

**Report on Regional  
‘learning from peers’  
exchanges to identify  
good practice examples  
from neighbouring  
countries**

## LIFE PlanUp

Published: January 2020

By Transport & Environment, with input from European Environmental Bureau (EEB)

Author: Luka De Bruyckere

Contributors: Asger Mindegaard and Davide Sabbadin

## To cite this study

LIFE PlanUp (2020) Report on Regional ‘learning from peers’ exchanges to identify good practice examples from neighbouring countries

## Further Information

Cristina Mestre

Climate and Biofuels Officer

Transport & Environment

cristina.mestre@transportenvironment.org

Tel: +32 (0)488 797 439

Square de Meeûs, 18, 2nd floor | B-1050 | Brussels | Belgium

[www.transportenvironment.org](http://www.transportenvironment.org) | @transenv | fb: Transport & Environment

## Acknowledgement

The Life PlanUp project has received funding from the LIFE programme of the European Union.

The project acknowledges the generous support of the European Climate Foundation.

## Legal notice

This publication *Regional ‘learning from peers’ exchanges to identify good practice examples from neighbouring countries* is financed by the European Commission through the LIFE + programme and by the European Climate Foundation.

It is the overarching goal of the LIFE + programme to act as a catalyst for changes in policy development and implementation by providing and disseminating solutions and best practices to achieve environmental and climate goals, and by promoting innovative environmental and climate change technologies.

The information and views set out in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the European Commission.



## Table of Contents

<b>Summary of the events</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Objective &amp; main programme point</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Stakeholders input collection</b>	<b>6</b>
Agriculture	6
Transport	8
Buildings	10
<b>Event evaluation by event organiser</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Impact follow-up</b>	<b>13</b>
Madrid workshop	13
Warsaw workshop	13
Overall impact evaluation	14
In attachment	14



## EVENT REPORT

### Project Partner: Transport & Environment

**Title of the event:** C6.1 Regional 'learning from peers' exchanges to identify good practice examples from neighbouring countries

**Date & location:** 5-6 November, Madrid and 20-21 November, Warsaw

**Organiser(s):** Transport & Environment, Ecodes, Polish Green Network

**Number of Participants:** Nov 5: 33; Nov 6: 35 (Madrid)/ November 20-21: 32 (Warsaw)

### Summary of the events

In the context of the LIFE PlanUp project, two regional workshops were organised. They were presented to participants under the name *Achieving a low carbon pathway in Southern/Eastern European countries through ambitious Energy and Climate Plans*. The workshop on Southern European countries was held in Madrid, the one on Eastern Europe in Warsaw.



*Event in Spain (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

The events gathered local and regional authorities (LRAs) as well as civil society organisations (CSOs), policy makers and researchers to discuss the ongoing process on the National Climate and Energy Plans (NECPs). The workshops focussed on the transport, buildings and agriculture sectors. Speakers were invited to present on concrete good practices in their city or country that could contribute to strengthen the NECPs in these sectors. Furthermore, the events included an emphasis on the governance of climate policies at different levels - EU, national and local. Participants exchanged on lessons learnt, potentials and pitfalls of these concrete climate measures, including the potential for emission reductions and the barriers for implementation.

On the first day of both events the PlanUp project was presented, as well as the methodology to identify good practices developed by the PlanUp project. Furthermore, speakers from Spain, Portugal and Italy (Southern EU workshop) and Hungary, Romania, Poland and Estonia (Eastern EU workshop) presented good practices in the transport, buildings and agriculture sectors. To conclude the day, the PlanUp project partner Energy Cities presented on good practices in climate policy governance. In Madrid, Italian NGO legambiente presented on a joint effort of a coalition of Italian and international NGOs to present recommendations to improve the Italian NECP in transport.



*Event in Poland (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

On the second day the EU Cacl Tool was presented by Climact. In Madrid several additional good practices from Spain and France were presented. The main part of the day was devoted to sectoral break-out sessions during which several good practices selected by the PlanUp project, mainly for their high replication potential, were discussed in depth to explore their strengths, weaknesses, replication potential, financial and knowledge needs and public support. The sessions were moderated by a sectoral expert and a project expert from the PlanUp project. The outcomes of each session were presented in plenary and discussed with all participants. The workshops concluded with an overview of the next steps in the NECP process and upcoming PlanUp project activities.

### **Objective & main programme point**

The regional workshops presented an opportunity for participants to engage with the NECP process, to learn on good practices in their region and to network with policy-makers, civil society organisations and researchers working on concrete climate measures. These exchanges are a first step to create regional alliances between LRAs and CSOs in their respective countries. These alliances can inspire coordination and cooperation on NECP implementation by sharing experiences on good practice policies. Apart from presentations on good practices the workshops facilitated a discussion on selected good practices in each of the transport, buildings and agriculture sectors. The selected practices were considered to significantly reduce emissions and to have the potential to be replicated in the focal countries in either Southern or Eastern Europe.



*Event in Spain (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

The main takeaways of the events focussed on the importance

- of **public participation** to foster support for a specific measure. Informing and engaging stakeholders has proven to reduce opposition and facilitate compliance
- to **include local actors** to mobilize resources, actors, trigger investments, raise ambition, etc. Regional and local authorities are often the best actor to centralise information and coordinate among stakeholders

- of **reducing complexity** of policy measures to facilitate compliance. By reducing thresholds and by taking away practical hurdles people are more inclined to participate. In case of, for instance, a subsidy scheme this means setting up a decentralised application system, allowing for applications all year long and creating a one stop shop of information and assistance
- of a measure's **replication potential**. For instance, when a measure has been funded by EU money it might not be easily replicable as this funding might not be available elsewhere. Furthermore, It should be noted that contexts can vary in different Member States, for instance regarding a measure's acceptability, hampering replicability.
- of **legal barriers**. Sometimes legal adjustments are needed to facilitate the implementation of certain practices. Test cases of practices can provide for the needed argumentation to carry out these changes
- to **anticipate market changes**, for instance, price increases after the introduction of a subsidy scheme. Working with recommended suppliers who commit not to increase their prices can mitigate this issue
- of realising that after a heavy initial investment burden, often a practice can lead to **significant savings**

## Stakeholders input collection

Apart from the discussions summarized above the events gathered stakeholder input on several preselected good practices during break-out sessions on the transport, buildings and agriculture sectors.

### 1) Agriculture

The sessions on **agriculture** focussed on the specific sustainability situation of the sector in the represented countries (Spain and Portugal, and Romania, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania and Moldova). In all countries there is a tendency of intensive, large-scale farming outcompeting and “swallowing” smaller actors, which leads to a loss of traditional agricultural systems and diversity of production, as well as biodiversity. In Portugal, there is a small counter-movement where foreign entrepreneurs buy small plots of land, introducing “new” and more sustainable farming methods, at times inspiring local farmers.



*Event in Spain (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

The role and potential of high-tech farming methods was discussed. On the one hand, this has the potential to increase the sustainability of farming and attract younger people to farming (e.g. in Southern Europe where this is increasingly difficult). On the other hand, high-tech farming is not yet widely accepted as a part of rural culture, which makes it harder to get adopted. Furthermore, there is a discrepancy between access to knowledge, technology and funding between large and small-scale farmers, which affects the ability to transform agricultural practices of small farms towards more sustainability. Several participants stated that regulation should prioritize large farms, as these are cultivating the largest share of land and as it is administratively complicated to change the practices of many small farmers with relatively small net gains.

On the ideal governance of changing agricultural practices it was noted that farmers are often opposed to change. This triggered the discussion as to whether farmers should be incentivised

or obliged to adopt, for instance, cheap and efficient practices such as catch crops and crop rotation. There was no real consensus, but there was a general agreement that a combination of both is necessary. Overall, participants agreed that changes have to be accompanied by funding to be implemented.



*Event in Poland (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

Both sessions in Madrid and Warsaw discussed the barriers to and potentials of several good practices identified by the PlanUp project:

- **Variable fertilization rates**
- The **French national agroforestry development plan**
- **Sustainable rice cultivation practices** in wetlands in Spain
- Practices **protecting against nutrient run-off**, through mineral and natural fertilizers and buffer zones, stubble crops and catch crops

Regarding **variable fertilization rates**, a practice that matches fertiliser application to fertilizer needs of different fields, it was agreed that this could reduce fertilizer use and that it was easy to adopt but that a lack of knowledge and investment needs posed a barrier to wide adoption. Bringing experts and farmers together and providing loans to the farmers might mitigate these barriers.

The **French national agroforestry development plan** aims to promote agroforestry by conducting research, monitoring adoption, provide a regulatory framework, financial support and advisory services and promotion. This is needed since agroforestry is less profitable than intensive agriculture, but has many co-benefits such as climate adaptation, soil protection and an increase in biodiversity. The plan can mitigate the lack of knowledge and technical capacity among farmers to implement agroforestry practices.

A practice to make **rice cultivation in wetlands in Spain more sustainable** includes the removal of straw after harvest to use it for gas production, building material or paper production, instead of burning or leaving it on the ground. Another good practice is its incorporation into the soil immediately after the harvest and before the post-harvest flood. An issue identified is the lack of a market for the straw.

Lastly, during the workshop in Warsaw practices applied on a specific farm were discussed<sup>1</sup>. These **protect against nutrient run-off**, through the careful and well-timed application of

---

<sup>1</sup> This practice was not part of the PlanUp project but was suggested by the sectoral expert and selected for the WWF Baltic Sea Farmer Awards.

mineral and natural fertilizers and various buffer zones, on which trees were planted. A variety of crops are kept in rotation on the fields, including stubble crops and catch crops.

## 2) Transport

The sessions on **transport** discussed several best practices. In Madrid, these were

- the **Madrid Central Low Emission Zone** (LEZ)
- the Milanese **Cerchia dei Bastioni** (Area-C)
- the **U-MOB Life** project

With its 5 km<sup>2</sup> the **Madrid Central** LEZ was considered small but ambitious. It has reduced traffic within the area with 24%. LEZ are considered a star measure in the Spanish NECP, which encourages local governments to implement these. However, it was pointed out that this encouragement on the national level might have little effect in municipalities where the local government disagrees. Therefore, it was argued that LEZ should be made mandatory. It was suggested that an EU Directive could streamline the way LEZ should be implemented. Overall, it was agreed that the implementation of LEZ should be accompanied by investments in public transport to provide alternatives for private car use. A co-benefit of LEZ is that certain public transport modes such as busses run faster when the overall number of cars decreases. Another advantage of the measure is that it is not expensive to implement.



*Event in Spain (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

The **Cerchia dei Bastioni** (Area-C) is a Limited Traffic Zone (LTZ) in the city centre of Milan that requires car drivers to pay a congestion charge. A daily entrance ticket costs €5. There are various types of other entrance tickets for resident and service vehicles. Mopeds, motorcycles, electric cars, vehicles for people with special needs, public utility and public transport service vehicles, taxis, electric and hybrid vehicles cars are exempt from the charge. Simultaneously with starting Area C Milan introduced new public transport rules, which increased the price of a single trip (subscriptions remained the same), increased the age limit during which youngsters enjoy a discount, and extended the zone in which you can travel with a standard ticket. In a public referendum on limiting traffic and increasing the uptake of low-emission vehicles in the city center a 79% majority voted in favour. It was noted by participants that the referendum was not about Area C itself but about less traffic and more EVs, so actual public acceptance is probably lower. Participants agreed that, as with LEZ, it is important to improve public transport before implementing such car reducing measures.

The **U-MOB Life** project aims to reduce emissions from travel to and from universities in Spain, Poland, Italy and the Netherlands. This is done by creating a network to exchange best practices and facilitate dialogue about sustainable mobility practices. Given that universities have an educational role and can make decisions on territorial management of their campuses as well as work and study schedules of the university population they affect the mobility practices of thousands of people. Participant considered this practice to be less impactful since they missed concrete actions to reduce emissions beyond dialogue. On the other hand, behavioral change among young people can be an important driver of emission reductions.

In Warsaw participants discussed



- Purchase of **low-emission buses and associated infrastructure** in Warsaw
- The **sustainable transport system** in Arad
- **Velocitta**: Better use of Bicycle Share Systems



*Event in Poland (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

The **Warsaw electric buses project** replaces 10% of the vehicle stock of the Warsaw municipal bus operator with 130 electric busses and creates the associated infrastructure, including the construction of aerial chargers at the ends of selected bus lines, and the adaptation of bus depots. In the long run the project will assist the Poland-wide trend towards electric mobility. Apart from reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the project will also reduce the amount of pollutants such as NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub>, and will lead to a reduction of noise produced by standard vehicles. Participants noted that it is essential that the electricity grid is decarbonised before electric busses can have a decisive impact. However, even with a grid powered by fossil fuels, these busses reduce immediate air pollution. Another point that was raised concerned the high upfront costs that hampers a fast roll out of electric busses, despite lower life cycle costs if energy prices don't increase. Energy prices might increase in Poland. In this case costs savings may be limited. At times authorities face the dilemma of buying a limited amount of electric busses with the available resources, or buy more new conventional busses that pollute less than their predecessors but can provide for a larger public transport offer. Regarding replicability of the measure participants agreed that this depends on the available funding.

The Romanian city of Arad has the second largest tram network the country, and holds the longest urban network of cycle lanes in the country (135 km) and has the highest national rate of bicycle use (8,2%). Since 2005, the municipality has developed a series of public interventions to further **improve the sustainability of its urban transport system**, such as revamping a large part of its tram infrastructure (23 km) with a grant from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), modernizing notably its tram depot, implementing an e-ticketing system and procuring six new energy efficient trams with improved access for citizens with reduced mobility. In addition to these widespread investments in its tram network, the Romanian municipality also invested in its bus infrastructure by procuring electric buses and other buses using ecological sources (e.g. local biogas) and extended its cycle network with EU INTERREG funding to the Hungarian town of Gyula it is bordering. Romanian participants pointed out that the city has a green mentality that is different from the rest of the country. Furthermore, the city has a longer history of building tram infrastructure than the rest of the country.

The **Velocitta project** supports the development of bicycle share systems (BSSs) via communication and awareness campaigns. While introduced in many cities, there are still barriers for these systems to be widespread such as the upfront investments, the urban infrastructure needed, safety and the willingness of users. However, the benefits or proper BSSs are numerous: less pollution, reduction of congestion, health and well-being, image of the city,

etc. The project aimed to keep the scheme affordable, easy to use, accessible and flexible, keep awareness campaigns on a targeted manner, address sectors of society such as schools, to boost safety as well, the ability of the scheme to solve problems when reported by the users, make the BSSs part of an integrated mobility network in interaction with other transport options (bus, metro, etc). In all cities the registration of users has increased and has led to big energy savings due to modal shift. Participants concluded this is a measure easy to replicate. However, infrastructure is key for making BSSs function. Another important element is affordability. Most cities subsidize a certain share of the costs, which is considered good practice. To keep the schemes accessible for everyone, different ways of renting a bike should be available (not only with a smartphone), for instance through a card that can be used for public transport as well. Overall the scheme should be kept simple to attract as many users as possible. Lastly, when designing such a system, it should be considered where people commute most, to improve cycling infrastructure in these areas. This way a city with little infrastructure can start a BSSs without having to wait until infrastructure improved everywhere.

### 3) Buildings

The sessions on the **building** sector focussed on best practices in the respective regions. In Madrid the following projects were presented and analysed:

- The adoption of the **Passivhaus Building Standard** in Navarra Social Housing
- The **Energy rehabilitation of the Fasa-Delicia district** in Valladolid
- The deep **renovation of condominio Murillo** in Milan

The Navarra Social Housing program, promoted by the Government of Navarra, provides 524 social housing units compliant with the **Passivhaus standard**. Tenants of these energy efficient housing save on energy bills which alleviates energy poverty. Furthermore, the project provides housing to young people or families with scarce resources. The project is co-funded between regional authorities, local society and the EIB.



*Event in Spain (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

The **energy rehabilitation project of the Fasa-Delicia district** in Valladolid, funded by Horizon 2020 and private investments, is part of the city's Land and Housing Plan 2017 - 2020. The collaboration between the municipality, communities of owners and tenants, and the European REMOURBAN innovation project proved key to allow for the project to be carried out. 19 owner communities (398 houses), a fourteen-story tower and all common areas will be renovated to improve energy efficiency (insulation of the facades, renovation of the existing heating network to supply it with renewable energy, installation of photovoltaic facades and renovation of common areas through the installation of LED systems).

During the **renovation of condominio Murillo** in Milan<sup>2</sup>, a building of nine apartments was insulated (roof, facades, attic and basement) and equipped with a heat pump. Residents only pay 30% of the investment. Fiscal discounts were used. All residents were educated on how to treat the building.

---

<sup>2</sup> This practice was not part of the PlanUp project but was suggested by the sectoral expert. More information can be found here: <https://civicocinquepuntozero.it/testimonial/condominio-passeroni/>

For all the three projects, technical details related to efficiency and renewable energy actions were provided, as well as financing details and return on investments. Most comments focused on

- Upfront cost being the main economical obstacle: innovative finance schemes are needed
- Projects should find an external source of financing to scale up results of the pilot project and Return on Investment should be acceptable for all participants
- Knowledge/cultural issues are extremely relevant in large scale innovation, where consensus is needed to take action
- Skill-building trainings are often overlooked while they should be a priority to enact change
- Management of projects should be dealt with a regional/national agency that focused on building renovation

The session inspired some participants to organize a similar discussion in the framework of the Horizon 2020 project “Innovate”<sup>3</sup>.

During the workshop in Warsaw, participants discussed three local projects implemented in Poland, as the participants were coming from that country only:

- **Energy efficient social houses** in Kępice
- **Energy modernization of municipal facilities following the ESCO formula** in the city of Płock
- **Free energy audits** to support citizens’ investments in **thermo modernization**



Event in Poland (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)

New social housing for impoverished families in Kępice was built according to **passive house standards** and equipped with PV panels. The houses were connected to a heating network powered by a biomass boiler, which significantly limits the cost of maintaining the house as well as its impact on the environment. The PV panels and the boiler significantly reduce the energy bill of the residents. An innovative technology of a single-layer wall, made of pressed, expanded polystyrene covered with expanded clay was used. The project was seen as highly replicable. The project was awarded in the competition "Green cities - towards the future" organized by the Polish Ministry of the Environment

The city of Płock concluded a public-private partnership agreement with Siemens company for the **energy modernization** of 24 public facilities (kindergartens, schools, swimming pools and City Hall building). The project is implemented in the formula of ESCO (Energy Service Company). It is an energy management model under which a specialized company, in this case Siemens, is responsible for analyzing the improvement of energy efficiency, ensuring financing, supervision over the implementation and operation of the project. The project aims to deliver energy savings of 34%. The liability will be fully repaid from the generated savings over 17 years. As a part of energy modernization, selected heating and lighting installations and equipment were replaced

<sup>3</sup> More information can be found here: <https://energy-cities.eu/project/innovate-2/>

and modern automation was installed, thanks to which it is possible to optimize the consumption of both heat and electricity. Energy management is based on monitoring and setting temperatures or illuminance in rooms depending on their use. To this end, Siemens uses its remotely readable system that allows control of all facilities served in the country. Some of the buildings were subjected to thermo-modernisation.

The city of Sztum supports its residents in carrying out **thermomodernization, by offering free energy audits**. Residents received reliable information on energy consumption and energy saving options, and were encouraged to invest in thermomodernization of their homes and prepared to submit applications for funding. The project improved energy efficiency, reduced emissions from solid fuels combustion and reducing energy poverty in Sztum.

The discussion that followed focused on the possibility of standard schemes to be applied to Poland. More specifically the following considerations were made:

- Energy service company (ESCO) schemes are not very appealing in eastern Europe, where many structural funds are available to refurbish dwellings with incentives that can reach up to 100%
- Such contribution somehow spoils the market and people are not so keen to invest in refurbishment as they expect that the state will take care of it
- Payback times with ESCo schemes can be much longer and sometimes they can cover the whole life span of the products installed
- Many municipal authorities do not take any initiative because the political pressure on decision-makers is very high: any decision is challenged in courts and the risk of being condemned is too high. This is a serious obstacle for change in local municipalities.

### Event evaluation by event organiser

Both events went smoothly. For the Madrid workshop, two speakers cancelled due to travel issues, which were beyond the control of the organisers. In Madrid, limited knowledge of English might have been a barrier to active participation of some participants to the discussions. On the second day, participants engage more actively. This might be partially due to the fact that a journalist was hired to moderate the day, which created a more dynamic atmosphere. In Warsaw no journalist was hired but participation was higher than in Madrid, potentially due to the smaller amount of participants, facilitating interaction.



*Event in Poland (Photo Credit: LIFE PlanUp)*

Overall, presentations on good practices were often longer than asked for, leading to an overly long session on good practices. The time limit could have been emphasized more to speakers. However, the events did not last much longer than indicated in the programme, so this was eventually well managed by shortening other less essential parts of the conference such as breaks.

The quality of presentations was good, with some being especially relevant for the climate policy process. This includes a presentation by the Stockholm Environment Institute on a report for the Estonian government on the impact and costs of policy measures needed to reach climate

neutrality in 2050. The study led to the adoption of the EU 2050 climate neutral objective by Estonia.

The break-out sessions proved useful to spread awareness, share knowledge and tease out an interesting debate on several good practices relevant for the focal countries.

Networking among participants was successful as several essential contacts were made, thereby facilitating the forging of alliances between CSOs and LRAs in the focal countries to coordinate and cooperate on NECP development and implementation by sharing experiences on best practice policies.

## **Impact follow-up**

After the event a survey was circulated among participants. 18 participants of the Madrid workshop filled out the survey and 22 participants of the Warsaw workshop did so as well.

### **1) Madrid workshop**

Six participants (33.33%) rated the event as “excellent”, while 11 (61.11%) stated they found the quality of the event to be “above average”. One participant (5.56%) found the event to be of “average” quality. None of the participants found the overall quality of the event to be “below average”.

Six participants (33.33%) found the amount of information “learned excellent”. Nine (50%) rated this as “above average”, while two participants (11.11%) stated the amount of information learned was “average” and one participant (5.56%) indicated it to be “below average”.

When asked how useful the information provided at the workshop was for their work, eight participants (44.44%) rated this as “excellent”. Seven (38.89%) found the usefulness to be “above average”, while two (11.11%) indicated it to be “average”. One participant (5.56%) found the usefulness of the information to be “below average”.

The opportunities for discussion and networking with other stakeholders was rated as “excellent” by eight participants (44.44%). Another eight (44.44%) found this to be “above average”, while two (11.11%) stated these opportunities at the event were “average”. None of the participants found this to be “below average”.

When asked whether participants had comments on topics within the event subject matter which according to them should be covered in greater depth or added, or should be given reduced coverage or dropped, it was mentioned that the reduction of energy use - and not solely the transition to renewable energy - could have been discussed in greater depth. Regarding transportation this would be issues related to accessibility, better urban planning, the reduction of the number of cars in cities and active mobility (walking and cycling). Another participant remarked that more time should have been reserved for the break-out sessions. Lastly, one of the participants found that there was little balance of participants between round-tables. It was added that the good practices presented were very interesting.

Additional comments to improve future PlanUP events included the remark that the event should have lasted three days. Regarding the event location, it was mentioned that it was a nice place but that from some angles it was difficult to see the screen properly.

### **2) Warsaw workshop**

Nine participants (40.91%) rated the event as “excellent”, while 10 (45.45%) stated they found the quality of the event to be “above average”. Three participants (13.64%) found the event to be of “average” quality. None of the participants found the overall quality of the event to be “below average”.

Seven participants (31.82%) found the amount of information learned “excellent”. Thirteen (59.09%) rated this as “above average”, while two participants (9.09%) stated the amount of information learned was “average”. None of the participants found this to be “below average”.

When asked how useful the information provided at the workshop was for their work, six participants (27.27%) rated this as “excellent”. Thirteen (59.09%) found the usefulness to be “above average”, while three (13.64%) indicated it to be “average”. None of the participants found this to be “below average”.

The opportunities for discussion and networking with other stakeholders was rated as “excellent” by thirteen participants (59.09%). Another five (22.73%) found this to be “above average”, while four (18.18%) stated these opportunities at the event were “average”. None of the participants found this to be “below average”.

When asked whether participants had comments on topics within the event subject matter which according to them should be covered in greater depth or added, or should be given reduced coverage or dropped, one participant indicated that some topics, such as the energy sector were not of interest to him/her. More details on the agricultural sector and LULUCF in the NECPs would have been useful. Other issues participants found useful to expand on more where the role of ESCOs, the institutional/political difficulties that prevent change and cross-sectoral issues. The exchange formula was lauded for not being too formal and targeted to the exchange of experiences and preoccupations.

Additional comments to improve future PlanUP events included the remark that participants should have been evenly distributed between the break-out sessions, in order to have a more homogeneous representation of countries in all sessions. Lastly, it was suggested to write up the conclusions of the workshop and share with participants, together with the list of participants including contact details of those who accept this. It should be noted that contact details and all presentations have been shared with all participants to facilitate future cooperation (see below).

### **3) Overall impact evaluation**

Overall it can be concluded that the events were evaluated positively by a large majority of participants. To facilitate future cooperation and alliances on the NECPs contact details were shared among participants. Networking among participants was successful, contributing to the workshops’ aim to facilitate alliances between CSOs and LRAs in the focal countries to coordinate and cooperate on NECP development and implementation. In terms of knowledge sharing, break-out sessions were seen as a useful way of sharing experience on good practices and the information provided at the workshops was seen as useful for participants’ work.

#### **In attachment**

- Workshop programmes
- List of participants
- Presentations



**Join the conversation** ➤

[www.planup.eu](http://www.planup.eu)