic. Such pilot projects should have added value in terms of learning, problem solving, and stimulating interest that could lead to replication and/or up-scaling. Current activities of National GCCA programmes should be considered as a potential source of inspiration for regional pilot activity.
5. Stronger programming links must be established with national GCCA programmes. Regional programming should seek to address gaps in national programming that can also address regional considerations. Of special interest is to look at successful programming components of national GCCA programmes in terms of their suitability for application at the regional level.
6. Institutional analysis in relation to climate change capacity should be conducted of the key partners involved in the ClimDev and the COMESA-led Programmes. Organisational needs in terms of administrative and technical capacity should be identified and strategies mapped out to ensure these programmes are guided towards institutional capacity comparable to the other Intra ACP programmes. This should be considered as a condition for accessing GCCA and Intra ACP+ Programme resources. It may also be prudent to examine, with the other organisations guiding regional programmes, aspects of their operations that could benefit from reinforcement through the Intra-ACP Programme.
7. The EU should establish a mechanism to better monitor regional programmes. This is especially important for more problematic programmes. Options for this should include looking at a more pronounced role of the EU Delegations in ACP countries and possibly increased use of the resources of the CSF.
8. A clear administrative structure for the TA to the ACP Secretariat and CSF should be established to ensure that these services are used more effectively. The key is to have a structure that ensures there is an ongoing demand. This could be achieved for example by giving the TA to the ACP Secretariat and the CSF more direct responsibilities related to matters such as ensuring that the Intra-ACP GCCA+ respects the objectives of the Cotonou Agreement. There is a clear role for the CSF to build bridges between the regional programmes towards achieving global objectives. In respect to individual regional programmes there is a need for a more planned approach on how the CSF can support regional objectives in the form of the provision of technical support. There should be more active dialogue and information sharing between the TA to the ACP Secretariat and CSF, on the one hand, and individual regional programmes on the other. This could be achieved by such means as having representatives of CSF regularly attend regional programme steering committee meetings where all key partners are in attendance.
9. The five priority areas of the Intra ACP Programme should be reviewed to ensure they will remain relevant throughout the next phase of the Intra ACP GCCA and beyond. Of special interest are the mitigation and CDM related priorities; improving the forest stock in terms of volume and diversity and encouraging carbon neutral sources of energy, for example, remain worthwhile objectives. Given current trends in carbon financing, the question is what is the best way forward for the Intra ACP to make gains in this area and how best to frame it. At the same time, this should be seen as an opportunity to identify global initiatives that could be shared and supported by all regional programmes.
10. Remaining funds of the Intra ACP GCCA envelop should be used for such concrete purposes as covering the expenses for comprehensive evaluations of the ClimDev and COMESA led regional programmes, in as far these cannot be covered from other resources. The cost of institutional analysis of the partner organisation of these programmes, such as COMESA, EAC and SADC, should also be covered and where applicable, should lead to capacity building strategies. The funds should be used to develop a strategy for stronger coordination of inter-regional programming and ensuring adherence to objectives of the Cotonou Agreement. The remaining financial envelope should also be used for measures aimed at increasing the use of and improvement of the CSF.
11. For the purpose of the programme’s visibility, the ACP Secretariat and the EU should establish guidelines to ensure minimum expectations are met in areas such as internet presence. Currently, the programmes employ very different communication strategies and some are more successful than others, but overall there should be minimum practices and standards for communication activities that are shared by the regional programmes.

# Introduction

##  Context of the evaluation

### The evaluation assignment

This report is one of the two final outputs of the team responsible for Evaluation of the GCCA and Mid-Term Assessment of the Intra-ACP GCCA, an assignment awarded under the Framework Contract EuropeAid/127054/C/SER/Multi - Lot 6: Environment. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the assignment are attached as *Annex 1*. For reason of the believed interaction and complementarity of the two programmes, it was decided to commission one single evaluation covering both programmes. In addition, the GCCA Intra ACP is a sub-programme of the GCCA Initiative. However, as the programmes have different funding sources; two separate final reports were to be produced, one for the global GCCA and one for the Intra-ACP GCCA.

The team was mobilised under the EURONET Consortium and comprised Mr Egger Topper (AGEG Consultants), evaluation and forestry specialist, 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 expert. 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 presentation tasks. The evaluators assessed a sample of six regional and ten national GCCA programmes. On the basis of several criteria (refer Desk Report), the following countries were selected for 3-5 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. In addition, interviews with the Technical Assistance to the ACP-Secretariat and with management of the Climate Support Facility were conducted. A work calendar is provided in *Annex 6*.

This report follows a desk report which was submitted at the end of the desk phase, and explained the proposed approach and methodology. Essentially, the report aims to answer the ten main evaluation questions 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.

The report is essentially based on the series of Mission Aide-Mémoires (presented in *Annex 3*) which highlight strengths and challenges for each of the individual projects and programmes evaluated. The mission aide-mémoires also present issues at the ‘micro-level’, which are primarily of interest for the concerned country or regional project, but these have only been reported here in case they were of interest to the evaluation of the overall programme.

The report is structured as follows: in this chapter, further background information is provided on the GCCA initiative and the linkage between the various components. It is explained 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 2.2, 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 Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria, and (3) a scoring table reflecting performance of each of the projects and programmes evaluated on the various evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. Details on methodology as well as the scoring table are provided in *Annex 4*. A reflection on methodology and some of the difficulties encountered in implementation of the assignment are discussed in chapter 2.2.4.

In chapter three, the main findings and answers to each of the ten Evaluation Questions (EQ) are presented along with evidence and reasoning. Chapter four then synthesises all answers to evaluation questions into an overall assessment of the programme. Table 1 on page 40 gives an overview of performance of the various programmes on the different criteria. Chapter five, finally, presents the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from the evaluation.

### The GCCA

The GCCA is an initiative of the EU, launched in 2007 through a Communication (*COM (2007) 540 final)* from the 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 the dialogue and the cooperation on the issue of climate change with the developing countries[[4]](#footnote-4) 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 greenhouse gas 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, and 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.* It 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 support *REDD related activity.* 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 create incentives for forest protection, while preserving livelihoods and ecosystems depending on forests.
4. Another priority area intending at reducing greenhouse gas 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. *DRR* is also among the five priorities of the GCCA. Through this priority area the focus is 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. The GCCA organisational structure is depicted in *Annex 5.*

*Financial commitments*

Since 2008, the GCCA has committed 287 million EUR from the EC budget, the 10th EDF, and contributions from different member States[[5]](#footnote-5). This includes Fast Start Finance (FSF) pledged at the UNFCCC 15th Conference of the Parties (COP) in Copenhagen in 2009 to support immediate action on climate change in developing countries. To date, FSF from the EC, Ireland, Estonia and Cyprus has provided approximately 103 million EUR to GCCA-supported interventions in Africa, Asia and the Pacific.

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 is supporting the mainstreaming of climate change into national development planning in a majority of these 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.

Besides supporting individual countries, the GCCA is active at a regional level, supporting programmes that tackle climate change issues that cross the borders of individual countries. This means pooling of resources, strengthening capacities, sharing knowledge and working in partnership with the regional organisations already in place to build on existing work and successes. As of today, more than 60 million EUR has been committed to regional programmes, including a 40 EUR million contribution from the EDF-funded Intra-ACP budget. Of this commitment, only 37.5 million EUR was engaged in reality. The latter funding has resulted in a technical and financial support programme named the Intra- ACP programme, comprising TA as well as five regional components.

*Coordination and implementation*

The GCCA initiative is coordinated by the Directorate General Development and Cooperation (DEVCO) of the EC, in particular by the DEVCO C2 Unit (Climate change, environment, natural resources and water). 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 and ACP-wide) are responsible for management of the 37.5 M€ allocation of Intra-ACP budget to the initiative (the Intra-ACP GCCA programme).

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 overall evaluation for the initiative, including the various funding mechanisms.

## Methodology

### Evaluation questions

As proposed in the Desk Report’s section on methodology and approach to the assignment, the Evaluation Framework is built around Ten EQs, in order to force the evaluation team to remain focused. The EQs are primarily based on the evaluation questions, sub-questions and ‘issues’ contained in the ToR, complemented by questions emerging from a first review of documentation. They have been grouped according to the five DAC evaluation criteria (though 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[[6]](#footnote-6)? (= 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 overall objectives?

For the Intra-ACP GCCA this objective is *to reduce poverty by enabling countries to adopt productive capacities for a sustainable climate change adaptation.*

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?

This evaluation also had a number of specific responsibilities in terms of gathering information and making recommendations. To this end, the role of the CSF in the Intra ACP Programme is analysed throughout the report, and an Aide Memoire on the CSF can be found in the Annexes of this report. The CSF has been operating for two years as a Support Facility to the Intra-ACP GCCA programme. It is meant to be a demand-driven instrument responding to a wide range of needs emanating from beneficiaries and potential beneficiaries of Intra-ACP GCCA support. Also to be reviewed is the role the TA to ACP Secretariat has played in the programme and more specifically the contribution of the climate change specialist designated to support the ACP Secretariat who is also known as the Technical Assistant to the ACP.

In addition, the evaluation team was mandated to identify priorities and provide recommendation(s) for allocation of the remaining 0.5 million Euros from a 1.0 M Euros financial envelop allocated to strengthen efforts to complement the implementation of the current programme.

### 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 GCCA and the Intra-ACP programmes. This was done to respond to specific evaluation needs. Furthermore, the questions were tailored to the global/macro level and to the level of individual actions (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 served for further elaboration of the evaluation matrix.

### 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, in analogy to the scoring system in the ROM methodology (a score ranging from *‘a’* (very good) to *‘d’* (serious deficiencies)). The resulting table allows for a synthetic overview of performance of the various interventions in the different regions, on the one hand, and of evaluation questions and criteria on the other, for the Intra- ACP GCCA programme and the global GCCA and their various components. The results of the rating are discussed in Chapter 4 on Overall Assessment, and synthesised in Table 1 on page 40.

### 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. Most of them evolve around trying to make important decisions on programmes within a very short amount of field time. Typically, evaluation team members would spend two to three days in the field for the regional programme evaluations. The reality is that this was insufficient; each regional programme is very complex. There was a need to visit not only the country where the headquarters of the regional programme was found but possibly two or three other countries to see what was taking place. For the evaluation of the COMESA programme, for example, a visit was made to one other country that was part of the programme but stakeholders in that country had little knowledge about the regional programme. In other words, time allocations for the country visits were largely insufficient.

In support of the evaluation of the Intra ACP Programme there were essentially five evaluations conducted of five individual programmes within a very short period of time. They all deserved the amount of attention that any programme evaluation would deserve. For evaluators, there is a professional obligation to ensure that standard evaluation procedures are followed such as the triangulation of information. In the methodology used for this evaluation this was not possible. This is why now, for example, for the ClimDev and COMESA programmes, recommendations were made in their respective aide-memoires to undertake comprehensive evaluations, as this was deemed the only way to properly understand what is taking place within these programmes. With some programmes, such as the CCCCC programme in the Caribbean or the CILSS programme in West-Africa, a good understanding of the programme could be established. However, even in the more favourable circumstances, a greater amount of time than allocated was required to gather and analyze information.

It is also worth mentioning how different each of the programmes is from their counterparts. This should be expected, but comparing them – as a scoring table does, can be challenging, as each should be judged on their own merits. Comparing a CILSS with the climate change unit of COMESA, for example, is difficult and is not necessarily fair.

An issue that was not explicitly addressed by any of the evaluation questions, but should have been, is how the programmes function as regional programmes. On this matter, criteria such as leadership and ability to coordinate and nurture partnerships could have played a more prominent role. Also, as will be brought up on a number of occasions in this report, a regional programme has an added responsibility to demonstrate the regional relevance of programme activity and should manage its activities accordingly. Similarly more consideration in the evaluation questions should have been given to the issue of the relationship between the regional programmes and national GCCA programmes. These issues are nonetheless addressed in the report as they formed an important line of investigation throughout the evaluation.

# Main findings

In this chapter, answers to each of the ten Evaluation Questions are provided, together with evidence and reasoning.

## 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?***

SIDS are the major focus of Intra ACP programming in the Pacific, Caribbean and Indian Ocean. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and more specifically the Working Group II[[7]](#footnote-7) during its tenth Session in March 2014 on *Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability,* declared that SIDS are among the neediest countries in terms of climate change support. The evaluation process confirmed this as stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation spoke very passionately about the challenges faced by SIDS.

At the same time, there are other circumstances being faced by ACP member states that are highly challenging in their own right. In Southern and Eastern Africa, which are also considered to be two of the more vulnerable regions to climate change,[[8]](#footnote-8) the promotion of Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) and Conservation Agriculture (CA) practices and policies by the Intra ACP are seen as highly pertinent responses to climate change where livelihoods in those regions of Africa are in good part, agriculturally-based. In West Africa, the situation is similar; the United Nations (UN) has determined that climate change is having a disaster impact on livelihoods in the 17 countries of West Africa and “hotspots’ are being created due to growing tensions between and within communities over increasingly diminishing natural resources[[9]](#footnote-9). In response, the West African Intra ACP Programme managed by CILSS/Agrhymet is improving climate monitoring capacity to conduct analysis of climate change in the Sahel (and in the other beneficiary countries) and its impacts on agro-sylvo-pastoral production systems.

Many of the countries of the Intra ACP Programme face multiple challenges related to climate change. Over the course of a few years, SIDS such as Mauritius can be devastated by drought, flooding from heavy rains and extreme weather event such as cyclones. In Belize, there are zones that can switch from flooding to drought conditions from one year to the next.

ACP member states struggle with establishing and maintaining the technical capacity and financial resources to stay on top of the circumstances created by climate change. There are also numerous institutional challenges, in terms of having appropriate policies and maintaining positions of influence within national governments through functioning climate change offices to ensure the issue remains a strong priority. A key objective in all ACP regions is to raise the standards of all ACP countries to permit them to simultaneously address national climate change challenges while effectively participating in regional and international forums and processes to articulate their interests and those of their region. In different ways and to different degrees, all six programmes reviewed here are contributing to achieving this.

The idea that capable regional-level institutions can assist in achieving national and regional objectives is a valid assumption. Organisations such as the CCCCC in the Caribbean, Agrhymet in West Africa and USP, PACE-SD, SPC, and SPREP in the Pacific are highly credible institutions each having their own comparative advantages in carrying out region-wide climate change mandates. UNECA and COMESA appear to be two institutions that have less suitable profiles for managing a regional climate change programme. This does not take away from the fact that in Africa there is a need for increased regional leadership on climate change. The question remains whether or not there was a better alternative to the institutions that were chosen.

The Intra-ACP operates under the guidance of a broad range of national and regional policies and strategies. In the Caribbean for example, the CCCCC led programme is being implemented in accordance with the “*Climate Change and the Caribbean: A Regional Framework for Achieving Development Resilient to Climate Change (2011 to 2021)”* that in fact, was prepared by the CCCCC at the request of the Caribbean Community Secretariat (CARICOM) Heads of State. In the Pacific, the two regional programmes support the implementation of the *Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (PIFACC) that covers the period from 2006 to 2015.* In addition, a policy consultation/formulation exercise was undertaken at national and regional levels in the Pacific which lead to the establishment of national and regional strategy merging DRR and CC adaptation into the “*Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific (SRDP) 2016 onwards.”*  In Africa, the three programmes are aligned with the *New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD)* and the *Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)*. All programmes also support the Joint ACP/EU Declaration on Climate Change of 2009 and are focused on delivering on the priorities of the Joint African/EU Strategy and Action Plan (08-10) on climate change. At the same time, in all countries where the Intra ACP Programme is operational, there is an obligation to respect national climate change and development related policies and strategies. In many instances the Intra ACP is actually assisting with the development of such strategies and/or creating conditions to ensure adherence to the national policies and strategies.

Overwhelmingly, the majority of the activities implemented through the Intra ACP are focussed on climate change adaptation (CCA). With a few exceptions such as Trinidad and Tobago, countries of the ACP are not serious GHG emitters and may never be. The Intra-ACP is demand driven and as such the needs of beneficiary countries are clearly focussed on reducing vulnerability to climate change. REDD-like activity such as reforestation should also be encouraged because there are clear economic, social and environmental benefits beyond addressing concerns related to climate change. Linking to international carbon markets is important for securing funding but does not override the importance of reforestation in addressing climate change. At the same time, promoting renewable energy has clear developmental advantages not the least of which is energy independence. At this time, the world's global system for carbon trading is far from being fully operational. Meanwhile, the Intra ACP Programme has two of its five priority areas dedicated to some degree or another carbon financing and trading. Though circumstances surrounding carbon markets can change, priority areas three and four (REDD) and five (CDM) of the ACP should be revisited. Without discouraging the promotion of REDD-friendly activities, it should be examined how best these types of activities can be conceptualised and integrated into regional and national programmes in an ongoing manner regardless of the status of the carbon markets.

In terms of the relevance of the CSF, there is little doubt that the CSF should be highly relevant considering its function and operating modalities; the question is why in reality it isn’t. There is no strong demand for the service - which would be the best indication of its relevance. The issue is more complex than to simply conclude that the CSF has no relevance. The mandate of the CSF is tied to the five priority areas of the GCCA and feedback from completed CSF work orders indicates that the service, when active, is addressing key issues. The focus has to be placed on better understanding the circumstances under which the CSF has operated as a means of making the CSF more relevant.

One of the expectations of the Intra-ACP Programme is that it would contribute to the Cotonou Agreement and most specifically Article 32A. The Cotonou Agreement aims to eradicate poverty while contributing to sustainable development. The expectation is that poverty should be eradicated while ACP countries are fully integrated into the world economy. With the Cotonou Agreement there are also specific objectives related to climate. These objectives are outlined in the table below and the Intra-ACP`s contribution to their achievement.

***Table 1: Assessment of Intra-ACP achievements in terms of objectives defined by Article 32A of the Cotonou Agreement***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Elements in Article 32A of the Cotonou Agreement | Intra-ACP GCCA Achievements  |
| (a) recognise the vulnerability of ACP States and in particular of small islands and low-lying ACP States to climate-related phenomena such as coastal erosion, cyclones, flooding and environmentally induced displacements, and in particular of least developed and landlocked ACP-States to increasing floods, drought, deforestation and desertification; | The main programming thrusts of the Intra ACP are aimed directly at recognising the vulnerability of the ACP states to climate related challenges and events such as floods and drought. The Intra-ACP is addressing vulnerability through concrete ground level activity such as disaster risk management planning and drought resistant agriculture. There are also efforts to institutionalise policies and capacity to establish more permanent mechanisms to address vulnerability.  |
| b) Strengthen and support policies and programmes to mitigate and adapt to the consequences of, and threat posed by, climate change including through institutional development and capacity building; | The Intra-ACP`s main programming element is adaptation related activity. The focus on adaptation has emerged as a response to the needs at the regional, national and local levels. At the policy and research level for example, there has been support for NAPAs and NASAPs. In terms of mitigation related activity, the engagement of the Intra-ACP has not been as strong. As the Intra-ACP is demand driven the greater focus on adaptation is an expression of where MS priorities lie. Nevertheless, the Intra-ACP has provided supported for important efforts such as the completion of NAMAs.  |
| (c) Enhance the capacity of ACP States in the development of, and the participation in, the global carbon market;  | During the lifetime of the Intra-ACP Programme there have been important developments related to the carbon markets that has seen interest dampening significantly and new funding mechanism emerging. A few regional programmes were making efforts to establish for example, Designated National Authorities (DNA) that could approve CDM projects. However, at least one regional programme has switched its focus towards NAMAs and post 2015 carbon financing.  |
| Focus on the Following Activities |  |
| (i) Integrating climate change into development strategies and poverty reduction efforts; | There has been Intra-ACP Programme support at the national level to mainstream climate change considerations into policies and practices. There is the support for NAPAs and playing a role in the creation or strengthening of national climate change offices that in turn provide guidance on climate change mainstreaming. There has also been support for developing more climate sensitive practices and policies in the agricultural sector both nationally and the regional level.  |
| (ii) raising the political profile of climate change in development cooperation, including through appropriate policy dialogue; | Support has been provided through all regional programmes for participation in international climate change forums and negotiations. Debate and dialogue has been facilitated at the national and regional levels. There have also been joint meetings/workshops where representatives from the different regional programmes have attended. This is an area where the Intra-ACP could place more emphasis.  |
| (iii) assisting ACP states to adapt to climate change in relevant sectors such as agriculture, water management and infrastructure, including through transfer and adoption of relevant and environmentally sound technologies; | There are a number of examples of direct support to specific sectors. In the Caribbean for example, varied support has been provided to the water sector in promoting improved technologies to better manage water resources. In Easter and Southern Africa, the overall focus of the regional programme is on improving agricultural production.  |
| (iv) promoting disaster risk reduction, reflecting that an increasing proportion of disasters are related to climate change; | In the Pacific and Caribbean DRR activities are key programming elements. In Africa support is being provided to drought resistance agriculture.  |
| (v) providing financial and technical support for mitigation action of ACP states in line with their poverty reduction and sustainable development objectives, including reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and reducing emissions in the agricultural sector; | As noted above mitigation activities have not necessarily been a strength of the specific regional programmes.  |
| (vi) improving weather and climate information and forecasting and early warning systems; | In the Caribbean there is a concerted effort to improve the use of climate information through efforts to downscale its application.  |

The aggregated score based on the evaluation rating system of the regional programmes of the Intra ACP programme is B (good). The Intra-ACP is clearly attempting to respond to the needs of its member states with a solid focus on addressing their climate related priorities. At the same time it was observed through the evaluation process that it was possible for a regional programme to provide support in a priority area but without the precision required to make such an intervention more strategic. For example, COMESA is assisting Eastern and Southern Africa with CSA and CA interventions but at the same time, so are many other organisations. In a regional programme there should be added responsibility to ensure that activities have added value from a regional standpoint. A stronger case has to be made for each activity.

## 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?***

The original project documents of the regional programmes of the Intra-ACP reveal a great deal of what would eventually happen with the regional programmes with no greater indicator than the logframe. For the COMESA programme, a poorly designed logframe is still in place while the programme continues to struggle. The logframe is considered to be of little use with the objectives and indicators on occasion being found to be excessively optimistic. For example, for Programme Objective No. 3, relating to adoption of CSA and CA practices, the verifiable indicator is 1.2 million farmers adopting elements of CA by 2016. ClimDev has similar challenges with its logframe. The original ClimDev Logframe was found to be unfocussed with confusion between results, outputs and outcomes. At one point a Theory of Change exercise was introduced to make improvements in the logframe, but at the time of the field visit for this evaluation, problems persisted with programme and the logframe.

In the Pacific region, the two programmes struggled initially with inadequate logframes but eventually made modifications. ROM visits to both programmes resulted in changes to the logframes establishing a better linkage between objectives and more realistic and verifiable indicators. With the CCCCC and CLISS/Agrhymet, the logframes have never been a real issue. The CCCCC programme has been slow to achieve results but this has more to do with other factors such as countries taking too much time to sign the programme’s Memorandum of Understanding (MoU).

There are noteworthy design features of the different programmes. For example in the Caribbean, the working environment can be very difficult as communication and administrative procedures are slow. For this reason it was decided to work as much as possible through pre-established projects and relations. For example, through previous non EU projects CCCCC had invested a great deal of time and effort supporting the Government of Suriname building climate change capacity. With the Intra ACP Programme, Suriname is now playing a leadership role in a region-wide meteorological data service initiative. Another good feature in the Caribbean was to associate the programme with CARIFORUM[[10]](#footnote-10) as opposed to CARICOM. Unlike CARICOM, Cuba and the Dominican Republic are member states of CARIFORUM. Having these two countries involved opened up learning opportunities for the other MS, as Cuba in particular, is highly advanced in areas such as DRR.

In the Pacific with the PSIS programme, an approach was taken to allow countries to select their sector of focus. They were then assisted to develop a 0.5 million Euro adaptation project. They were also supported through additional climate change mainstreaming activities and capacity building. This approach encouraged buy-in into the activity. Hence, even though there is a considerable amount of variety in these activities, for example an agro-forestry and a coastal stabilisation structure project, there was an overriding strategy to allow countries to define their priorities and their project choices stemmed from these priorities. Another design feature of PSIS has been to work directly with national GCCA programmes to improve capacity and understanding related to climate finance through national and sector based budget support.

The Pacific and Caribbean programmes also share the feature of working from well-defined regional climate change strategies. For the Pacific programmes, it is the PIFACC which covers the period from 2006 to 2015. In the Caribbean, the Regional Framework for Achieving Development Resilient to Climate Change is a 10-year vision that outlines priority areas and institutions across the Caribbean that can act as lead agencies and/or collaborators. In contrast, the COMESA led programme for Southern and Eastern Africa refers to the Climate Solutions Africa document that does not have close to the same level of detail and focus of the Pacific and Caribbean documents.

The USP programme, in recognition of the need to optimise the use of the limited human, technical and financial resources in the countries, integrates climate change and disaster risk management objectives in some Intra ACP Programme activities. This is achieved through formal training and non-formal training and through the development of community-focused toolkits. The Disaster Risk Management (DRM) course, developed and taught under the project, includes two modules on the integration of CCA and DRR. The non-formal trainings conducted at regional and sub-regional levels include a session on the integration of CCA and DRR in the community resilience plans. The toolkit developed for the community includes information collected on both climate change and natural hazards issues, increasing the awareness of the communities of the common points of these two types of actions.

The CILSS/Agrhymet West African programme was designed to focus on building capacity on a number of levels, and strengthening knowledge on the impact of climate change in West Africa. This is not necessarily very innovative but it has proven to be very effective.

On one level, compared to other regional programmes, the COMESA programme should be admired for its attempts to make the connection between ground level activity and high level policy as is being attempted in relation to CSA. The focus on women should also be acknowledged, even if otherwise, the programme has been problematic. It was allowed to subscribe to a very ambitious agenda that the three implementing partners (COMESA, SADC & EAC) were unprepared to carry out. With the COMESA programme close to its EU-funding termination date[[11]](#footnote-11), it can be argued that capacity building of the implementing partner should have been and should still be the programme`s first priority. The three RECs are not obvious choices as implementing partners like one has in West Africa with the technical institution Agrhymet. This reality should have defined the Programme’s strategy. Situational analysis of at least a sample of countries should have been undertaken before the Programme commenced. This could have been completed while the respective RECs were being prepared to take on responsibility for the Programme. What actually occurred was that in 2013, situational analyses were completed and these can at least now serve other purposes.

Although the COMESA programme’s focus on agriculture is the right decision, the programme should be working from a strategy or vision for the region that would allow for greater flexibility to cover in greater detail both forestry and land use management issues as was originally intended for the Programme. The core document *African Climate Solution,*guiding the programme does not appear to be serving much purpose. It identifies agriculture, Forest, and Land Use as possible areas of intervention, but the COMESA programme is now by and large focussed purely on agriculture.

With ClimDev, the use of the newly designed Theory of Change and the related Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) strategy would actually require delegation of staff to M&E tasks and their preparation for use of the system, but training is apparently still ongoing. Judging from recent progress reports, however, the M&E logics do not seem to have been internalised as of yet, by the implementing partners. A Risk Management Matrix is included in the work plan but remains more theoretical at the time of the evaluation.

In terms of the overall Intra-ACP Programme, four of the six regional programmes had slow starts and have or will request extensions to complete their respective activities. In the case of the CCCCC programme there are a number of key studies that will not be completed. In the case of COMESA and ClimDev, there are multiple activities that require more time. The key point to consider is that an error was made in assuming that the regional programmes could hit the ground running.

There is limited structure and/or incentives to encourage more pro-active interaction between the regional programmes leading to more collective global activities and impacts. This might be simply a case of the implementers of the regional programmes having to be more preoccupied with simply ensuring their respective programmes were operating effectively. Entering into the GCCA+ the overall design of Intra ACP+ should be able to make assumptions that programmes will be better positioned to be more strategic at both the individual regional levels and globally.

In terms of the CSF, there appear to have been design issues impacting on the use of the service. For example, there is no mechanism or process in place to encourage or oblige the use of the service that is free of cost. With the regional programmes operating largely independently there is no structured system in place that would see the CSF drawn upon as shared resource. A ROM report on the CSF indicated another issue is the inadequate system in place to identify the needs and demands for CSF support. Cases were found where needs within countries or regions were identified by regional programmes, or by other actors (such as UNDP), but were not being channeled towards the CSF. There are also appears to be issues related to facilitating the assessment of initial requests and the speed of the preparation of Work Orders. Another concern has been the inability to establish an effective communication strategy to draw attention to the services and resources of the CSF. Another reason that would have contributed is that some of the regional programmes were having difficulties in disbursing financial resources. In such a context the appeal of the free of cost nature CSF diminishes.

Some observers point to the structure of the CSF as being problematic. It is divided between two contracts: preparatory work (contacting potential beneficiaries, receiving requests and processing these into Work Orders) as well as post-service assessments (assess satisfaction of beneficiaries with services provided) are taken care of by the Technical Assistant to the ACP-Secretariat, under one contract. The actual implementation of the service delivery is taken care of under another contract (the CSF service delivery as such). This set-up was opted for to avoid possible conflicts of interest of a service provider creating its own demand.

The collective score for the regional programmes on the issue of design was a score of C which is below average. Paying greater attention to details such as having a clear regional strategy, appropriate project documents such as logframes and M&E systems would go a long way in eliminating problems. The Intra ACP Programme overseers share some of the blame for the difficulties. In certain circumstances corrective action was required and if there is no pressure or support to do so it won’t happen. Clearly too the design in support of the CSF required more thinking.

## On effectiveness (achievement of purpose):

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

There are a number of examples of the Intra ACP contributing to dialogue on climate change both regionally and globally. The facilitation of communication channels has taken many forms but apart from most regional programmes supporting participation in international climate change negotiations, there is no other general trend in the nature of the dialogue being supported.

Political dialogue has been a key priority for the CILSS/Agrhymet programme. Objective number three of the CILSS/Agrhymet programme relates to building capacity for climate negotiations and access to carbon market finance mechanisms. Seventeen negotiators from the AGN were trained, and a position paper was submitted at COP 19, where the West African group also supported a side event. The document was developed to outline why agro-forestry should become eligible for the Kyoto Protocol and the CDM. CILSS/Agrhymet provided scientific and technical support in writing the paper. COMESA and ClimDev have also supported the writing of position papers.

In the three countries visited for the CILSS/Agrhymet evaluation the actions to support the AGN and the participation of West African nationals in other international conferences were well received. However, it is important to emphasise that in West Africa, important differences remain in positions on climate negotiations between civil society and governments, and that support during the negotiations from the programme could be more effective. To correct this situation the programme is exploring a potential collaboration with the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA), an organisation representing African civil society on climate change.

The COMESA-led programme has some good aspects as it relates to creating broader dialogue. This includes assisting in the creation of the Eastern and Southern Africa Climate Change Media Network that is a forum for the exchange of views on climate change and awareness raising of journalists on climate change issues who then in turn are expected to sensitise the general public on issues related to the subject. The Network was an outcome of a meeting held by COMESA and the Network of Climate Journalists of the Greater Horn of Africa (NECJOGHA).The COMESA programme also supported three regional conferences that brought together youth to learn and develop perspectives on climate change. The COMESA led programme also deserves credit for putting an extra emphasis on ensuring the participation of women in Programme activities.

Also, with the COMESA programme, regional Parliamentarians have been sensitized through the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA) resulting in the adoption of the EAC Climate Change Resolution that has paved the way for the formulation of the EAC Climate Change Bill to provide a legal framework for the implementation of the EAC Climate Change Policy. Political good-will has been mobilized at the regional level through facilitating the EAC Heads of State Retreat on Climate Change and Food Security in 2010 that resulted in the EAC Heads of State Declaration on Climate Change and Food Security.

As noted earlier, the COMESA programme is involved in facilitating the participation of the AGN. There are some issues surrounding administrative matters and the selection process used to determine delegates. There is a belief that SADC and EAC and MS in general should be more directly involved in the selection process. There have been no clear guidelines on how the negotiators are being chosen and there is a feeling that good candidates are being left aside. At the same time however, the COMESA programme is credited with giving the negotiators a chance to gain good experience.

 In relation to ClimDev, weak reporting made it difficult to make a reasonable assessment about what is being accomplished in this area. Some of the outputs related to attendance or organisation of Summits, Committees, Conferences or training events have not been made available to the EU or to the evaluation team. In addition, reporting does not allow for a clear establishment of actual contribution (in terms of financial and human resources) by ClimDev to these events and activities. This brings up a larger issue on the support provided by the three African Intra ACP regional programmes and the Global GCCA. Due to the time limitations of the evaluation process, it was not possible to completely comprehend what is taking place but there is a perception that there could be a certain amount of overlap in supporting the AGN. In addition, there appears to be little or no coordination between the regional programmes and the national GCCA programmes on issues related to the participation of African negotiators in international climate forums. Nor does there appear to be any coordination with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on this matter which should not be the case given the leadership role the UN agency plays on this matter. This requires follow up investigation.

The USP programme contributed to dialogue through its training component. Students were supported to act as members of their country delegations during UNFCCC negotiations. In 2013 for example, seven students attended the COP-19 in Warsaw, Poland. Six students went as part of the Nauru Delegation as part of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) Delegation and one student was part of the Solomon Islands Delegation. Through the USP programme there was national level integration of local adaptation plans developed by the programme. An example of this would be the connection that was made between the National Island strategic plan of Tuvalu and the community development plan of Niue. From a dialogue perspective, the processes depended on consistent communication between the Programme`s country coordinators and EU staff along with key decision makers in the lead Ministries and communities.

Through the PSIS programme, the AOSIS has been supported in consolidating the perspective of Pacific island states and acting as an ad-hoc lobby and negotiating voice for the islands within the UN system. The PSIS programme has also supported participation in COP 18 and 19 (from Cook Islands, Kiribati and Tonga) and played a role in the participation of AOSIS in COP negotiations. In addition, the PSIS programme supported the 2013 Pacific Climate Change Roundtable that brought together a wide range of stakeholders including donors to improve collaboration in addressing climate change.

There is no outstanding aspect of the CCCCC programme on political dialogue but at the same time there are no worrying aspects either. The CCCCC programme benefits from the ongoing dialogue that the CCCCC maintain with CARIFORUM countries. The CCCCC programme has also supported the creation of a national climate change office for the Government of Belize that is critical in maintaining political dialogue.

The overall rating for the regional programmes is considered a B (good) with all the regional programmes individually receiving a score of B. This is good sign that overall, all regional programmes have taken the issue of political dialogue to heart.

***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)?***

A combined focus on poverty reduction and climate change is an area that on the surface would not be considered a strength of the Intra ACP. At the same time, it is not always necessary or strategic that every activity is strongly focussed on poverty alleviation. While it is true that all activities that contribute to reducing risks and building resilience to the impacts of climate change create better circumstances for poverty alleviation, there are clearly other more direct ways to reduce poverty.

There are three programmes (CILSS, CCCCC and ClimDev) that address the issue of poverty reduction indirectly. CILSS/Agrhymet and CCCCC, among other things, oversee critical research, training and other capacity building activities while collaborating with national governments, often at a strategic level. At the same time however, Agrhymet has always struggled with becoming an effective ground-level organisation that would put it in a better position to achieve more direct results related to poverty alleviation.

Nonetheless, there are aspects of the Intra ACP Programme that do directly address poverty reduction. The COMESA programme for example, promotes CA and CSA. This is done in an African context where a large percentage of the population depends on agriculture production to survive. CSA pilot activity is underway in Uganda, Kenya (in EAC region) and Zambia, Malawi and Zimbabwe in (SADC region). EAC is planning to initiate CSA pilots in Burundi, Rwanda and Tanzania in 2014 in an effort to increase CSA pilots. The COMESA Programme’s focus on women would also contribute to addressing poverty.

With PSIS in Kiribati, an environmental health surveillance laboratory was recently refurbished recognising that outbreaks of climate sensitive related diseases such as dengue fever, diarrhoea, and giardiasis are becoming more frequent. In addition, five PSIS countries have chosen to focus on outlying islands for their adaptation project activities, recognising that in many cases persons living on these islands are isolated and have limited to no access to alternative sources of food, water and livelihoods. The PSIS programme is trying to maintain an approach that ensures enough flexibility to respond to these specific poverty-related circumstances.

USP pilot projects were implemented to assist vulnerable communities in the periphery by strengthening the capacities to tackle the combined challenge of poverty and climate change. By the end of the USP programme, 43 demonstration communities in 15 countries are expected to establish a network of successful CCA strategies throughout the Pacific Island region. The Locally Managed Climate Change Adaptation (LMCCA) Network includes communities, Non Governmental Organisation (NGOs) and local authorities. Rapid Assessments (RAs), and the Vulnerability and Adaptation (V&A) methodologies that were developed, have subsequently been used by governments, especially the environmental Ministries, in all participating countries. In Timor Leste, the Ministry of Environmental Affairs and Climate Change was not previously acquainted with participatory methods and their knowledge and experience on how to conduct assessments - and hence their ability to be effective in poorer communities - has been improved. Similarly, in Niue, RAs and V&A methodologies formed the basis of the National Adaptation Plan and of the Village Sustainable Development Plans.

With CILSS/Agrhymet, the programme is establishing hydro-climatological information systems, which produce highly relevant information for crop and livestock farmers on weather forecasting and the identification of agro-hydrological risks or on potential flooding. However, this information, in order to be useful to final users, needs to be translated into practical tools and local languages, and linked to structures to spread the information. This type of activity is not one of Agrhymet’s strengths. The CCCCC has been asked by the Government of Grenada to provide support for the installation of a salt water reverse osmosis plant to create a sustainable source of fresh water on an isolated island. The poverty alleviation potential of this technology replicated across the Caribbean is considerable as well.

The Intra ACP GCCA receives an overall score of B on linking poverty and climate change with the understanding that Intra ACP can make strong contributions without always having a strong focus on poverty alleviation oriented activities, such as income generation.

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

There are some substantial efforts being made by all six regional programmes to build capacity. This has been occurring with stakeholders at the community level and at the highest levels of national governments. A lot of specialised training in areas such as climate modelling has also been supported. Assistance has been provided in building institutions and developing policies and strategies. Below is not meant to be an exhaustive list but rather a sampling of some of the capacity building activities supported through the Intra ACP.

As noted earlier, the CILSS/Agrhymet programme has put a comprehensive focus on training and capacity building. An example of this would be the training of approximately 40 managers from the region’s meteorological and hydrological services and river basin organisations on seasonal forecasting for rain and water flow of main water sources. In Niger, there has been considerable success in training on the integration of climate change considerations in planning exercises. A direct objective has been to ‘adapt’ the Community Development Plans (CDP). To date, 34 CDPs and 46 Annual Investment Plans (AIP) (plans drawn up annually to implement the CDPs) have integrated climate change considerations with support from various funding sources including CARE and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF).

In addition, in Niger the integration of the climate change dimension into planning has been achieved in the health sector, and with the Ministry of Transport it is in progress. As mentioned in relation to EQ 3, there have been activities to prepare West African experts for COP 19 (Warsaw), which have been generally well received. Nevertheless, some people contacted during the evaluation expressed the view that operational effectiveness was limited, and that the activity could be made more efficient in comparison to the experience of the SIDS on this issue. Finally, although not foreseen in the contract, the programme has assisted with Agrhymet’s educational activities, particularly as part of its ‘climate change and sustainable development’ Masters’ programme.

Along the same lines, the USP has established dedicated scholarship programmes for the Postgraduate Diploma, EU-GCCA Masters and PhD in climate change. Formal training has focused on long-term capacity building through the development of a post-graduate climate change programme at the USP, offering course work and training for post graduate diploma students and applied research by MSc and PhD students. The climate change programme continues to build the capacity of government officials and other stakeholders through a longer, more in-depth training programme, in parallel with the non-formal training programme. The climate change programme at USP was augmented and expanded with scholarships and additional course offerings through the USP programme building on the foundational climate change program started with AUSAID funding. Post-Graduate, Master of Science and PhD scholarships were available for students from the region to enrol in the post-graduate courses or conduct their Master or PhD research projects on different aspects of climate change.

Four new courses were developed to meet the specific needs of the region, focusing on both climate sciences and climate adaptation issues. Since the start of this programme, 84 students have completed Post-Graduate diplomas, 17 completed MSc and seven students are currently working on completion of their PhD qualifications, with 31%, 47% and 57 % of students respectively benefiting from EU scholarships. These students include young graduates and more mature government officials who restart their studies under the climate change programme.In addition, 15 National Project Advisory Committees (NPACs) have been established in the 15 programme countries that have assisted with the implementation of 26 of the 43 community adaptation plans. In support of the local adaptation plans, local communities were trained in specific technical areas relevant to their respective adaptation plans. For instance, in Tuvalu, three pilot sites in remote islands installed water tanks of 10 500 litres each and trained more than 35 persons on water management.

One of the modalities the PSIS programme has adopted is to deliver national training, con-ducted in-country, on basic project management practices. This includes proposal preparation, use of the logical framework approach and follow-up training on project design, budgeting, and monitoring and evaluation. This training has been conducted in all nine countries of the programme. The training has had a very positive response from participants. In Niue, six months after the training, an impact evaluation showed that 33% of the participants had used the logical framework approach to prepare a project proposal since the training. Furthermore, 25% of the participants had had their proposal actually funded. Other forms of training provided and considered to be successful include specific training in the health and agriculture sectors, country-to country exchanges (in the field of coastal erosion) and on-the-job training, especially in the field of financial management.

With ClimDev, while there is no systematic monitoring of the programme’s contribution to building capacity, the evaluation process nevertheless concluded that ClimDev is making a contribution to building (African) capacities on climate change study, analysis, policy formulation at different levels and in various sectors, through formal training and capacity building events as well as ‘on-the-job learning’ (through participation in events and workshops). Examples include the training workshops on climate finance. Important resources have gone into ClimDev providing TA to the AGN. The ACPC that is managing project activity is understaffed and it should be enhanced as a first step in ensuring that the future the overall capacity building activities of the programme can be properly guided and monitored.

Similarly, with the COMESA-led Programme, capacity building should have started in-house. There must be a minimum amount of technical and administrative capacity in place to ensure that programming activity is properly handled. Slowly this began to happen. The main COMESA Programme management team has grown from three to 16 staff people. SADC and EAC finally have their teams in place. In the case of EAC, this only happened in January 2014. The current COMESA team is seen as having potential but is limited by a lack of experience in the climate change field and managing a regional programme of this nature. Beyond the gains made in transforming the RECs, the capacity of institutions affiliated to the COMESA programme has been enhanced. An example of this would be the East African Legislative Assembly (EALA)’s that increased its appreciation of climate change through the Committee on Agriculture, Natural Resources and Tourism. The role of parliamentarian’s in responding to climate change at the regional level has been enhanced. An EAC Climate Change Resolution was adopted in 2013 and the process for formulating the EAC Climate Change Policy was initiated in 2014.

Moreover, the technical capacities and understanding of the practice of CSA has also been enhanced in the region through learning visits and initiation and implementation of activities in the CSA pilot countries. As noted earlier, the negotiation capacities of African negotiators and technical advisors have also been enhanced, leading to African negotiators facilitating various negotiation items such as agriculture, capacity building, and technology transfer under the UNFCCC. Similarly, the efforts to develop National Climate Change Policies and Response Strategies and Action Plans create capacity and leave a benchmark in the form of policies and strategies that can guide subsequent activity.

Finally, with the CCCCC, there has been a focus on technical training. Regional climate modelling workshops were held in August 2012 and January 2013 for the northern/western Caribbean countries. In total, 31 people were trained. The Climate Studies Group (CSG) of the University of the West Indies (UWI) in Jamaica, and the Institute of Meteorology (INSMET) of Cuba, the Caribbean Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the United States have been important partners in building capacity. The CSG and INSMET have been partnering with the CCCCC in the downscaling of climate models and the development of climate scenarios for use in the conduct of vulnerability and impact assessments. The CSG and INSMET have also been engaged in the planning, preparation of the training workshop in the use of specific sector (agriculture and water) models for impact assessment for adaptation to climate change. NOAA has been working with the CCCCC programme towards the expansion and strengthening of the coral reef monitoring network in the Caribbean. Under this activity five Coral Reef Early Warning System (CREWS) stations have been procured and will be installed in five programme countries. As noted earlier, the CCCCC has been playing an important role in building the new Climate Change Office of Belize and the Climate Change Division in Jamaica. In Belize, the CCCCC has assigned a staff member to the Climate Change Office and continues to pay her salary. In Jamaica, the Climate Change Division credits the Intra ACP GCCA with enabling it to become active in its early years.

From a capacity building standpoint an important tool at the disposal of the Intra-ACP Programme is the CSF. Although there have been successful usage of the service, especially in West Africa, by and large the service has not been as effective as it could be in assisting in the process of building capacity. As indicated above, there has been a considerable amount of capacity building taking place but without CSF support. The Technical Assistant to the ACP who manages the CSF work orders has been in discussions with regional programme implementers to determine ways in which the service can be used more.

Overall, a very solid contribution has been made to improve the relevant capacity of ACP countries and begin nurturing regional level capacity. A rating of B (good) has been assigned with three programmes scoring A (very good).

## 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?***

Efficiency and non-efficiency can be measured in many ways and this is on full display with the Intra-ACP Programme. A key contributing factor with Intra ACP Programme in terms of efficiency is benefiting from existing structures, relationships and capable institutions as a basis to launch Intra ACP Programme activity.

The presence of a coordinator for the programme in the CILSS Executive Secretariat, and a scientific coordinator with Agrhymet has helped to create a satisfactory connection between the policies and strategies of the CILSS and the activities implemented by the programme, despite the physical distances between Ouagadougou (political headquarters of the CILSS) and Niamey, Niger, the home of Agrhymet. The ClLSS/Agrhymet programme Steering Committee meets annually to ensure strategic orientations, and to monitor progress. Given CILSS and Agrhymet’s past experience and reputations, the two institutions have been able to put to good use their capabilities and the relationships they have built in West Africa in an efficient manner. Agrhymet is well known and enjoys a strong scientific reputation. However, from an efficiency standpoint, the choice of Agrhymet brought certain limitations. It meant that the ClLSS/Agrhymet programme would be more inclined towards studies, experimentation with technology, the establishment of a model, or cartography. A natural focus on end users with respect to the populations most vulnerable to climate change has not come easy. The question of how the relevant information produced can be made available to programme beneficiaries in a proper and due form has still not been adequately addressed.

Similar to the other programmes, the start up of the CCCCC programme was delayed. Six months were lost as countries officially signed onto the Programme. One country, the Bahamas, has still not signed the agreement. Jamaica admitted responsibility for the delay in signing as the Intra ACP Programme became lost amongst other priorities. Despite this, the CCCCC is confident that all the deliverables will be met but an extension for a few activities will be requested. The CCCCC programme is benefiting from the relationships that have been established throughout the Caribbean with institutions such as the UWI and internationally with NOAA.

The CCCCC programme was also bogged down by procurement requests that required a great deal of patience and persistence as EU suppliers of technical equipment were sought. In dealing with other complexities of EU procurement procedures the CCCCC has been able to find ways to make matters less difficult. For example, two Requests for Proposals were combined in the Dominican Republic where there was a considerable amount of overlap in content. A Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment (VCA) and the preparation of sector specific impact assessments leading to the preparation of National Adaptation Strategies and Action Plans (NASAP) were combined for the same amount of money but it eased matters because the studies did cover some of the same ground. This permitted both the consultancy firm and CCCCC to achieve efficiency in terms of costs and time. Another point brought up during the evaluation was that the EU was supposed to hire a consultant(s) to assist in designing the programme for the Caribbean. Finally, it was determined that the EU would not be able to do this so the CCCCC quickly completed the task itself to make up for the lost time.

At the onset of the ClimDev programme, stakeholders were rightfully in agreement that the programme should be an African driven initiative. The principal African partners include the African Union Commission, UNECA, the AfDB and the International Research Institute for Climate and Society (IRI) is a key NGO partner. A major weakness with this team of partners is their limited ability to recruit and retain staff in support of the programme. Also, low disbursement and implementation rates remain an issue. As with the COMESA programme, this evaluation process did not afford enough time to understand and analyse all the complexities related to the ClimDev initiative. In particular, the evaluation process could not gain a good picture of ACPC’s work on managing a pipeline of projects that are to be funded. Also, what needed to be better understood is AfDB’s efforts supporting the preparation of the corresponding investment plans that were expected to accompany the ClimDev programme. A climate change fund, the ClimDev-Africa Special Fund (CDSF) with financing supplied by donors to the amount of 30 million U.S Dollars was to be created. Since 2012, the ClimDev partners have urged their technical teams to engage with donors to ensure reaching the minimum statutory amount of US$ 30 million for the CDSF to become operational. However to date, this objective has not been realised. This is a major programming shortcoming.

In terms of the COMESA led programme, one could imagine a scenario where a smaller amount of financial resources being spent in a more strategic manner would have resulted in a better programme. As of the summer of 2013, only 7% of the EU budgetary contribution was disbursed. COMESA recognises that spending has been slow and that request for a budget neutral extension will be required. Nevertheless, disbursement has increased to 40% through the latter part of 2013 and into 2014. According to COMESA, it may appear that the programme had taken on more than it could handle but the situation is changing as team strength and absorption capacity have increased. A ROM mission completed in 2013 and reports from the Department for International Development (DFID), a programme donor, circulated shortly afterward that were highly critical of the COMESA programme. The challenges faced by the Programme are openly discussed. While improving, there is a concern with COMESA`s management style that is criticised for being too slow and arbitrary and at times overbearing. Concerns about COMESA administration led DFID to take back control of DFID funding for the Objective No. 5 on implementing Climate Vulnerability Assessments and Analysis and Objective 7 on the Results Facility for up-scaling CSA activities.

Establishing clearer divisions of responsibilities between the three RECs that would be reflected in a reworked logframe would create a more effective management structure. There is currently too much overlap between the three RECs and coordination can be a problem. Simple requests for assistance can fall through the cracks as was experienced by Mozambique when it tried to make a request for support. Activities can be held in a region without them being properly communicated to all concerned parties. While EAC and SADC struggled to staff positions, their financial resources were withheld. SADC and EAC understand that COMESA and the donors want to ensure that money is being injected into the best possible administrative and technical structures possible, but it is felt that a more flexible approach to the situation might have been more effective, especially as it relates to the operational needs of the two organisations. Each organisation has its own administrative procedures that have to be respected and this can slow matters down.

The circumstances related to ClimDev and the COMESA programme draw attention to the role or lack thereof of the CSF. Its support has been largely absent from both programmes while the much more successful CILSS/Agrhymet programme has made extensive use of the service at no cost. The CSF provides short-term customised TA and training to ACP member states. The Facility consists of a pool of experts in a range of areas related to climate change. The experts are accessed through an on-demand system. The expertise can be used for training purposes, workshops, capacity building, project identification/formulation, feasibility studies, assessment of projects and help to access funding and policy development, strategies, roadmaps preparation.

With the COMESA and ClimDev programmes, there is a concern regarding EU oversight. For the COMESA programme, the EU Delegation to Zambia oversees the Programme which is implemented in 26 countries. During the programme’s lifetime, there have been a number of staff changes within the EU Zambia office. The current EU project officer does have some experience managing EU climate change project activity but this is not his first area of expertise. The CSA activities of the COMESA programme are led from Lusaka but there are also EU representatives to SADC and the EAC who could provide oversight to activities in their respective regions. The mission wondered whether EU staff in Gaborone and Arusha Delegations could not be more actively involved in the CSA programme. Possibly, an external programme monitor could work with the M&E focal points of COMESA, SADC, EAC, with the EU keeping oversight of the Programme as a whole.

It seems that more should be done in terms of securing additional climate financing to extend the impact of the COMESA-led Programme. However, Africa has always been marginal in the Carbon markets and with the programme focus on small scale agriculture it is hardly set up to attract financing. On the other hand, there is funding available for well thought-out adaptation projects that could involve the agriculture, water, forestry or land use sectors or a combination of these sectors.

For the USP programme, good progress was made in project implementation after the change of direction with the arrival of a new Director in 2013, in partnership with the current programme manager. Nonetheless, the level of efficiency of certain activities was questioned, such as the fees charged for the project’s regional scholarship students. The EU Delegation was informed of this and an audit will start in July 2014 to further explore this assertion.

With the PSIS programme, the project management team is directly attached to the SPC’s Deputy Director General for Operations who oversees all six SPC divisions. Given that climate change is such a cross-cutting issue, the location of the project management team under the Deputy Director General turned out to be very strategic in turns of reaching out to all the sectors touched by the PSIS programme. Once initial administrative challenges were overcome, disbursement levels increased considerably pointing at an increasing rate of implementation.

One of the issues that is central to the Intra-ACP Programme’s mandate is regarding how the programme has been building mechanism(s) to integrate member state countries and regions into larger global climate change structures or processes. Along the same lines there is a question on how efficient the Intra-ACP Programme has been in connecting to GCCA national programmes. What is sought in forging in this direction is greater coherence and complementarity with different EU programmes. As discussed in other parts of the report the Intra ACP Programme could have been more efficient in both regards in terms of building regional specific activities and nurturing global connections. The GCCA+ has to ensure that there is a stronger understanding that more effort has to be made in both areas.

There are a number of matters related to the CSF as it pertains to efficiency. Since its inception, there has never been a steady demand for the services of the CSF. There have been 50 work orders covering a broad range of activities and it is recognised that this has been disappointing. There has been roughly one work order a month. There were expectations that 2.5 works would have been a reasonable output. However, the figure of 2.5 a month is questioned as this might have been overly ambitious as this was established as an expectation in a period where the CSF was catching up after an initial slow start. There have been periods of more intense activity but there has also been noticeable slow period. With the CSF the issue is always that the service is demand driven and despite efforts to promote its use, the demand has not increased. This has resulted in a corresponding expenditure rate of approximately 50% of the budget, even though recent projects are slightly larger in size and budget.

Another constraint is that information on initiatives across the GCCA strands (global and Intra-ACP) is not always properly shared. The same is true for exchanges of information between the Regional Programmes and the CSF – which are both financed under the Intra ACP GCCA programme. Other than the Regional Team Meetings, there is no structured intercommunication between the CSF and partners of the regional programmes. The Technical Assistant to the ACP Secretariat would seem best placed to ensure and coordinate such communication. Ongoing participation of either the Technical Assistant to the ACP Secretariat or a representative of the CSF in regional programme steering committee meetings might be a solution. A review of the ROM reports developed for CSF activity would indicates that the services provided are being well executed. Apart from CILSS, most regional programmes (CILSS, USP, CCCCC) making support requests to the CSF concerned coverage of incidental expenditure (travel, seminars, exchange visits), and not the TA. In the Pacific there are ongoing negotiations with the ACP Secretariat to make amendments to allow for the funding of activities under the CSF that previously had not been covered such as covering travel cost of delegates to attend conferences. The evidence exists that the CSF can be an effective and efficient resource but it requires more attention and ongoing dialogue between stakeholders on how to make it more viable. A number of initiatives have been undertaken to enhance awareness and visibility of CSF. Given this is a complementary service; the question is why should the CSF have to go to any great length to promote its use? The answer is of course there should be no need to promote the CSF if it is properly conceptualised.

Given all these divergent tendencies it is difficult to assign an overall rating in terms of efficiency. Nevertheless, based on the respective ratings for each regional programme an overall rating of B was given. Two Cs were handed out on this question. The late start-up of the regional programmes appears for the most part to be a shared responsibility between the regional programmes, and the EU and the ACP.

***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?***

Through the Intra ACP Programme there are many examples of establishing linkages and creating synergy in a variety of scenarios, including between national GCCA programmes and the regional programmes of the Intra ACP funding; the main question is whether or not there could be even more synergy and creativity in this regard. The following examples are meant to provide an overall sense of what has taken place.

The CILSS/Agrhymet programme benefits strongly from much current and past collaboration related to climate and water sciences. The CILSS/Agrhymet programme collaborates closely with the FFEM-CC (French Global Environment Facility-Climate Change project), facilitating communication between experts from different countries and offering access to current information on climate change to the general public. In addition, collaboration with UNFCCC contact persons has been significantly strengthened, with whom all activities at the country level are carried out in collaboration. As mentioned earlier, in Niger, the CILSS/Agrhymet programme was able to find financial support for the CDPs that the programme developed from many donors including UNICEF, GIZ, and CARE. Nevertheless, the evaluation concluded that there is still room to strengthen collaboration on a number of fronts in relation to current programme activities. For example, collaboration with ECOWAS itself on regional policies and strategies regarding climate change could be strengthened.

The COMESA programme has developed partnerships at the country level with organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). Similarly, SADC developed partnership with DFID and EAC with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). But, as the programme’s donor partners have stressed, they would like to see more strategic partnerships with more formal structures. This is seen as not only necessary from the standpoint of improving the COMESA programme but also towards legitimizing it.

The ClimDev programme can potentially draw its strength from the comparative advantages that each of the three partner institutions have in the respective fields of policy development, advocacy and decision-making and investment. However, these comparative advantages have yet to be fully developed due, in large part, to the fact that the CDSF has still not been established. The ClimDev programme is complemented by other UNECA-lead action in the field of climate adaptation and mitigation. UNECA conducted case studies on loss and damage assessments, for example, which contributed to the discussions on the loss and damage work programme of the 19th session of the UNFCCC COP (Warsaw, November 2013).

Besides the GCCA funding, ClimDev is supported by other development partners as well, notably the Swedish Embassy, Norwegian Embassy, DFID and USAID. The donors have recently started organising common meetings in order to clarify progress on project activities, funding obtained and amounts disbursed. Information on these matters has not been previously available to donors. ClimDev has developed a multitude of partnerships (approximately 30), with a wide range of partners including the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO), the World Resource Institute (WRI), the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) and many others. As the Aide-memoire points out, purpose and outcomes of these partnerships are not always very clear, nor is how functional they truly are. While the programme has a distinct networking function and requires an extensive network for increased outreach, a clearer focus on creating and sustaining core business is desirable.

The PSIS programme has been much focussed on linking up with other climate change initiatives. A good example of this would be the *Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region* (CCCPIR) project implemented by Germany’s GIZ, the only EU MS with significant involvement in climate change in the Pacific. The CCCPIR is co-managed by the SPC and the project aligns itself with the PIFACC. The CCCPIR provides TA and does not support on-the-ground adaptation activities. In contrast, almost half of the PSIS programme budget is directed towards adaptation actions on-the-ground. The CCCPIR is housed within SPC and coordinates its actions with the PSIS programme.

The USP programme has also established several partnerships with other donor-funded projects, such as AusAID, the WMO, and United States Agency for International Development (USAID). In fact, the Aide-memoire for the USP programme should be consulted to understand the degree to which the USP programme is connected to other development initiatives. Collaboration starts with the PSIS programme, ‘the other GCCA-funded’ programme’, where there is regular coordination through the SPC and some direct collaboration on the ground (*Ewena* community in *Abaiang* Island). The PSIS project team (IWRM-Water & Department of Environment) for Niue's Rainwater Harvesting project also used V&A reports prepared by the USP programme for presentations in villages, which is a practical example of complementarity between the two GCCA-funded projects.

The USP also collaborates with the ACP-EU project entitled ‘*Building safety and resilience in Pacific’*, which is a part of the 10th EDF Intra- ACP envelope for DRR, whose aim is to reduce the vulnerability as well as the social, economic and environmental costs of disasters caused by natural hazards. Finally, the programme also collaborates with the CCCPIR, which aims at integrating climate change into primary and secondary education and technical and vocational training. The CCCPIR has sought the assistance of the USP programme to review the teaching modules and curriculum on DRM and CCA aimed at the facilitators of such courses.

Similar to the Pacific region, there are a number of good concepts emanating from the Caribbean on building linkages and synergy. In the Caribbean, the CCCCC programme sought to build on a number of earlier project initiatives including the Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change (MACC) and the Special Pilot Adaptation to Climate Change (SPACC) Project. The CCCCC programme has built upon the initiatives of the MACC Project by exposing national practitioners to biophysical models in climate change in the agriculture, water, coastal and marine, health and social sectors first developed through MACC. Two (2) sector-based training workshops in the application of these models have been conducted.

In some Caribbean countries there has been good coordination between National GCCA project activity and the ACP Programme. For example in Jamaica, the national programme has successfully supported areas such as forestry and coastal management. Moving forward the Regional Programme will complement this activity by assisting the fisheries sector of Jamaica under a comprehensive study. At the same time, both the national GCCA project of Belize and the Regional Programme are supporting the recently created Climate Change Office of the country. In Grenada, the CCCCC programme is coordinating with the OECS programme on the salt water reverse osmosis plant pilot project in Grenada hoping to extend the network of the distribution of the water system. The CCCCC programme has also facilitated collaboration between countries in the Caribbean. For example, Cuban experts are currently working with the City of Belize to develop a comprehensive adaptation strategy.

Nonetheless, overall, more could be done to explore linkages and synergies. This could start within the GCCA network of regional and national programmes. In Jamaica, through the national programme, encouraging work is being done piloting new technologies to protect shorelines. This includes propagating seagrass, Modular Turbulence Generators Artificial Reef Structure (MTGs), Wave Attenuation Devices (WADs), mangrove plantation, and the experimentation with the *“Shorelock”* proprietary technology. If these technologies and practices prove to be viable options, then their use should be more actively encouraged starting in Jamaica then throughout the GCCA network of countries. This is but one example of how greater synergy could be developed with GCCA national programmes; another would be that of GCCA partners from the CCCCC, Mauritius, Samoa, Solomon Islands participating in the Regional Meeting on Climate Finance using Budget Support Modalities, in Tonga in September 2013. The CCCCC’s participation in the third project Steering Committee Meeting of the PSIS programme is but another. Building on the foundation that has been established in each regional programme, the next phase should offer more possibilities to connect projects and programmes together, develop alliances and promote exceptional ideas and practices for the benefit of all regions. Overall the regional programmes scored a B on this question but for the next phase expectations should be higher.

With Article 12 of Cotonou Agreement Annex Four, there are expectations that Intra-ACP cooperation shall contribute to the objective of the ACP-EC Partnership and nurture supra-regional cooperation. With the Cotonou Agreement there is also anticipation that initiatives such as the Intra-ACP Programme will have clear added value in comparison to other development programmes. This includes its climate focused activities and indeed, the potential to establish linkages with the national GCCA programmes. As far as the Intra ACP Programme is concerned, the Cotonou Agreement is essentially a framework for building bridges between regional and national programmes to address climate change. The evidence of the Intra ACP Programme operating as an affirmation of the Cotonou Agreement is more anecdotal than systematic. There must also be consideration for GCCA+ that will be funded through the 11th EDF. The synergy and connection between Cotonou Agreement and moving towards GCCA+ appear not to have been fully contemplated. The ACP Secretariat in collaboration with the regional partners of the Intra ACP Programme does not appear to be working with an overriding strategy of how the Cotonou Agreement is guiding the current programme towards the GCCA+.

One has to consider the role or roles that the CSF could have played in facilitating value added synergy and connectivity between the regional programmes. To date, the CSF has not really been a key factor. However, that could be changing. At a recent Intra-ACP Programme meeting in the Pacific it was discussed how the CSF could be more supportive of improving synergies and sharing project outcomes. There are discussions regarding working through the CSF to support a regional networking event across each of the ACP regions, and a global networking event covering the whole ACP – in which project outcomes and findings can be shared, synergies improved and tools created can be shared and demonstrated across all GCCA projects. Two recommendations stemming from the 3rd Intra-ACP GCCA PSC Meeting, held in Fiji on 9- 10 July 2014, involved future use of the CSF:

1) The PSC has decided to continue the improvement of synergies and networking among the regional organisations and with the ACP secretariat and GCCA Programme. The ACP Secretariat will work with the regional implementing entities to facilitate and propose ways to improve this.

2) The PSC has adopted the third annual Work Programme of the CSF for 2014-2015.

## On impact (achievement of wider effects):

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

The overall objective of the Intra-ACP Programme of the GCCA is to reduce poverty by enabling countries to adopt productive capacities for a sustainable climate change adaptation. It has already been discussed in this report that many of the activities supported by the Intra ACP can be very valuable without pro-actively reducing poverty. Setting this aside, an examination of impacts can be undertaken using a less strict interpretation of the overall objective. What also emerges is the very different ways the individual regional programmes are measuring the overall objective of their programmes.

With ClimDev, the overall objective is for policies and decision on practices in Africa to take full account of climate change risks and opportunities at all levels (regional, sub-regional, national, local, community and individual). As such, primary beneficiaries are African policy makers, including REC’s, River Basin Organisations, national governments, parliamentarians and African climate negotiators. Furthermore, the regional climate, weather and water organisations would benefit and strengthen actions of the national bodies to respond to climate change. Final beneficiaries would be those rural and urban communities whose livelihoods are most affected by climate change. Of these groups, African climate negotiators seem to have, so far, most directly benefited from the programme, with the African policy makers as more indirect beneficiaries. There is a lot of ground to be made up before all these potential primary beneficiary groups will have actually benefited from the ClimDev programme.

For the USP programme, it was pointed out by the programme’s management team that it is important to take the programme’s focus on higher education into account – in particular for component 1. As such, impacts can only realistically be expected to materialise over the medium to longer-term. Nevertheless, students are already providing policy advice to the ACP States through Pacific Assistance to ACP States (PACP)’s Delegations during Climate Change negotiations under the UNFCCC. It will be important to keep track and monitor the career of these students, and USP is currently developing such database.

For the PSIS programme, expected impacts are measured in terms of resilience to climate change of the most vulnerable population in the Pacific. One of the ways to measure this will be the number of people benefitting. For example, in Niue, the adaptation project seeks to provide household water storage systems for all the inhabited houses in every community and this project is nearly complete as of 3rd June 2014. In Nauru, an extensive 6-months’ long analysis was conducted in 2013, to identify the most vulnerable households to receive rainwater catchment systems. The nine adaptation projects under the PSIS programme are counted on to contribute to enhance resilience of local communities, reducing their vulnerability in the medium-term and providing insights and experience for future interventions. In June of 2014, the 4th Steering Committee Meeting was held to examine progress in the context of the project’s exit strategy and, together with other development partners, identify opportunities for scaling up and continuation of some of the existing activities.

The CILSS/Agrhymet programme works the most directly towards the overall objective of the GCCA Intra-ACP to *reduce poverty by allowing countries to adopt sustainable practices and resources to adapt to climate change*. The evaluation of the CILSS/Agrhymet programme noted that the programme is making a highly relevant and significant contribution to improving the capacity of countries in West Africa, and regional actors, to formulate and implement policies and strategies integrating climate change into development plans and programmes. As well, the CILSS/Agrhymet programme is on track to achieve all three of the expected results, even if an extension of the project of about six months is needed.
There is a clear improvement in climate information systems, as well as the capacities to analyse climate developments and their consequences in West Africa. However, a more direct connection to national climate related information systems for farmers, including early warning systems would greatly improve the perception of the programme. The issues of climate change, low carbon emission solutions and climate resilience are today being integrated into national development strategies, whereas their integration into regional strategies (ECOWAS) is less apparent. Capacities for climate negotiations and for access to carbon funding mechanisms in West Africa have been strengthened, but need to be further reinforced, particularly in order to prepare for COP 21 (Paris, December 2015), in close collaboration with African Civil Society.

The overall objective of the CCCCC programme is to support sustainable development in the Caribbean region, preserving the progress of the countries towards the MDGs. It is early to speak about impacts with this programme as most of what is being championed is very long -term and the programme did start off slowly. Even when all the activities are implemented which will occur through a short extension, the number of identifiable beneficiaries will not be large. However, the possibility that the programme will have a more visible and quantifiable impact over the long-term, is strong.

The overall objective of the COMESA programme, finally, is to address the impacts of climate change in the region through adaptation and mitigation activities that build economic and social resilience. The impact of the COMESA programme could not be properly measured through this evaluation assignment, it would have required more time and travel to multiple countries. Still, one has to consider the slow start; the programme only became reasonably operational within the last nine months. Another problem concerns the way results are reported, and the lack of clear description as to what the Programme actually supported and achieved. Similar to the ClimDev programme, support to the AGN is considered a key accomplishment. The COMESA programme’s focus on women and having ground-level activity in areas such as CSA to influence policy are admirable, but what is actually being accomplished needs to be more clearly understood. Now that M&E experts are in place in the three RECs, the capacity is now available to improve both monitoring and evaluation functions.

Overall, the regional programmes received a rating of C (problems) on this evaluation question, as three programmes scored ‘below the mark’.

***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?***

As per the evaluation question, information was sought regarding creating awareness of the EU and ACP role in supporting the Intra ACP Programme`s activities. The intention in this chapter is to provide a sense of the range and quality of visibility events and products and how improvements could be made.

The CCCCC has made several presentations on the programme to national governments and other stakeholder agencies. The EU and GCCA logos have been utilized on letter-heads and stationary for all communications and have been put on display in public events, including training workshops and planning meetings related to the programme. Smaller promotional items such as polo shirts bearing the logos of the CCCCC and the EU have been procured and distributed at programme events including training workshops and the project planning meeting. All goods procured for the project have been, or will be branded with the EU logo as required. On another level, the communication specialist for the CCCCC has prepared a comprehensive communication strategy and visibility plan for the programme. This includes communication and visibility activities. The evaluation visit to Belize commenced just after a ‘media visibility event’ that included participation of EU staff from Jamaica who monitor the CCCCC programme. While the EU has good visibility there is minimal visibility of the ACP.

In West Africa, for the ClLSS/Agrhymet programme, the evaluation found many visibility and communication related activities with strong impacts. It was concluded that the CILSS/Agrhymet programme is making a strong contribution to raising awareness regarding the role of the EU and the ACP Secretariat in combating climate change. The West-African activities of the Intra ACP enjoy good media coverage including national, sub-regional TV, and national press coverage of workshops and organised events. The roles of the EU and the ACP Secretariat in facilitating these activities are on clear display.

With the USP programme, a webpage has been created with a good amount of information on programme activities (http://eugcca.usp.ac.fj). The USP’s Knowledge Centre webpage provides access to online resources such as i) Information Regarding Climate Science, ii) Documents on the impacts of Climate Change and Variability, iii) Documents on Integration of Traditional Knowledge, iv) Lessons learnt by the communities and past community adaptation projects, and v) a Catalogue of Best Adaptation Practices. On the Website both the EU and ACP logos are on display and reference is made to the EU. However, the ACP is not explained at all. While the USP programme is explained, the acronym Intra-ACP is used without any details as to what it signifies.

With the GCCA-PSIS programme, communication and visibility activities are considered to be rather good. A climate change communication plan was prepared and is used for planning and evaluation. A webpage (<http://www.gcca.eu/regional-programmes/gcca-pacific-small-island-states>) has been developed with details on country activities but this is part of the same website that all Intra ACP and GCCA projects and programmes share. The Pacific Climate Change Portal also contains details about the project and the EU logo is on display in the international partner section, but not the ACP`s. SPC and SPREP newsletters, as well as national newsletters, and other mechanisms are used for communication, supported by national and SPC media releases.

As regards to the COMESA programme, both positive and negative points can be identified. One important development is that there is now a communication specialist on staff who is taking the visibility of the programme very seriously and this should lead to a better profile. One of the problems at this point is that the COMESA programme has yet to establish itself as a strong viable entity that people are aware of. Part of this relates to the management of the programme. Events such as training sessions may take place in different parts of the region, and pertinent stakeholders from host countries, such as individuals involved in national GCCA project activity were found to be unaware that a workshop is taking place, for example. Part of the visibility challenges hence relates to the Programme’s lack of integration into the climate change/ development milieu of professionals and organisations, and this is obviously a deeper issue then benefiting from media visibility opportunities. Increased visibility was highlighted recently in a programme steering committee meeting as a necessary step for the Programme to take.

Where the COMESA programme has asserted itself on communication matters, a deliberate effort to credit the EU is noticeable. The Programme has significantly contributed to the visibility and has portrayed a good image of EU’s action in climate change through the deliberate branding policy that the RECs have individually and jointly adopted when implementing activities at the national, regional and international level. This has specially been seen through climate change negotiations and support to national climate change response strategies.

Information and communications personnel for SADC and COMESA are designing a consolidated communications and publicity strategy for the programme in 2014. COMESA and EAC are in the process of developing Climate Change Communication Strategies that will feed into the Programme Communication Strategy to enhance programme visibility.

On the COMESA website, there is virtually no visibility of the Intra ACP Programme. There is no website other than the web-page on the GCCA site. What is unique about the COMESA programme, though, is the use of social media. There is for example a Facebook page, the only regional programme to do so.

Overall, the Web presence of all the regional programmes could be improved. This should start with either a dedicated website or at least a clearly defined and robust section on the implementing partner’s own website. There should be standard guidelines for what is expected of each regional programme in terms of visibility standards for the EU and ACP Secretariat. This should also include standard procedures to ensure that events such as training sessions are properly promoted in host countries to ensure that media visibility opportunities are not lost and there is no confusion between regional programmes and GCCA national programme activities.

Overall a rating of B is provided on the question of the visibility of the EU and ACP.

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

***EQ 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?***

Given the slow start of most of the regional programmes, a discussion of sustainability is somewhat premature. Therefore, this discussion is more focused on the realisation of conditions for sustainability. Nevertheless, there are some good examples of where sustainability is achieved and other important issues are examined.

With the CCCCC programme, a focus has been placed on ensuring that actions are well designed and embedded into national systems and structures. As the CCCCC acknowledges, it is always a challenge to align programme activities with the policies and structures of the various governments it works within the region. There is always a ‘fiduciary risk’, according to the CCCCC, that there is a trust that governments acting as the programme’s agents will manage an activity as hoped. In terms of short to medium-term sustainability, combining forces with the national GCCA projects in Belize and Jamaica has resulted in making the climate change offices in those countries much more viable. As well, in both Jamaica and Belize, a contribution is being made in raising the importance of the climate change issue within government to a higher level where decisions are made.

Similar to the CCCCC, the PSIS programme also has looked to integrate sustainability into systems and structures and adaptation project design. The contribution and responsibilities of beneficiaries are planned and exit strategies are prepared for each project. Collaboration with related activities funded by other development partners - especially those that have a longer time frame than the GCCA – is pursued. This is an intelligent way to maintain momentum.

For the COMESA programme, at this point, it is difficult to speak of sustainability. With a slow start and only 54 months to implement a highly ambitious programme where the key implementing partners were, to some degree, relative newcomers to the climate change field, how much can realistically be expected in terms of laying the groundwork for sustainability? Nevertheless, the capacity of the three RECs has been improved and this will hopefully position them to better manage and implement subsequent ACP programme activity and other climate change initiatives. Technical proposals for establishing the EAC Climate Change Coordination Unit have been prepared and tabled to the EAC Institutional Review process. These are positive signs, though; the programme’s contribution to the development of National Climate Change Strategies and Resource Mobilization Plans provide a foundation for member states to sustain action on climate change. The work done to upscale CA and CSA is supporting existing policies and the CSA pilot projects are embedded in the regional and national climate change and agriculture policy frameworks, which contributes to sustainability.

What might be the most important indicator of sustainability is how the MS see the Programme. However, it was not possible for the evaluation team to gauge this. Over the longer term, perception of the RECs as leaders in the climate change field might emerge as an even more important indicator of what has been accomplished.

As regards ClimDev, the programme is considered to be fully integrated into African originated and managed structures – supported by the African Union - with a high degree of regional ownership. This is an achievement in itself and constitutes a solid basis for future sustenance of programme structures and results. Otherwise, a discussion of programme sustainability is still largely hypothetical, as the programme has only just started producing results in some areas, and the functioning of the Climate Development Support Fund is not confirmed. Prospects for sustainability of the ClimDev still depend on donor support for the action which, in turn, seems dependent on the performance of the programme. Overall planning, implementation and management (monitoring and reporting) need significant improvement.

For the USP programme, conditions for long-term results are relatively good. The University has already included the new courses in the curriculum and research opportunities in its new strategic plan. Training of professionals and continuation of the climate change courses developed by the USP programme are very likely to be sustained over the medium to long term. Moreover, demand for the courses is on the rise. In terms of financial sustainability, the Climate Change programme has succeeded in attracting sufficient numbers of qualified students to provide sustainable funding for hiring lecturers. Student enrolment continues to increase each year despite a declining number of scholarships being made available.

As regards field action, a variety of strategies for mainstreaming of the community adaptation plans at local and national level has been implemented as a means to ensure greater long-term sustainability of project interventions. In Fiji, for example, sustainability of the water supply systems is ensured by establishing water committees that have rules on sustainable use of the water, and maintenance and on raising funds. At the community level, collaborations through the regional and national level have enabled an increase of co-funding resources for the pilot communities. In Tuvalu, for example, collaboration with the Kaupule governing system in the islands of Funafuti, Nukulae and Nanumaga has ensured that the Project’s Adaptation Plan was mainstreamed into these islands’ individual Strategic Plans, with co-funding secured for implementation of adaptation actions.

Other donor support can also help sustain project results. The USAID-funded Climate Change Adaptation Project (CCAP) implemented by PACE-SD has similar pilot sites to the USP programme. Collaboration in funding for complementary activities (such as CCAP funding for installing of water tanks, while EU-GCCA funded water management trainings for the community) in some pilot sites, such as Samoa and Tonga, have assisted to enhance the adaptation related activities that are being implemented.

With the CILSS/Agrhymet programme, the focus has been building capacity. This strengthened capacity on research and technology, negotiations, and integration of climate change considerations into policies, is already proving beneficial. From this perspective, the programme outcomes are likely to be sustainable because they are being integrated into national planning and monitoring structures and systems. ECOWAS MS are advised to support and strengthen the processes initiated by the CILSS through the programme.

Overall, in the perspective of the evaluation team, more could have been achieved from a sustainability standpoint had greater attention been paid to cross fertilization and integration of Intra ACP Programme activities with Global GCCA national programmes. It would also have been beneficial, from a sustainability standpoint, that greater integration and coordination with other programmes and organisations in the climate change field had been achieved. The Pacific region is a good example of how this can work. In Eastern and Southern Africa greater integration would bring a lot of benefits from improving the credibility of the COMESA led Programme to creating learning opportunities and benefiting from the experience of other organisations.

As three of the five regional programmes had a good score for sustainability, an overall rating of B was attributed.

# Overall Assessment

In order to facilitate a clearer understanding of the achievements of the respective regional programmes in relation to the evaluation questions, as part of the methodology, a rating system was developed covering the ten main questions that guided the evaluation. The rating system covers the main evaluation criteria of relevance, design, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. For each of the EQs, a score was attributed, in analogy to the scoring system in the ROM methodology (a score ranging from *‘A’* (very good) to *‘D’* (serious deficiencies). The table with the scores can be found on the next page. The scores for each EQ are provided in their respective sections.

They are also presented in the table below that allows for a systematic overview of the performance of the various interventions under the Intra-ACP GCCA programme in the different regions, on the one hand, and of evaluation questions and criteria on the other. The ratings are far from being scientific, though. There can be variability in terms of a strong B versus a passable B. The ratings also fail to account for very specific problems that some of the regional programmes encountered, such as the slow starts that were in most cases were overcome and not necessarily completely the fault of the individual programmes. For example, the CCCCC programme in the Caribbean could have been scored more severely if one was to place responsibility for the lethargic procurement processes that had to be followed on the CCCCC. However, assigning a poorer grade was viewed as being unreasonable because it is very clear that the programme in the Caribbean is being properly managed but it is dealing with slow procurement processes.

Also, because there is not a specific EQ that directly covers the topic of relation building between the regional programmes or between the Intra ACP and the national programmes of the GCCA, the scoring system does not capture results in these areas very well.

Overall, the Intra ACP achieved a score of B. This was determined very logically on the fact that out of ten questions, a B was given on eight. There were two Cs handed out, one for design and the other for achievements of overall objectives. These scores do mask the very distinct levels of performance between the various programmes, as there are clearly better programmes (the two Pacific programmes, CILSS, and CCCCC) that stand in contrast with the ClimDev and COMESA programmes facing multiple challenges. In other words, two out of five Intra ACP funded programmes were found to be performing ‘below the mark’.



***Table 1.*** *Scoring of regional programmes (Intra ACP GCCA and global funding) on evaluation criteria and questions*

# Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons Learned

## Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The first phase of the Intra ACP has to be considered a success. Although some of the regional programmes that are part of the Intra ACP Programme struggled, overall, the positive attributes of the Intra ACP Programme outweigh its shortcomings. The impact of the Intra ACP Programme could have been much greater had the regional programmes avoided slow start-ups. During the start-up phase, there were considerable problems related to administrative and procurement issues. One would assume a second phase of the programme would avoid these obstacles and would be able to move directly to achieving results although in the Caribbean for example, procurement procedures may still pose an obstacle.

There has been an array of results with varying degrees of success that create a good base for moving forward with a second phase. Yet, despite whatever might have been accomplished during the current phase, the evaluation process has also concluded there is still a need for support for regional programmes to address climate change in ACP countries to complement national GCCA programmes and address problems in ways that such national programmes cannot.

Documentation was consulted regarding the possibility of a second phase of the Intra ACP Programme as part of GCCA+. What has been indicated is the GCCA+ will call for the adoption of a dual approach of strategic planning and institutional strengthening, while encouraging the implementation of policy measures. Based on what was learned from this first phase of the Intra ACP Programme, an ongoing focus on strategic regional activities and planning and institutional capacity building through the GCCA+ would be appropriate and even more so when synergy can be nurtured with Global GCCA National Programmes and other EU and non EU activities.

*Recommendation 1: This first recommendation is an overriding recommendation. Subsequent recommendations will address specific aspects covered by this recommendation. The creation of the GCCA+, a second phase of the Intra ACP GCCA programme, is strongly supported. This should nevertheless, be guided with the establishment of a longer-term strategy for the Intra-ACP Programme that takes into strong consideration the Cotonou Agreement. This strategy should have a long-term view and anticipate EU support beyond the GCCA+. Such a strategy would allow regional programmes to address the regional climate change concerns while building towards a substantive global alliance between ACP countries through shared programming. The strategy should also establish parameters for encouraging synergy between regional programmes and GCCA national programmes as a means for furthering national, regional and global objectives. At the same time it is imperative that each regional programme is guided by comprehensive regional climate change strategies. Currently some regional programmes cannot refer to such a document.*

2. The Intra ACP Programme is at its best when it is building regional-level capacity and consensus while also assisting ACP MS to develop critical capabilities for addressing national Climate Change and Disaster Reduction issues. How individual regional programmes contribute to developing overall regional capacity while filling gaps at the country level not met by National GCCA programmes can be starkly different, and there really is no single approach that fits all, as the regional programmes are all being implemented in very different circumstances. The only aspect they share in common is that their implementing environments are highly complex from political, cultural, economic and geographic standpoints. It should be recognised that some regional programmes are going to evolve more slowly than others but that it is important that all implementing partners should have strong and appropriate technical capacity.

*Recommendation 2: A differentiated approach to regional programming should be established that recognises that not all regional partners have the same capacity and that challenges faced by each region are significantly different. Mechanisms such as the CSF/TA to the ACP Secretariat should be employed to greater advantage to develop the capacities of regional implementing partners. To facilitate this in the Southern and East African Regions for example, this would involve direct communication between the SADC and the EAC, on the one hand, and the CSF and the TA to the ACP Secretariat on the other. In relation to this, a concerted effort should be made to ensure that each regional programme from a regional perspective is as strategic as possible, and opportunities for synergy with organisations such as the UNDP are fully explored.*

3. While it is apparent that the Intra ACP Programme has been successful, much of what has been accomplished is a result of the strong regional partners that have been able to carry out their respective responsibilities without the support of a strong overarching administrative structure for the entire programme. However there were weak elements within the programme that could have benefited from stronger overall guidance and oversight. There are two administrative layers to the programme, the EU and the ACP Secretariat. This brings both challenges and opportunities. One opportunity is presented by the vast administrative apparatus that the EU maintains throughout ACP MS countries. Yet, it is not clear how much thought has gone into determining how these capabilities could better assist with achieving the goals of the Intra ACP+ Programme.

*Recommendation 3: Develop a management and administrative strategy that contributes to increased consistency of results while providing support towards, for example, a stronger embracing of the Cotonou Agreement (in particular) article 32A and synergy between regional programmes, of the Intra ACP and GCCA+ National Programmes. First priorities include developing and implementing a plan to ensure a more effective use of the CSF and an improved overall monitoring and evaluation system.*

4. There should be a clear strategy on how the Intra ACP, through the different regional programmes, builds regional strengths that are shared amongst countries. There has to be more thinking behind the Intra ACP and the regional programmes to avoid them becoming simply another source of funding for national level activity. This will not be easy; regional-level activity is more difficult to implement as it involves more coordination, and regional institutions might not have as much influence as is needed. Yet it is worth the investment by the EU and ACP Secretariat to explore how a stronger regional approach could work, because there is a unique opportunity to establish a global platform for SIDS and LDCs to learn from each other and move forward together.

At the same time, while some innovative pilot activity has been supported, more would be helpful, especially of the type that is deemed to be instructive to an entire region. This does exist; in the Caribbean for example, the CCCCC is supporting a salt water reverse osmosis plant to create a source of fresh water for an isolated island in Grenada. This is what one would think of as being an ideal type of programme for the Intra ACP, as this type of project would be of interest to the rest of the Caribbean, the Pacific and the Indian Ocean. It is innovative and eye-catching and could have an enormous development impact if proven to be viable. Not every pilot project has to have as much relevance, but with the next phase or Intra ACP+, there should be more activities than there were with the first phase that could fit this description.

*Recommendation 4: Greater focus should be placed on promoting initiatives that have clear regional implications, in terms of addressing the potential needs of multiple countries. This could come in the form of services, information and developing shared strategies to address common problems. Pilot or demonstration activities should also be a part of a more pronounced effort to establish a strong regional dynamic. Such pilot projects should have added value in terms of learning, problem solving, and stimulating interest that could lead to replication and/or up-scaling. Current activities of National GCCA programmes should be considered as a potential source of inspiration for regional pilot activity.*

5. Greater synergy between Global GCCA national programmes and the regional programmes should be mandatory. It was found that there are Global GCCA national programmes that are designed to provide assistance in a number of areas, for example to multiple government departments. Often this approach is far from being comprehensive and exposes other areas of need. This is where there is a role for a regional programme, especially when core technical capacity of national level partners can be improved. The evaluation process also made it very clear that more coordination and collaboration with other organisations is necessary especially at the regional level. This is not really an issue in the Pacific as given the circumstances, a large number of very small countries, obliges joint approaches. However, there are other areas of the world where partnership building will take more effort and this needs to take place. This is not simply about signing MOUs; it requires mapping out strategies to share responsibilities and coordinating on critical matters from international climate change negotiations to regional approaches to problem solving.

*Recommendation 5: Stronger programming links must be established with national GCCA programmes. Regional programming should seek to address gaps in national programming that can also address regional considerations. Of special interest is to look at successful programming components of national GCCA programmes in terms of their suitability for application at the regional level.*

6. As this report has demonstrated, not all regional programmes performed equally well. The programmes of the Pacific, the ECOWAS/CILSS programme and the CCCCC programme were considered to be successful while ClimDev and COMESA were viewed as being problematic. As noted, what differentiates COMESA and ClimDev from the others is the limited capacities of the programme implementers, both technical and administrative. One could also add the limited experience in the climate change field, especially in assuming regional responsibilities. It can also be said that there might be specific aspects of the operations of other regional programme implementers that could benefit from focussed support. Agrhymet, for example, has struggled with channelling its strong technical capacity down to the community level.

*Recommendation 6: Institutional analysis in relation to climate change capacity should be conducted of the key partners involved in the ClimDev and COMESA led Programmes. The objective should be to identify organisational needs in terms of administrative and technical capacity and map out strategies to ensure these programmes are guided towards institutional capacity comparable to the other programmes of the Intra ACP. This should be considered as a condition for accessing GCCA and Intra ACP+ Programme resources. It may also be prudent to examine with the other organisations guiding regional programme aspects of their operations that could benefit from reinforcement through the Intra-ACP Programme.*

7. In hindsight, the priority for the Intra ACP should have been to place implementing partner institutions of the two problematic regional programmes, at the centre of their respective programmes in terms of building capacity and mainstreaming climate change. In the case of the programme for Eastern and Southern Africa, a priority focus for capacity development would have been the implementing partners COMESA along with EAC and SADC. The evaluation process concluded that to some degree this is probably still true today. In addition, the EU and the ACP Secretariat have to determine how regional programmes that encounter difficulties are going to be supported. Respecting autonomy is important, especially in light of the principles of the Paris Declaration, but a hands-off or minimalist approach of relying on the ROM system has not been effective and is not in the interest of any parties. It was also concluded that institutions such as COMESA and UNECA must assume responsibility for some of the problems encountered and that corrections with management practices are required.

*Recommendation 7: The EU should establish a mechanism to better monitor regional programmes. This is especially important for more problematic programmes. Options for this should include looking at a more pronounced role of the EU Delegations in ACP countries and possibly increased use of the resources of the CSF.*

8. The CSF should play an expanded role. It should be supporting the regional programmes in ensuring that weaker regional programmes are taking the necessary steps to reducing the gaps between the regional programmes, both in terms of the capacity of partner institutions and effectiveness of programming activities where the CSF can provide appropriate technical support. It should also be playing a more important role in nurturing and supporting common platforms and/or activities shared by the various regional programmes. Relying on the CSF for assistance should be seen as pro-active programme management. How the successful Intra ACP regional programme of West Africa put the CSF to good use could serve as an example of forward thinking with regard to how the CSF can be employed. However, the CSF is currently demand driven and overall the demand for the services of the CSF is very limited. If the purely demand-driven approach with the CSF is going to be employed with the ACP+, then the Intra-ACP GCCA+ has to be structured in such a way as to make the CSF more relevant. This could include taking steps such as having a representative of the CSF attend regional programme steering committee meetings to examine how the CSF can be used to assist the respective regional programmes to achieve their objectives.

There are many practical ways the CSF could be used to enrich the overall Intra ACP GCCA ‘experiment’. For example, in the Pacific there has been success in supporting formal training in climate change in the form of university degrees. At the same time in West Africa, the Intra ACP also supported formal education related to climate change. In the Caribbean, the UWI with some support could probably create a climate change degree programme. Under such circumstances, one could well imagine the idea of using the CSF to facilitate the creation of a global Bachelor or Masters Certification programme recognised by the EU and ACP Secretariat. This is simply a suggestion. But at some point, action has to be taken to either ensure there is a reasonable demand for the CSF or that the CSF is given specific duties or functions that the regional programmes require.

*Recommendation 8: A clear administrative structure for the TA to the ACP Secretariat and CSF should be established to ensure that these services are used more effectively. The key is to have a structure that ensures there is an ongoing demand. This could be achieved for example by giving the TA to the ACP Secretariat and the CSF more direct responsibilities related to matters such as ensuring that the Intra-ACP GCCA+ respects the objectives of the Cotonou Agreement. There is a clear role for the CSF to build bridges between the regional programmes towards achieving global objectives. In respect to individual regional programmes there is a need for a more planned approach on how the CSF can support regional objectives in the form of the provision of technical support. There should be more active dialogue and information sharing between the TA to the ACP Secretariat and CSF, on the one hand, and individual regional programmes on the other. This could be achieved by such means as having representatives of CSF regularly attend regional programme steering committee meetings where all key partners are in attendance.*

9. The EU and the Intra ACP Secretariat, along with their partner institutions overseeing the regional programmes, should reassess the priority areas of the Intra ACP Programme, as it appears that the ground has shifted regarding GCCA Priority Areas Four and Five. The collective stakeholders may wish to use this opportunity to discuss how new features might be integrated into the Intra ACP Programme keeping the Cotonou Agreement principles in mind.

*Recommendation 9: The five priority areas of the Intra ACP Programme should be reviewed to ensure they will remain relevant throughout the next phase of the Intra ACP GCCA and beyond. Of special interest are the mitigation and CDM related priorities four and five; improving the forest stock in terms of volume and diversity and encouraging carbon neutral sources of energy, for example, remain worthwhile objectives. Given current trends in carbon financing, the question is what is the best way forward for the Intra ACP to make gains in this area and how best to frame it. At the same time, this should be seen as an opportunity to identify global initiatives that could be shared and supported by all regional programmes.*

10. Part of the responsibility of this evaluation was to determine how the remaining allocation of the € 1.0 M pertaining to the “Intra ACP GCCA envelop" should be employed. At the time of the evaluation the envelope has been reduced to €0.5M. It is felt that part of these resources should be used to assist in the transition to the Intra ACP+ by taking care of some concerns that are cited in this report such as the performance of the ClimDev and COMESA programmes, though other resources may be available for this purpose as well. At the same time, during the implementation of this evaluation, the ACP Secretariat and DEVCO E3 agreed to concentrate € 0.5M into a costs extension of the contract providing Technical Assistance to the ACP Secretariat. This complementarity service added to the current Technical Assistance is to contribute to increased coordination of the programme in developing platform dialogue and synergies between the Regional Programmes and facilitating an increased use of the CSF. The evaluation process supports this, but it is also felt that some of these remaining financial resources should be directed at assessing the operations of the COMESA and ClimDev Programmes that are not at the same standards as the other programmes. This is as critical to the Intra ACP Programme moving forward as a more functional CSF.

*Recommendation 10: Remaining funds of the Intra ACP GCCA envelop should be used for such concrete purposes as covering the expenses for comprehensive evaluations of the ClimDev and COMESA led regional programmes, in as far these cannot be covered from other resources. The cost of institutional analysis of the partner organisation of these programmes, such as COMESA, EAC and SADC, should also be covered and where applicable, should lead to capacity building strategies. The funds should be used to develop a strategy for stronger coordination of inter-regional programming and ensuring adherence to objectives of the Cotonou Agreement. The remaining financial envelope should also be used for measures aimed at increasing the use of and improvement of the CSF.*

11. The degree in which the Intra ACP regional programmes contribute to visibility and good reputation of EU’s and ACP’s actions in the field of climate change varies considerably across the regional programmes, from strong communication activities and high visibility to low visibility. In particular, visibility of the ACP was found to be low relative to EU visibility. Nonetheless, all programmes have now taken up communication tasks as a specific area of activity, and websites and web pages are starting to be used more actively, though in highly variable formats. Further harmonisation seems desirable.

*Recommendation 11: For the purpose of the programme’s visibility, the ACP Secretariat and the EU should establish guidelines to ensure minimum expectations are met in areas such as Internet presence. Currently the regional programmes employ very different communication strategies and some are more successful than others but overall there should be more minimum practices and standards for communication activities that are shared by the regional programmes.*

## Lessons Learned

1. Regional Programmes are complex entities implemented in very challenging circumstances. It should not be assumed that administrative and procurement procedures will fall in place in an efficient manner. Programme designs should be developed to be able to better anticipate and respond to complicated start-ups.
2. 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.
3. Working through existing structures and previously implemented project activity should increase the possibility for project success. There are numerous examples from all three regions where a previous investment paid dividends for the Intra ACP.
4. 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 as crucial as ever. These can be modified as was the case with several of the programmes evaluated, but they should not be allowed to become a distraction and interfere with the ability to measure what is being achieved, as was the case with two of the African programmes.
5. The importance of flexibility in programme design was a theme that came up consistently during the Intra ACP Programme evaluation. This would appear to be an obvious observation for programmes that cover highly diverse countries and implementation contexts. A regional programme can respond to gaps both at the regional and national levels, and having some flexibility to do either is important in the programme design.

# Agreement at completion point[[12]](#footnote-12), October 2014.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Recommendations** |  **Suggestions for implementation** |
| 1. *The creation of the GCCA+, a second phase of the Intra ACP GCCA programme, is strongly supported. This should nevertheless, be guided with the establishment of a longer-term strategy for the Intra-ACP Programme that takes into strong consideration the Cotonou Agreement. This strategy should have a long-term view and anticipate EU support beyond the GCCA+. Such a strategy would allow regional programmes to address the regional climate change concerns while building towards a substantive global alliance between ACP countries through shared programming. The strategy should also establish parameters for encouraging synergy between regional programmes and GCCA national programmes as a means for furthering national, regional and global objectives. At the same time it is imperative that each regional programme is guided by comprehensive regional climate change strategies. Currently some regional programmes cannot refer to such a document.*
 | * Obligatory information session/workshop on the Cotonou Agreement for regional programme administers and key staff members with programming responsibilities. The goal would be to collectively explore options for ensuring adherence with the Agreement. ***Possible role for the CSF***
* Hold a visioning session (workshop) on where the GCCA should be in 10 to 15 years. The strategy that is decided upon should be based on realistic expectations as defined by the experience of the first phase, regarding the potential for progress, the pace of progress and the ability to nurture ACP MS ownership, including financial means of the GCCA for regional and global processes. Invitees should include regional programme designers, project managers and a select number of regional observers (not directly associated with the GCCA) with a strong understanding of their respective region in relation to climate change. Could consider inviting regional reps from UNDP or development agencies having a regional mandate/scope. ***Possible role for the CSF***
* Better ongoing dialogue should be established with the national programmes through simple means. For example, at meetings of regional programme representatives, a small but strategic number of representatives of national GCCA programmes should be invited to attend. A formula should be developed based on which the meetings are held. For example, when an Intra ACP programme meeting is held in the Pacific, three National GCCA programmes could be represented with one from each of the other regions. The same formula would be used when meetings are held in the other regions. ***Possible role for the CSF***
* Before the start of the GCCA+, each regional programme should provide a clear regional strategy that to the best degree possible will have been vetted by regional stakeholders. Some already have good strategies but a few do not. All regional programmes should provide detailed plans on how they intend to adhere to the Cotonou Agreement and collaborate with the National GCCA Programmes. ***Possible role for the CSF***
 |
| 1. *A differentiated approach to regional programming should be established that recognises that not all regional partners have the same capacity and that challenges faced by each region are significantly different. Mechanisms such as the CSF/TA to the ACP Secretariat should be employed to greater advantage to develop the capacities of regional implementing partners. To facilitate this in the Southern and East African Regions for example, this would involve direct communication between the SADC and the EAC, on the one hand, and the CSF and the TA to the ACP Secretariat on the other. In relation to this, a concerted effort should be made to ensure that each regional programme from a regional perspective is as strategic as possible, and opportunities for synergy with organisations such as the UNDP are fully explored.*
 | * Institutional analysis should be conducted of the climate change units of COMESA, SADC and EAC and ClimDev to determine what is required to ensure these entities have the necessary capacity to oversee their regional climate programme activities. This capacity building should be built into the Logical Framework of the respective programmes with benchmarks and performance indicators. Discussions should be held with CCCCC and Agrhymet to determine if there are areas where these institutions would benefit from capacity building. For example, Agrhymet and CCCCC do not appear to be very strong at community-level activity. Could the Intra ACP Programme provide support, for example, by hiring a community development specialist with CC adaptation experience?
 |
| 1. *Develop a management and administrative strategy that contributes to increased consistency of results while providing support towards, for example, a stronger embracing of the Cotonou Agreement (in particular) article 32A and synergy between regional programmes, of the Intra ACP and GCCA+ National Programmes. First priorities include developing and implementing a plan to ensure a more effective use of the CSF and an improved overall monitoring and evaluation system.*
 | * See suggested actions for recommendation No.1 for the Cotonou Agreement and synergy with the National GCCA Programmes
* The CSF could be used for developing an M&E system that has clear objectives and indicators. The EU delegations should be brought into the process of the elaboration of the M&E system with the perspective of the EUD playing a more proactive programme monitoring role. Another avenue to explore would be the hiring of programme monitors that can be shared by the various regional programmes. ***Possible role for the CSF***
* The ACP Secretariat, EC and regional programme representatives should collectively establish a process that would lead to a determination regarding the role or non-role of the CSF. The key question to be answered is how the financial resources for TA should be structured. Regional Programmes should be clear about the services they would like the CSF providing.
 |
| 1. *Greater focus should be placed on promoting initiatives that have clear regional implications, in terms of addressing the potential needs of multiple countries. This could come in the form of services, information and developing shared strategies to address common problems. Pilot or demonstration activities should also be a part of a more pronounced effort to establish a strong regional dynamic. Such pilot projects should have added value in terms of learning, problem solving, and stimulating interest that could lead to replication and/or up-scaling. Current activities of National GCCA programmes should be considered as a potential source of inspiration for regional pilot activity*
 | * An inventory should be developed of GCCA (Intra ACP and national programmes) pilot and project activities that are innovative, have a proven track record of successful implementation and can be visually appreciated either through site visit or video recording.
* The main GCCA web site should act as a clearing house for information including video documentation of successful and innovative pilot and project activities.
* The GCCA should facilitate/establish processes with resources that would allow successful and significant national programmes activity to be replicated at the regional programme activity, for regional programme activity to be replicated by other regional programmes and in well-planned circumstances, some actions should become global initiatives. This can only happen if a GCCA-wide dialogue is nurtured and information is made available
 |
| 1. *Stronger programming links must be established with national GCCA programmes. Regional programming should seek to address gaps in national programming that can also address regional considerations. Of special interest is to look at successful programming components of national GCCA programmes in terms of their suitability for application at the regional level*
 | * See suggestions for recommendations 4 and 1
 |
| 1. *Institutional analysis in relation to climate change capacity should be conducted of the key partners involved in the ClimDev and COMESA led Programmes. The objective should be to identify organisational needs in terms of administrative and technical capacity and map out strategies to ensure these programmes are guided towards institutional capacity comparable to the other programmes of the Intra ACP. This should be considered as a condition for accessing GCCA and Intra ACP+ Programme resources. It may also be prudent to examine with the other organisations guiding regional programme aspects of their operations that could benefit from reinforcement through the Intra-ACP Programme.*
 | * See suggestions for recommendation 2
 |
| 1. *The EU should establish a mechanism to better monitor regional programmes. This is especially important for more problematic programmes. Options for this should include looking at a more pronounced role of the EU Delegations in ACP countries and possibly increased use of the resources of the CSF.*
 | * See suggestions for recommendation 3
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. *A clear administrative structure for the TA to the ACP Secretariat and CSF should be established to ensure that these services are used more effectively. The key is to have a structure that ensures there is an ongoing demand. This could be achieved for example by giving the TA to the ACP Secretariat and the CSF more direct responsibilities related to matters such as ensuring that the Intra-ACP GCCA+ respects the objectives of the Cotonou Agreement. There is a clear role for the CSF to build bridges between the regional programmes towards achieving global objectives. In respect to individual regional programmes there is a need for a more planned approach on how the CSF can support regional objectives in the form of the provision of technical support. There should be more active dialogue and information sharing between the TA to the ACP Secretariat and CSF, on the one hand, and individual regional programmes on the other. This could be achieved by such means as having representatives of CSF regularly attend regional programme steering committee meetings where all key partners are in attendance.*
 | * See suggestions for recommendation 3
 |
| 1. *The five priority areas of the Intra ACP Programme should be reviewed to ensure they will remain relevant throughout the next phase of the Intra ACP GCCA and beyond. Of special interest are the mitigation and CDM related priorities four and five; improving the forest stock in terms of volume and diversity and encouraging carbon neutral sources of energy, for example, remain worthwhile objectives. Given current trends in carbon financing, the question is what is the best way forward for the Intra ACP to make gains in this area and how best to frame it. At the same time, this should be seen as an opportunity to identify global initiatives that could be shared and supported by all regional programmes.*
 | * A detailed review of trends/approaches/secondary funding sources for mitigation action should be undertaken
* The review of the priorities should be used as an opportunity to identify innovative practices related to mitigation, NAMAs and REDD that could be replicated through the GCCA. To be clear this involves looking at both GCCA and non GCCA actions.
 |
| 1. *Remaining funds of the Intra ACP GCCA envelop should be used for such concrete purposes as covering the expenses for comprehensive evaluations of the ClimDev and COMESA led regional programmes, in as far these cannot be covered from other resources. The cost of institutional analysis of the partner organisation of these programmes, such as COMESA, EAC and SADC, should also be covered and where applicable, should lead to capacity building strategies. The funds should be used to develop a strategy for stronger coordination of inter-regional programming and ensuring adherence to objectives of the Cotonou Agreement. The remaining financial envelope should also be used for measures aimed at increasing the use of and improvement of the CSF.*
 | * No suggestions required
 |
| 1. *For the purpose of the programme’s visibility, the ACP Secretariat and the EU should establish guidelines to ensure minimum expectations are met in areas such as Internet presence. Currently the regional programmes employ very different communication strategies and some are more successful than others but overall there should be more minimum practices and standards for communication activities that are shared by the regional programmes.*
 | * Study the communication strategies of noteworthy Intra ACP Programmes and National GCCA Programmes to identify best practices that could lead to the design and implementation of guidelines that would serve as minimum standards for communication practices for all Intra ACP programmes.
 |
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1. Overall, the GCCA supports eight regional programmes [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Forum of the Caribbean Group of the ACP States [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In all of the three RECs, a major setback were enormous delays in hiring staff due to administrative procedures [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Ireland, Sweden, Estonia, Cyprus and the Czech Republic [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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-6)
7. <http://www.climatechange2014.org/> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <http://www.bvsde.paho.org/bvsacd/cd68/ClimAfrica.pdf> Climate Change in Eastern and Southern Africa. Impacts, Vulnerability and Adaptation, Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo (2008) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <http://www.unep.org/disastersandconflicts/Introduction/EnvironmentalCooperationforPeacebuilding/EnvironmentalDiplomacy/SahelReport/tabid/55812/Default.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Forum of the Caribbean Group of the ACP States (CARIFORUM) is the body that comprises Caribbean ACP States for the purpose of promoting and coordinating policy dialogue, cooperation and regional integration, mainly within the framework of the [Cotonou Agreement between the ACP](http://www.caricom.org/jsp/community_organs/epa_unit/Cotonou_Agreement_%26_Lome4_agr05.pdf) and tEU and also the [CARIFORUM-European Community Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA).](http://www.caricom.org/jsp/community_organs/epa_unit/epa_text_ec_journal_30_10_08.pdf) The [EPA Implementation Unit](http://www.caricom.org/jsp/community_organs/cariforum/epa_unit_main_page.jsp) is subsumed under the CARIFORUM Directorate at the Headquarters of the CARICOM Secretariat. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. A concern was that since three donors (EU, Department for International Development (DFID) and Norway) began their support for the Programme at different times; additional reporting requirements were created. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The ToR for the Intra-ACP GCCA programme evaluation specifies that *‘the Agreement at completion point (of around 5 pages) will be specific for the Intra ACP GCCA programme and will summarize the conclusions and recommendations shared by the European Commission and the ACP Secretariat. It will take the main recommendations from the final evaluation report, one by one, and clearly indicate the concrete measures that will be deployed to implement them’*. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)