

# WP5 input for the Final Technical Implementation Report

valid for

Reporting period: 01.11.13 – 31.10.16  
IEE/12/708/S12.661214 - PRIMES

Coordinator name/ organisation/ e-mail/ telephone number:

Jørgen Grubbe

Holbæk Kommune (Holbaek Municipality)

[jogru@holb.dk](mailto:jogru@holb.dk)

+45 72 36 34 51

**SAVE, ALTENER, STEER, COOPENER and HORIZONTAL KEY ACTIONS**

2.5 Work package 5: Evaluation .....  
    2.5.1 Objectives.....  
    WP 5: Evaluation ..... **Fejl! Bogmærke**  
Table 1 Deliverables.....

## 2 Performance review by work package (10-15 pages)

### 2.5 Work package 5: Evaluation

#### 2.5.1 Objectives

The key objectives of WP5 evaluation have been:

- To provide the methodological basis for the evaluation of the PRIMES GPP achievements, including preparing the templates to ensure effective data collection (task 5.1)
- To organize knowledge sharing in relation to the project meetings aiming to be helpful both in terms of raising each partners' knowledge as well as facilitating experience exchange between the partner regions (task 5.2)
- To undertake quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the project achievements. This comprises evaluation of the fulfilment of Common Performance Indicators/CPI seen in relation to the targets set from the start of the action, the impact as how to improve awareness and capacities among beneficiary municipalities as well as the sustainability of the project intervention (task 5.3)
- To support the selection and elaboration of case studies in relation to the Task Force interventions under WP4 (task 5.4)
- To organize follow-up meetings with the beneficiary municipality to get feedback as how they experienced the Task Force services, the main lessons learned and future prospects and needs of GPP activity in the municipality (task 5.5)

#### 2.5.2 Major activities and achievements

- **Task 5.1: Design of templates, which ensures swift and correct data collection**  
In the early stage of the action ECNet, as WP leader, developed a template (D5.1) that has been used by task force leaders to provide overview of the various interventions and to keep track of the progress in terms of Task Force interventions. This 'intervention table' contains info on the Common Performance Indicators (CPI) of each intervention and matters such as training needs etc. The template has been adjusted underway and in its final version it has included the following columns per TF region: 1) GPP ID No, 2) GPP characteristic, 3) State of project development, 4) Link to tender documents, 5) CPI figures incl. explanation, 6) CPI methodology, 7) Involved stakeholders, 8) State of Task Force intervention, 9) Key achievements, 10) Successes and failures of the interventions, 11) Lessons learned (+ do and don't), 12) Replicability aspects, 13) Training needs identified and 14) Case study potential. The intervention table has been effective to monitor the process in conjunction with the task force report under WP4.
- **Task 5.2: Knowledge sharing at the biannual steering committee meetings**  
The internal workshops on knowledge sharing at every partner meeting in relation to Task 5.2 has proved to be useful and appreciated elements in the project implementation. The workshops have been designed by ECNet in coordination with the other WP leaders, where the workshop themes reflected the state of action:
  - The workshop at the KoM in Växjö, January 2014, focused on how to mobilize the Task Forces
  - The workshop at SC2 in Genova, June 2014, focused on how to handle the deliverable D5.3 on Successes and failures of each TF intervention

- The workshop at SC3 in Koprivnica, Nov 2014, focused on how to boost TF interventions, reflecting that several of the Task Forces at that point of time struggled with gaining momentum
- The workshop at SC4 in Riga, May 2015, comprised an exchange between the Task Forces as how to manage issues like PI quantification and the associated methodology (related to D5.4) as well as a follow-up exchange of how to handle D5.3 Successes and failures.
- The workshop at SC5 in Lyon, Nov 2015, was an exchange of the overall TF progress, the key barriers and successes and not least how to plan remaining TF activities in order to reach the project goals
- The workshop at SC6 in Brussels, June 2016, focused on how to handle the evaluation of TF interventions, notably the challenges in terms of quantifying (CPI) the interventions
- The workshop at the final meeting in Holbæk, Oct 2016, focused on key aspects in terms of elaborating the final version of D5.3 on Successes and failures and D5.4 the core evaluation report.

These internal workshops have been supplemented with knowledge sharing on online meetings. Notably, ICLEI brokered a webinar with a technical expert, who, in the GPP2020 project, is responsible for the development of calculators for measuring CO<sub>2</sub> and energy savings. Hands-on advice, incl. tips and tricks for users, was given on the calculator tools, which exist for lighting, vehicles, IT and energy to date.

- **Task 5.3: Evaluation of the achieved results**

The main scope of this task has been:

1. To assess the level of implementation of GPP in each Task Force region, incl. the quantitative (mainly CPI) and qualitative aspects of the TF interventions
2. To access the state of advancement of the beneficiary municipalities
3. To extract the case study potential as well as successes and failures of the performed GPP interventions
4. To access the sustainability and future aspects of GPP measures in the target regions

Ad 1) ECNet has throughout the action led the work on compiling the intervention progress via the intervention tables (task 5.1) and an evaluation template per TF region that was put into force since Sept 2015. This has given a good overview of the progress and, as mentioned under task 5.2, the partners exchanged experiences underway with a view to improving the implementation.

Ad 2) An integrated part of the evaluation system has been to access the state of advancement of the beneficiary municipalities. The evaluation input per TF region comprises a table describing the point of departure per municipality and how it progressed in terms of GPP awareness and capacity during action. Under D5.4 has been elaborated four impact assessment reports with the conclusions and observations regarding 1) and 2).

Ad 3) In the intervention tables the TF partners indicated the case study potential of each intervention that formed basis for the selection process. They also indicated observations regarding successes and failures per intervention that has been supplemented with exchange at the internal workshops. ECNet has led two versions of D5.3, the last of them addressing the experiences at the end of action, supported by an internal workshop at the final project meeting.

Ad 4) The last and final version of the evaluation report (D5.4.4) contains a review of the sustainability aspects. A main conclusion is that the combined project approach in form of capacity building along specific GPP interventions has been effective in terms of paving way for sustaining GPP as an established concept in the PRIMES region. Having in mind the immature situation in the municipalities at the starting point this has been a big achievement of the PRIMES project.

- **Task 5.4 Selection and provision of relevant information for the case studies**

Task 5.4 has been undertaken in interaction with other WP and their leaders and this way WP5 has given partial contribution. The intervention table has helped on tracking the case study potential of the TF interventions and making sure that data is sufficient (cf. task 5.3 description). Please refer to other description of the achievements with case studies other places in the final report.

- **Task 5.5 Follow-up meetings**

In month 25-36 of the project period the PRIMES partners organised follow-up meetings with the beneficiary municipalities to get feedback as how they experienced the Task Force services. The meetings were organized as either physical meetings or phone interviews and a report was prepared according to a standard template (D5.2). Moreover, the municipalities delivered a declaration as an official statement of their engagement in PRIMES. The overall conclusion is that the municipalities were generally very satisfied with the TFs' intervention and appreciated the capacity building activities and provided materials. Further details can be found in the D5.4 final evaluation report and the attached materials.

*See app. D5.3.2\_Successes and Failures of Each Task Force Intervention\_Oct 2016\_FINAL*

*app. PRIMES\_D5.4.4\_Evaluation Report\_Oct 2016\_FINAL*

*app. Assessment table\_All PRIMES regions\_October 2016\_FINAL*

*Other deliverables have been submitted with previous progress reporting*

### **2.5.3 Assessment of the performed work**

The PRIMES project's performance in relation to fulfilment of the Common Performance Indicators is described other place in the Final Technical Implementation Report.

The PRIMES undertook a dedicated effort to assess the CPI having in mind that common tools exist only in limited GPP areas. For the remaining part the assessment had to rely on national or local tools, which has made it more difficult to ensure consistency across the TF regions. As WP leader ECNet has monitored the CPI figures and methods used by each TF partner and intervened if any numbers or methods appeared suspicious. Thus, this dialogue between WP5 leader and TF partner has aimed to ensure as much accuracy as possible within the project resources.

There is undoubtedly need for considerably more efforts to put in place easy to use and reliable tools on how to assess the achievements of GPP actions. This is also to serve a tool that can help municipalities identifying and prioritizing the type of GPP actions that bring most impact in view of the local strategies and context. Section 1.7 Lessons Learned of Performed Actions of the D5.4.4 Final Evaluation Report gives indication of some observations to made in this regard due to the experiences of the PRIMES interventions.

The qualitative assessment has given important added value to the quantitative assessments. For instance, the assessment as how the beneficiary municipalities progressed in their capacities thanks to the TF services since the start of action has been very useful, an assessment that was strengthened with the follow-up meetings held in the last stage of the project period and underlined with declarations of the municipalities that received TF assistance (cf. the D.5.4.4 Final Evaluation Report).

All together, we as PRIMES team believe to have undertaken a tremendous effort to both execute a high number of specific GPP interventions along capacity building and a careful effort to evaluate and learn from these achievements.

Table 1 Deliverables

Deliverable N°	Deliverable name <sup>a)</sup>		Results achieved	Level of achievement	Month of completion <sup>h)</sup>
	<b>Evaluation</b>				<b>Month of completion <sup>h)</sup></b>
D5.1	Templates for the task force leaders		A template (excel file) to give overview of the TF interventions	Achieved	Month 2
D5.2	Template for the municipalities		Template and evaluation system to obtain feedback from beneficiary municipalities	Achieved	Month 27
D5.3.1 D5.3.2	Four reports concerning the successes and failures of each task force intervention		Two reports, cf. work description	Achieved	Month 23 Month 35
D5.4.1 D5.4.2 D5.4.3 D5.4.4	Two Impact assessment reports		Four reports, cf. work description	Achieved	Month 24 Month 27 Month 31 Month 36
D5.5	Final WP Report		WP5 input to the Final Technical Implementation Report	Achieved	Month 36