



CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION THROUGH DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION

*Contribution of German development cooperation
to mitigating greenhouse gas emissions in developing countries*

Executive Summary

2024



DEval

GERMAN
INSTITUTE FOR
DEVELOPMENT
EVALUATION

IMPRINT

Authors

Dr Thomas Wencker
Georg Kühltau
Dr Isabel Mank
Kevin Moull

Responsible team leader

Dr Thomas Wencker

Responsible head of department

Dr Sven Harten

Design and graphics

Zlatka Dimitrova, Katharina Mayer, DEval

Editing

Marcus Klein, PhD, Bonn
www.marcusklein.org

Translation

exact! GmbH, Mannheim

Photo credits

Cover: Dr Thomas Wencker

Bibliographical reference

Wencker, T., G. Kühltau, I. Mank and K. Moull (2024),
Climate Change Mitigation through Development Cooperation. Contribution of German Development Cooperation to Mitigating Greenhouse Gas Emissions In Developing Countries, German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval), Bonn.

Published by

German Institute for
Development Evaluation (DEval)
Fritz-Schäffer-Straße 26
53113 Bonn

Phone: +49 (0)228 33 69 07-0

Email: info@DEval.org

www.DEval.org

The German Institute for Development Evaluation (DEval) is mandated by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) to independently analyse and assess German development interventions.

The Institute's evaluation reports contribute to the transparency of development results and provide policymakers with evidence and lessons learned, based on which they can shape and improve their development policies.

This report can be downloaded as a PDF file from the DEval website: :

<https://www.deval.org/en/publications>

A BMZ response to this evaluation is available at:

<https://www.bmz.de/de/ministerium/evaluierung/bmz-responses-19422>

© German Institute
for Development Evaluation (DEval), 2024

ISBN 978-3-96126-219-9 (PDF)

This is an excerpt from the DEval publication: "Climate Change Mitigation through Development Cooperation. Contribution of German Development Cooperation to Mitigating Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Developing Countries". Download the full report here: <https://www.deval.org/en/evaluations/our-evaluations/climate-protection-through-development-cooperation>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The international community has set itself ambitious targets for climate change mitigation in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement (UNFCCC, 2015). The most important goal is to limit the global temperature increase to well below 2 °C and, if possible, below 1.5 °C compared to pre-industrial times. In order for the objectives to be achieved, a transformational change towards climate-neutral, inclusive, equitable, resilient and sustainable development pathways needs to take place quickly and in the near future (Climate Investment Funds, 2021; IPCC, 2022a: 298; UNFCCC, 2023a).

The ambitions and implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) are currently insufficient to achieve the climate targets (UNFCCC, 2023b). Average annual global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the period from 2010 to 2019 were higher than ever before in human history (54.6 ± 5.55 GtCO_{2e}), and they continue to rise. In 2022, they were 37 percent higher than in 2000 (UNEP, 2023).

Development cooperation (DC) can contribute to the mitigation of GHG emissions in developing countries. For the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the topic of “climate and energy” is one of six core areas. The BMZ aims to strengthen capacities and institutions for the creation and implementation of climate-relevant policies, support a fundamental system change towards climate neutrality with a transformational climate portfolio, meet the increasing energy demand with a climate-neutral energy supply and make cities sustainable and climate-neutral (BMZ, 2021).

In addition, the DC places further demands on the mitigation-relevant DC. As a signatory to the 2030 Agenda, the Federal Government is committed to leaving no country or population group behind (leave no one behind) (BMZ, 2021; UN, 2015a). The BMZ therefore also supports the just transition approach, which aims to shape the transition to a climate-friendly economy and way of life and pursue the goal of compensating as far as possible

for social disadvantages that are caused or exacerbated by the change in the economic structure, for example in the energy sector (BMZ, 2022a). Supporting this approach is a prerequisite for effective transformational change (IPCC, 2022a: 412).

Objectives, purpose and object of the evaluation

The aim of the evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness and overarching development impact of mitigation-relevant DC under the political responsibility of the BMZ. Beyond the DC for which the BMZ is responsible, the evaluation also makes statements about the impacts of German and international DC relevant to mitigation. The data currently available is not sufficient for a comprehensive assessment of efficiency. However, proposals are being developed that could make this possible in the future.

The purpose of the evaluation is to further develop German mitigation-relevant DC, in particular through the evidence-based implementation of the BMZ core area strategy “Responsibility for our Planet – Climate and Energy”. This will supplement the DEval evaluations on interventions for climate change adaptation (Leppert et al., 2021; Noltze et al., 2023a, 2023b; Noltze and Rauschenbach, 2019), access to (green) energy in rural Africa (Rauschenbach et al., 2024) and the circular economy (Guffler et al., in publication) as well as the synthesis study on the German contribution to the REDD+ forest and climate protection programme (Reinecke et al., 2020).

The evaluation examines climate policy interventions by the BMZ, Germany and the members of the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to mitigate GHG emissions. This includes the scope of Germany's climate- and mitigation-relevant development finance as well as the scope and distribution of BMZ funds. It also analyses the causal pathways and the climate-relevant effects and impacts of development finance by OECD-DAC member states and specifically Germany.

Evaluation questions (EQs)

Firstly, the evaluation assesses the extent to which German DC fulfils international agreements, meets the goals it has set itself and takes partner priorities into account.

The subject of international agreements as well as national objectives is first of all a balance between the funding of interventions to mitigate climate change and those to adapt to its consequences. Two funding objectives are also relevant:

1. The German Federal Government aims to increase climate finance for developing countries from budget funds to at least EUR 6 billion per year by 2025 at the latest.
2. The Federal Government has made an international commitment to make a fair contribution to the industrialised nations' goal of increasing international climate finance to USD 100 billion per year from 2020.

Whether these targets are considered to have been achieved depends largely on whether funds are reported as being relevant to mitigation. On the one hand, this evaluation highlights the challenges of transparency and accountability by analysing the extent to which it is plausible to identify mitigation-relevant interventions using the Rio markers. On the other hand, it shows how difficult it is to precisely determine the level of public commitment in the climate sector in a universally recognised way. Four forms of reporting are compared: the official (international) climate reporting to the European Environment Agency of the European Union (EU) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the reporting on DC to the OECD as part of the Creditor Reporting System and the BMZ data in the Modular Extensible Management Financial Information System (MeMFIS).

As public funds are not sufficient to achieve the climate targets, this evaluation also includes private capital mobilisation through the BMZ's fund and direct holdings. This is complemented by an analysis of the extent to which funds from bilateral German mitigation-relevant climate finance match the needs expressed in the NDCs of partner governments.

Evaluation question 1 (Relevance): To what extent is the mitigation-relevant portfolio aligned with international agreements and the priorities of the development partners and the German Federal Government?

The second evaluation question revolves around the criteria according to which the BMZ distributes mitigation-relevant development finance. In particular, the evaluation considers possible connections between allocation decisions on the one hand and the mitigation potential, need and political-institutional framework conditions in developing countries on the other hand.

Evaluation question 2 (Relevance): To what extent is the BMZ's distribution of mitigation-relevant development finance aligned with the mitigation potential, taking account of the need of development partners?

Thirdly, the evaluation investigates the extent to which mitigation-relevant development finance contributes to the reduction or avoidance of GHG emissions. It not only examines the achievement of objectives (effectiveness), but also analyses the contribution to GHG emission mitigation (impact). The focus of this analysis is on the BMZ "Energy" funding area (which covers energy generation, distribution and efficiency). This addresses a "key sector for climate change mitigation" (BMZ, 2021: 23), and it is where developing countries articulate the majority of their needs for mitigation interventions. It also accounts for almost half of bilateral BMZ development finance relevant to mitigation.

Evaluation question 3 (Effectiveness): To what extent are the intended objectives (outcomes) of the BMZ's German mitigation-relevant development finance in the "Energy" funding area achieved?

Evaluation question 4 (Impact): To what extent is the overarching development impact of GHG emission mitigation achieved through German mitigation-relevant development finance in the "Energy" funding area?

Fourthly, the evaluation identifies prerequisites for evaluating the efficiency of mitigation interventions. For this purpose, it examines the current reporting on the standard indicator for the quantity of reduced or avoided GHG emissions by the two largest implementing organisations – the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and KfW Development Bank (KfW). Due to a lack of suitable data, it does not assess efficiency.

Evaluation question 5 (Efficiency): What are the requirements for evaluating the efficiency of development interventions to reduce and avoid GHG emissions and how can these be met by improving reporting?

Methods

This is a macro-quantitative evaluation. Many cases or observations are compared using predominantly statistical methods, based largely on existing data.¹ The identification of average associations and the derived evidence on causal relationships at an aggregated level can yield useful information for strategic decisions and in particular for portfolio management. Macro-quantitative analyses can also uncover abstract causal relationships and thus reduce complexity. Specifically, eight analyses were carried out (see Box 1).

Box 1 Analyses

- Descriptive portfolio analysis of the amount and distribution of public funds in the climate sector
- Machine classification (natural language processing) of mitigation-relevant interventions based on their brief descriptions in combination with a qualitative analysis of a sample to test the Rio markers
- Statistical comparison of all fund and direct holdings managed by the KfW on a fiduciary basis since 2017, regardless of whether or not they relate to mitigation, for the analysis of private capital mobilisation
- Statistical comparison of the sectoral distribution of mitigation-relevant development finance with the conditional targets set out in NDCs to determine partner orientation
- Inferential statistical analysis of which countries receive bilateral, mitigation-relevant official development assistance (ODA), with what probability and to what extent, in order to assess the distribution of mitigation-relevant development finance
- Synthesis of scientific findings on DC interventions in order to better understand causal relations and create valid models for them
- Descriptive and inferential statistical analysis of the extent to which mitigation-relevant development finance disbursements are linked to changes in the energy system and GHG emissions
- Qualitative analysis of KfW and GIZ reporting on the standard indicator “quantity of reduced or avoided GHG emissions” with regard to the requirements for evaluating allocation efficiency

¹ Many DEval evaluations that have already been published use macro-quantitative methods (Noltze and Rauschenbach, 2019; Wencker, 2022; Wencker and Verspohl, 2019).

Findings, conclusions and recommendations

Mitigation funding

Germany is one of the largest donors of public climate-relevant development finance. According to its own data, Germany – and the BMZ in particular – contributed a total of EUR 9.96 billion in 2022 from budget funds including grant equivalents, market funds mobilised by the KfW and DEG, and mobilised private climate finance to achieve the goal of industrialised countries to provide developing countries with USD 100 billion annually for climate change mitigation and adaptation as of 2020 (BMZ, 2024a). The share from budget funds including grant equivalents totalled EUR 6.39 billion.

In view of Germany's contribution to global warming to date and its current capabilities, Germany's share appears fair, that is, in line with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities set out in Article 3(1) of the UNFCCC. Scientific studies estimate Germany's share of the USD 100 billion target to be just over 8 percent on average. Germany is also one of the most important donors in terms of climate-relevant development finance, which is provided with the main aim of promoting economic and social development. However, the figure of USD 100 billion is well below the investment needs identified in the global stocktake of the Paris Agreement. Future commitments are likely to depend on the negotiations of the UNFCCC on the New Collective Quantified Goal on Climate Finance (NCQG) in the context of the Conference of the Parties (COP29).

Apart from the financial targets, the decisive factor is ultimately the mitigation achieved. There is no doubt that climate finance is an essential tool for climate change mitigation, as this evaluation also shows. The current debate is focussing on funding objectives, the time frame, possible sources and the distribution of the funding burden. The mitigation achieved takes up comparatively little space.

The BMZ is succeeding in its efforts to achieve an almost equal distribution of mitigation- and adaptation-relevant development finance through bilateral commitments from budget funds from 2011 to 2021 (see also Noltze et al., 2023b).

The ministry is therefore achieving its goals in this respect. However, this only slightly affects the enormous imbalance of all public and private financial flows aimed at low-carbon and climate-resilient development in favour of mitigating GHG emissions. If the activities of companies, households, financial institutions and banks are also included, only 5 percent of these are relevant to adaptation, according to Buchner et al. (2023).

However, these overall positive results for mitigation funding are relativised by doubts about the reporting. In line with many other studies, analyses performed as part of this evaluation indicate that the Rio markers for climate change mitigation (KLM) are assigned too frequently and sometimes too high. In addition, the way in which grants and loans are counted must always be taken into account when assessing the achievement of objectives. This primarily concerns the question of whether loans subject to repayment should be recognised as funding in their entirety or whether this should only apply to the financial advantage resulting from the interest rate reduction compared to market conditions.

In addition to public funding, the joint commitment of public and private sector stakeholders is a key factor in achieving the climate targets. However, this evaluation shows that – despite the interest in impact-oriented investments in the area of “climate change mitigation and clean energy” – private capital mobilisation in this area is no more successful than in comparable cases in other focus areas. The renewable energy sector continues to be characterised by an imbalance between demand and investment, particularly in developing countries (IEA, 2024). Considering the financial challenges and in view of private investment, market opportunities, innovation potential and the future security, a greater priority needs to be assigned to clean technologies.

Irrespective of the mobilisation of private capital, an appropriate partner orientation should contribute to a more effective and efficient use of limited financial resources.

There is a double finding here. On the one hand, the majority of German mitigation-relevant development finance is provided in line with the partner governments' NDCs. On the other hand, there are no indications in the statistical country comparison of this evaluation that allocation decisions by the donor community are actively orientated towards this, as agreed in the Paris Agreement.

The findings with regard to the amount, balance, leverage effect and partner-orientation of mitigation-relevant DC give rise to the following recommendation:

Recommendation 1: The BMZ should uphold its commitments to make a fair contribution to mitigating GHG emissions, in line with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and capacities, and continue to align its commitments with the NDCs in order to achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement.

When implementing the recommendation, the BMZ could (1) focus more on verifiable mitigation impacts in addition to climate finance objectives; (2) further improve the transparency and validity of reporting; (3) continue to work towards a stronger partner orientation of the donor community in line with the NDCs, hereby maintaining and strengthening the principle of self-determination of the NDCs; (4) systematically ensure that the distribution of mitigation-relevant DC is oriented towards partner priorities and that the achievement of the NDCs is supported; (5) strive to make better use of the comparative advantages in the area of mitigating GHG emissions in private capital mobilisation and carry out an analysis of the risk-specific mobilisation effect. Existing structures such as the Just Energy Transition Partnerships and the private capital mobilisation staff can be utilised.

Distribution patterns of mitigation-relevant development finance

When distributing mitigation-relevant development finance, the BMZ focuses more on countries' socio-economic need than on their mitigation potential. This means

that poorer countries receive more frequent and higher commitments. In addition, the ministry works more frequently with technological pioneers, including countries that patent low-carbon energy technologies. However, there is hardly any evidence to suggest, for example, a focus on a lack of efficiency in energy supply or high per capita emissions.

With regard to the political-institutional framework conditions, it can be seen that democracies receive more frequent and higher commitments, and are therefore systematically favoured over autocracies. In contrast, there is at best weak evidence for an orientation towards governance, conflict intensity or the number of women in parliament.

Due to the long-term negative consequences of climate change and the effects and impacts of mitigation-relevant development cooperation identified in this evaluation, a reduced commitment to mitigation-relevant DC in favour of other development goals does not appear to be expedient. However, the distribution of mitigation-relevant DC requires careful consideration of several interlinked and potentially conflicting objectives, in particular national economic development and global climate change mitigation. The urgency, risks and uncertainties of climate change and climate change mitigation must be taken into account. It is therefore hardly possible to make generally valid recommendations.

When weighing up strategic allocation decisions, the nexus between socio-economic development and the promotion of global public goods must be taken into account. For example, climate change mitigation is particularly efficient where the costs of avoiding emissions are low, but this would imply neglecting poorer countries with mostly low GHG emissions. As a result, opportunities for growth may be missed, as climate change mitigation can promote socio-economic development through greater resource efficiency, the scaling effects of new technologies, increasing productivity and innovations. A purely efficiency-orientated approach that exempts mitigation-relevant interventions from the development proviso could, in extreme cases, also violate

the do-no-harm principle due to negative externalities. In the light of a multidimensional understanding of development, which pursues coherent and integrated policies to achieve the SDGs as important norms, such an approach does not appear feasible.

The aim of international and German DC is a holistic approach to sustainable development that encompasses both climate change mitigation and socio-economic development. This gives rise to the challenge of distributing scarce DC funds in such a way that climate change mitigation and development goals are achieved in a balanced manner. One possible way of utilising synergies here is to align mitigation-relevant development cooperation with a fundamental change in climate-relevant systems that makes extensive positive contributions towards inclusive, climate-neutral, equitable, resilient and sustainable development pathways. German DC has also set itself the objective of enacting transformational climate policy.

In addition to these synergy effects, there are also potential conflicts of objectives relating to inequality that are relevant for strategic allocation decisions. Climate change mitigation can increase consumption and production costs in the short term, which disproportionately penalises poorer population groups. The just transition approach can be used to take this into account in the allocation. It aims to offset the negative social consequences of climate change mitigation and thus reduce potential conflicts of objectives.

Based on the analysis of the distribution of mitigation-relevant development finance, this evaluation reaches the conclusion that the requirement to focus on mitigation potential, need and suitable political-institutional framework conditions is partially fulfilled. The evaluation gives rise to the following recommendation:

Recommendation 2: When distributing mitigation-relevant DC, the BMZ should more specifically consider the synergies and conflicts of objectives between promoting socio-economic development and mitigating GHG emissions in order to minimise potential conflicts of objectives and maximise possible synergies.

In implementing the recommendation, the BMZ could (1) recognise the conflicts of objectives and the synergies between key development results even more strongly by using up-to-date, well-founded, complexity-reduced descriptions of these areas; (2) deal more systematically with the conflicts of objectives and the synergies and, if conflicts of objectives exist, focus mitigation-relevant development finance more strongly on mitigation potential, in the process mitigating possible short-term negative impacts of mitigation interventions through accompanying interventions based on the just transition approach and, at best, creating new socio-economic synergy effects or strengthening existing ones; (3) further promote transformational approaches to utilise synergies, including comprehensive risk management, climate and development partnerships, partnership-based and donor-coordinated approaches such as the NDC Partnership, and a cross-ministry environmental policy.

Effectiveness and impact of mitigation interventions

In order to understand the effects and impacts of mitigation-relevant DC, it is first of all important that there is sound scientific documentation of the effectiveness and impact of several groups of interventions that development cooperation aims to promote. The evidence synthesis of this evaluation sums this up for seven groups of interventions:

- **Technological and infrastructural interventions** promote direct investment and infrastructure programmes as well as the introduction of new technologies, processes or practices, thereby increasing renewable energy generation capacity, energy efficiency and the effective use of low- and zero-carbon energy sources.
- **Economic interventions** such as carbon taxes and emissions trading systems are particularly effective.
- **Institutional interventions** such as the establishment of institutions and governance structures strengthen state capacities and thus create the framework conditions for the implementation of mitigation interventions.
- **Regulatory interventions** effectively contribute to the avoidance of GHG emissions through the introduction of performance and technology standards.

- **Climate change mitigation strategies and laws** are used to set emissions targets, promote cross-sectoral approaches and improve the political framework conditions for climate change mitigation in the long term.
- **Voluntary interventions** contribute to mitigating GHG emissions through voluntary commitments and agreements. One example is the global “C40 Cities” network, in which cities enter into voluntary agreements.
- **Information-based and behaviour-changing interventions** improve access to information and influence the behaviour of target groups to mitigate GHG emissions.

As the results of this evaluation show, the extent to which mitigation-relevant DC succeeds in promoting these interventions varies. There is particular evidence of a favourable effect for technological and infrastructural interventions. Specifically, it can be seen that disbursements of mitigation-relevant DC are linked to a growing share of renewable energies in electricity generation in partner countries. The benchmark of decarbonising the energy supply through mitigation-relevant development finance in the “Energy” funding area is therefore partially fulfilled.

Irrespective of specific impact pathways, the results of this evaluation show that both DC with the principal objective of mitigating GHG emissions and mitigation-relevant DC in the energy sector go hand in hand with emission mitigation by development partners. This emission mitigation relates to greenhouse gases that are produced when converting existing energy into electricity or heat as well as when storing, transporting and distributing energy. However, there are no comparable effects for the total mitigation-relevant DC. This is primarily due to the fact that the funding of interventions that aim to mitigate GHG emissions as a significant objective does not go hand in hand with emission mitigation. This could be because the distribution of these funds is based more on need. In addition, significant objective interventions could be less climate-relevant than reported. The results of the Rio marker assignment support this interpretation, demonstrating that the climate relevance of significant objective interventions is not always clear. One explanation as to why interventions in the “Energy” funding area are effective can be found in the results

of the analysis of effectiveness, as this funding area more frequently implements direct interventions (technological and infrastructural), which the analysis of effectiveness shows to be effective.

The evidence synthesis of this evaluation indicates that democracies and well-governed countries are comparatively better at mitigating emissions. Democracy is crucial for climate change mitigation, and democracies adopt more ambitious climate policies compared to autocracies. This could be because democracies are accountable to large majorities or the electorate as a whole and prioritise public goods over private goods. Good governance and political stability also often correlate negatively with emissions. However, further current research seems advisable here. After all, although democracy should facilitate decarbonisation, authoritarian regimes are still able to implement large-scale environmental policy interventions.

In summary, the objective of mitigating GHG emissions is therefore met both for interventions with mitigation as principal objective and for mitigation-relevant DC in the “Energy” funding area, but is not met for mitigation interventions with “climate change mitigation” as a significant objective. The evaluation thus gives rise to the following recommendation:

Recommendation 3: The BMZ should continue to substantially promote the effective and impactful interventions in the portfolio of mitigation-relevant development finance with the principal objective of “mitigation”, especially in the “Energy” funding area, in comparison to the rest of the mitigation-relevant portfolio.

During implementation, the BMZ could also critically examine the actual effects and impacts of interventions in the cross-sectoral portfolio of mitigation-relevant development finance. When managing the portfolio of DC mitigation interventions with a more indirect effect, in particular, the ministry should take greater account of how the political-institutional framework conditions can strengthen or weaken mitigation effects and, where appropriate, specifically promote framework conditions by promoting democracy and state capacity.

Efficiency measurement

Finally, this evaluation develops five prerequisites for a future evaluation of the efficiency of development interventions to reduce and avoid GHG emissions. Valid statements on the emission-mitigating impact of individual development interventions can therefore only be made if effects and impacts are reported in a complete, differentiated, comprehensive, standardised and simultaneous manner.

The analysis of reporting on the standard indicator “quantity of reduced or avoided GHG emissions [in tonnes of CO₂ equivalent/year]” by the GIZ and KfW shows a mixed picture. Firstly, although the current reporting does not provide a complete record of all mitigation-relevant impacts, it appears to be sufficiently complete to evaluate efficiency. Secondly, uncertainties could be communicated more clearly, especially when measuring indirect effects and impacts. Thirdly, definitions at the GIZ and KfW should be standardised. Fourthly, direct and indirect emissions should always be reported separately. Fifthly, a standardised ex-ante and ex-post assessment is recommended, insofar as this is possible with sufficient certainty. The comparison of technical and financial cooperation interventions remains a particular challenge due to their typically different results chains.

In principle, it would therefore appear possible to evaluate the efficiency of direct effects and impacts of mitigation-relevant interventions in particular. In the case of indirect effects and impacts, however, the downstream and delayed mitigation effect means that an efficiency analysis is associated with great uncertainties and, if at all, is only possible using an ex-ante assessment.

The objective of performing complete, differentiated, comprehensive, standardised and simultaneous reporting on emissions and mitigation effects in order to evaluate the allocation efficiency of development interventions for reducing and avoiding GHG emissions is therefore barely fulfilled up to now. This gives rise to the following recommendation:

Recommendation 4: In the future, the GIZ and KfW should document mitigation effects at module level in such a way that valid statements can be made on the emission-mitigating effect of (groups of) development interventions.

During implementation, the GIZ and KfW could coordinate further development interventions to ensure complete, differentiated, comprehensive, standardised and simultaneous reporting on the standard indicator “mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions”. More specifically, the GIZ and KfW could (1) estimate information on the mitigation relevance of interventions below the significance threshold on the basis of a sample; (2) standardise definitions of different types of emissions; (3) always report direct and indirect emissions separately; (4) communicate uncertainties more clearly, especially when estimating indirect effects and impacts; (5) carry out a uniform ex-ante and ex-post assessment of the mitigation effect where this is possible.

In order to limit the resulting additional effort, mitigation effects could in future only be recorded for a representative sample. This could be done with greater care in each case. Better data quality reduces the measurement uncertainty in individual cases and, in combination with the recommended standardisation of definitions and procedures, makes it less likely for systematic errors to arise. These advantages could be weighed up against the expected sampling error. In summary, a sampling-based approach could thus reduce the systematic and random errors that occur when recording GHG emissions and at the same time be more cost-efficient.

The findings on the reporting of the Rio markers are also important in this context. The allocation of markers should continue to be subject to ongoing quality assurance. For example, the proportionate crediting of mitigation interventions could be more finely scaled and reported on an intervention-specific basis in order to contribute to the transparency and credibility of the reported German climate finance.

Overall results

Looking at the overall findings of the evaluation with regard to mitigation-relevant DC gives rise to the following consequences for relevant, effective, impactful and economical DC.

In view of the extreme risks of climate change with negative implications for a wide range of SDGs, the BMZ should continue to ambitiously pursue the goal of mitigating GHG emissions. The climate relevance of all interventions reported as climate-relevant could be made even clearer in the reporting.

The distribution of the funds provided should be orientated towards partner priorities in order to increase effectiveness through ownership. As the funds made available will probably not be sufficient in the future either, further distribution criteria are necessary. Mitigation potential could play a greater role here. This applies especially to interventions with the primary objective of climate change mitigation, as such interventions effectively mitigate GHG emissions. More democratic and better governed development partners are particularly suitable. In non-democratic countries or where there are restrictions on good governance, promoting the state and civil society can also help to achieve climate targets, although short-term success is not so likely here. Where the mitigation of GHG emissions is only a significant objective, distribution can continue to be primarily based on need. In this case, the primary aim is to take account of negative externalities for climate change mitigation in order to counter the immense dangers of further global warming for development goals. Conversely, the social impacts of mitigation-relevant DC should always be included in considerations to ensure that climate change mitigation is organised in a socially just and inclusive way.

This is an excerpt from the DEval publication: "Climate Change Mitigation through Development Cooperation. Contribution of German Development Cooperation to Mitigating Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Developing Countries". Download the full report here: <https://www.deval.org/en/evaluations/our-evaluations/climate-protection-through-development-cooperation>