Evaluation of the process and outputs of the Low Carbon Communities Challenge (LCCC)

Undertaken by the Office for Public Management

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors, not necessarily those of the Department of Energy and Climate Change (nor do they reflect Government policy).

July 2012

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Low Carbon Communities Challenge (LCCC), a Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) programme which ran between 2009 and 2011, was funded by DECC, the Department for Enterprise, Trade and Investment (Northern Ireland), the Welsh Assembly, and the Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (Sciencewise-ERC) [1]. The LCCC provided financial and advisory support to 22[2] communities and aimed to test community-scale implementation of low carbon technologies alongside community engagement and behaviour change initiatives. The programme was designed to inform energy efficiency and low carbon generation policies.

The LCCC was intended to result in extensive learning from the experience of the programme. A five strand evaluation programme was designed to capture and disseminate the key elements of that learning. DECC commissioned OPM to conduct one of these strands: an independent evaluation of the processes and outputs of the LCCC. The main objectives of the process and outputs evaluation were four-fold:

1. **Process evaluation of the LCCC programme management:** which aspects of the management and administration of the LCCC worked well and less well to support local project teams to deliver their projects;

2. **LCCC outputs delivered by each project:** the technology installed, engagement activities to encourage behaviour change, and building organisational capacity and partnerships. This objective had two distinct elements:

    a. The first was a formal audit exercise (appended), capturing outputs from each LCCC community in respect of (a) the low carbon technologies and measures they have installed and (b) the engagement and behaviour change initiatives they have undertaken; and

    b. The second element was to capture the key learning from the projects' perspective, in terms of project outputs that worked well and didn't work well, and – with the benefit of hindsight and experience - what advice they would give to a project trying to do something similar.

3. **Outcomes:** the process evaluation explored any impact data which had been gathered by the projects, as well as a more subjective assessment of what impacts the projects think they have had in their communities. It has also assessed perceptions of the impact of the LCCC programme on DECC policy and practice. The overall five strand evaluation provides the main data for assessing the overall impacts of the LCCC programme; and

4. **Future lessons** – consideration of the implications of the LCCC for future action learning and collaborative research programmes, especially in relation to community-led energy initiatives.

---

[1] The Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (Sciencwise-ERC) is funded by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and helps policy makers to understand and use public dialogue to inspire, inform and improve policy decisions around science and technology. See http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/

[2] Four projects – Ballymena, Berwick, Awel and Cwm Arian - were LCCC winners but were not able to complete their projects to the LCCC timetable

OPM collected evaluation data in the following ways:

- A review of interim findings from the parallel strands of the evaluation, such as a review of 'Findings from the engagement support'[3] and findings from a process evaluation on of the Application process (Unsuccessful applicants)[4];

- Eighteen visits to local projects teams;

- Gathered data on the measures and technologies installed by the local project teams and their activities to encourage behaviour change (in appendix 2 and 3); and

- Interviews with fourteen stakeholders, including members of the delivery team, steering group, DECC policymakers and other representatives from the community sector and the wider research community.

The Low Carbon Communities Challenge

The 22 projects selected for the LCCC were split into two phases of delivery. Phase 1 projects had to deliver their programme of capital measures by the end of March 2010 and phase 2 projects had to deliver their programme of capital measures by the end of March 2011. The LCCC projects demonstrate a diverse range of installations and activities, including energy generation; energy efficiency measures and activities such as food growing, car clubs, cycle parking, zero-carbon café. Projects were involved in a wide range of engagement activities to encourage behaviour change initiatives such as training sessions, community events, meetings and open days of buildings where installations were located.

A programme of co-inquiry and shared learning was undertaken by Dialogue by Design (DbyD) with every local project team. The co-inquiry process was intended to facilitate local discussions with a view to consensus building and practical actions and steps going forward in each community. This programme involved a series of engagement planning and review meetings. The LCCC programme also developed a specialist support team, offering advice and support from a number of national bodies to local project teams on energy-related matters, financial matters and community engagement. At national level, the LCCC programme provided a number of opportunities to share learning between and beyond local project teams including: a pilot of an online portal, four thematic policy workshops with DECC, involvement in national conferences and DECC 'customer closeness' visits to projects.

A steering group was in place to provide strategic overview and direction to the LCCC programme. This group had a broad and diverse membership including policymakers from DECC, the Welsh Assembly Government and the Northern Ireland Department for Enterprise, Trade and Investment, and Sciencewise-ERC, as well as stakeholder representatives of community organisations and research and grant-making communities. The delivery group for the LCCC consisted of the relevant DECC policy leads and a Dialogue and Engagement Specialist from Sciencewise-ERC, as well as the evaluation manager appointed to oversee the overall five strand evaluation programme.

---

[3] 'Findings from the engagement support' by Dialogue by Design is available here
[4] 'LCCC process evaluation, report 1: Application process (Unsuccessful applicants)' is available here

Evaluation of the national LCCC process

A number of aspects of the national LCCC process were identified as working well. Some local project teams welcomed the LCCC's hands off approach. They felt it allowed them to find their own solutions, and suggested the government trusted their ability and competence to deliver. The impact of the timescales on the projects' ability to deliver their projects was a key and frequently noted issue, however a couple of projects acknowledged the tight timescales might have helped them to meet their commitments. The engagement support and review meetings, provided by DbyD, were viewed as adding value to some local project teams' ideas about how to engage their communities or groups within it. Finally, the steering group was seen by its members as a forum to bring together people from different backgrounds from within and outside government, allowing cross-departmental and cross-sector learning.

The evaluation indicated several areas for improvement in the national LCCC process. Many local projects and stakeholders felt the timescales for the application and selection processes were unrealistic[5]. Anecdotal evidence from local project teams and stakeholders, and evidence from the evaluation of the unsuccessful applicants,[6] suggests that these tight timescales precluded less well-established groups from taking part. This was due to the amount of time it takes for groups to think through a new plan (as opposed to drawing on an existing idea) and the greater time needed to write bids by projects with less experience of applying for funding.

Some local projects felt they wanted more support and contact from DECC, particularly at challenging times, such as during the change of government in May 2010 and when there was confusion about the eligibility for feed in tariffs (FIT)[7]. Many local project teams felt the specialist support team didn't meet their needs and didn't provide them with the advice they required, such as legal advice. The engagement support was seen as being of limited value to some projects who felt they knew how to engage their communities. The timing of the engagement and review meetings was inconvenient for some projects - for example, being asked to complete engagement plans when engagement activities were underway. According to the delivery team, there was sometimes a lack of clarity amongst projects teams about how the co-inquiry process linked to the development of engagement plans and formal review meetings, especially given a focus on immediate pressures rather than the long term learning from the work.

Evaluation of the local LCCC process

A number of aspects of the LCCC delivery worked well for local projects. The LCCC successfully supported the design and delivery of numerous different approaches to community led delivery, enabling the programme to test what works in different types of communities.

The third sector led approximately one third of local project teams. A benefit of this model according to these types of projects was that they tended to be better resourced and had easier access to guidance on specific issues such as planning regulations. Community groups led another third of all projects. These projects felt they represented a 'truer' model of community led delivery and this model encouraged local ownership which would lead to longer-term behaviour change.

---

[5] Phase 1 projects had between September 2009 and November 2009 to submit their applications and phase 2 projects had between September 2009 and December 2009 to submit their applications
[6] Process evaluation: Application process (Unsuccessful applicants) http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/Project-files/2404-lccc-process-evaluation-report-1.pdf

[7] Whether projects were eligible to receive payments (feed in tariffs or FITs), from their low-carbon electricity generation when those generation measures had been funded through a government grant

Regardless of the model, however, projects felt they were trusted because of their local role and saw engagement and behaviour change as a central activity to their work. During the LCCC some of the project teams adopted a legal structure that would support the delivery of the LCCC and the sustainability of their projects in the longer term. Those who did set up a new organisation, chose one of the many forms of a mutual, as this was seen to direct strategy and 'bind' resource to the objectives the organisation was set up to pursue.

Project teams that were able to draw on existing resources found it easier to deal with the tight timescales. Strong partnerships, well-established community groups and already-discussed ideas for reducing the carbon emissions meant local projects could 'hit the ground running'. Whilst having at least some of the necessary skills, relationships and structures in place was seen as essential to successful implementation some stakeholders argued that this didn't mean similar projects could not work in other types of community. They felt the difficulties experienced by some project teams had not been intrinsic to communities but a function of the stringent requirements of the LCCC programme – particularly timescales and also the focus on outcomes and not development.

Whilst some projects were clear about the challenges of delivery, their ability to overcome them was related to their skills and experience of specific technologies and their existing resources. All local project teams described a steep learning curve and felt the LCCC had built their confidence and skills for future similar projects, which they were keen to be part of. Local projects were keen to use the skills and resources they had developed in the future. Many community groups had thought beyond the timescale of the grant funding and had made provision for investments to generate income and support further low carbon work in their communities.

The evaluation identified a number of areas for improvement from the local projects' experience of their LCCC activities. The considerable challenges faced by projects, combined with the scale and ambition of the LCCC, created a rich mix of change, uncertainty and opportunity. This was unprecedented for many of the projects who felt the LCCC was a steep learning curve. Some stakeholders felt that more support for projects at the outset was necessary and this would have helped projects to understand the commitment and responsibility required for success. In addition, projects and stakeholders would have appreciated more support throughout the LCCC, to deal with specific legal and technological issues, which some projects felt posed a risk to the completion of their projects. They felt that greater clarity and guidance from the outset on the parameters of the support and guidance available through the programme may have helped avoid problems later, particularly in terms of what help and support local projects could expect around the specific technological issues they faced and when there was confusion about the eligibility of FITs.

Evaluation of opportunities for dialogue and sharing learning
The LCCC programme provided a number of opportunities for dialogue and for wider sharing learning of beyond local projects. A number of aspects of these opportunities for dialogue and sharing learning were identified as working well. The Climate and Communities Action Alliance (CCAA) conference was felt to have provided valuable opportunities for projects to network, share learning with each other and feed learning into a wider group of stakeholders in the field. Specifically, the value of the CCAA was in bringing together projects and stakeholders in the community energy sector, enabling learning to be shared more widely. This was particularly true for projects that had chosen technologies installed by only a few other LCCC projects, giving them access to a wider spread of expertise and experience.

5

The four thematic policy workshops were seen by several projects as providing an opportunity to network around a specific issue, such as community scale renewables or fuel poor communities, and to share their learning. Opportunities which involved sharing learning with DECC policy makers, (such as the four thematic policy workshops and customer closeness visits) were highly regarded. Projects were keen to share the difference the LCCC had made on the ground, and to discuss issues which arose during the process with DECC policymakers.

Two main areas for improvement in opportunities for sharing learning were identified. The online portal, despite being requested by projects, was seen as OK rather than particularly positive or negative. According to local projects, the online portal was not used extensively and for this reason was not regarded as a valuable resource. A number of reasons for lack of participation in the online portal were cited including: participation being burdensome to some projects, whose advice and guidance was frequently sought because they were doing well, and an unappealing presentation and design. In addition, some projects were not convinced of the value of getting involved in any learning opportunities. A number of reasons for this were cited including that some project teams felt were too busy with their projects to attend events, and some felt they had little to learn as they were already well-informed and confident. Nonetheless there was strong support for the idea of learning opportunities post-programme, in order to capture and share experiences and reflections without the pressure of delivery.

Outcomes from the LCCC programme

Project teams were able to identify a number of outcomes arising for them from their participation in the LCCC. For many projects, the LCCC funding enabled them to realise their long term plans. Being approved as a LCCC project enhanced the credibility and legitimacy of the local project team within their communities and with external stakeholders. For some projects, the LCCC was seen as a catalyst that enabled their groups and communities to become more sustainable and self sufficient as they began to generate and recycle their resources – both the energy created and/ or the financial resource being directed back to the established community group or for reinvestment in the community. Whilst the exact mix of skills and knowledge within project teams differed at the outset, many felt they had been challenged by delivering their projects and felt they had learned a great deal.

All projects undertook engagement activities with their communities through the LCCC. From these activities, some feel they have engaged their communities in low carbon and sustainable living, reporting 'heightened awareness' and 'consciousness' of what low carbon living means in practice. Some projects reported that their LCCC work has provided their communities with an example of community led delivery in practice and inspired others to 'make a difference' in the local area. Projects evidence a number of new teams and activities forming as a result of the LCCC, e.g. a revived Parish Council, multiple residents' associations, a community cinema, a community orchard and a community shop. Greater opportunities for local participation and volunteering were reported by some projects to have created a sense of social cohesion in the local area, with some residents spoke of having a renewed sense of 'confidence', 'pride' and 'enthusiasm'.

Project teams feel they have begun a process of positive behaviour change which will continue for many years. Many sites are collecting their own evidence to evaluate behaviour change and many are working with academic partners, such as the University of Chester and the University of Nottingham, to monitor these outcomes. Early indications of impact are emerging: one project team reported that the local incomes recovery officer who pursues late rent payments hasn't visited any households in the area in the last six months. This is being attributed to tenants' fuel poverty being reduced and they are now able to pay their rent.

Amongst stakeholders there was a lack of consensus about the nature or extent of the outcomes from the LCCC for DECC policy and practice. Caution was based on a number of factors including: community initiatives being based across a number of policy areas, making causal relationships between any particular policy or project hard to determine and, the move towards commercially orientated approaches to low carbon and sustainable projects such as the Green Deal, making lessons from the LCCC less relevant (given their community focus and grant funded approach). Some stakeholders were able to identify evidence that DECC had embedded the community led model into its thinking, for example, around new policy initiatives such as the Local Energy Assessment Fund (LEAF). The LCCC has been credited with contributing to a 'buzz' and momentum around community-led delivery more generally.

Lessons for the future

Based on these evaluation findings, it has been possible to identify a number of lessons for future programmes, particularly those relating to community-led energy initiatives:

Lesson 1: Any future national programmes of this sort must carefully consider the timing and process at the start. Inappropriate application, planning and delivery timescales can prevent communities with fewer resources or skills from gaining access to such programmes. Advance notice of new funding streams should be identified and publicised well in advance of deadlines, to give a range of communities time to plan and apply.

Lesson 2: Support offered to communities needs to be tailored to their specific needs and developed with them in a collaborative manner.

Lesson 3: Government involvement in projects such as the LCCC can go beyond setting project requirements and deadlines and providing funds and also include more visits to local project teams and other longer term links that help them to understand the contexts in which policy is being delivered.

Lesson 4: Local project teams and steering group members were keen to continue their involvement in the LCCC to share learning.

Lesson 5: Government can build on the successes of and lessons from the LCCC to ensure that future local energy initiatives can be supported through partnerships with known and trusted community organisations with proven experience of working at a community level.

Lesson 6: National programmes have particular value in supporting community-led projects to deliver low carbon work, both for the local projects and in informing future national policy.

Lesson 7: Future national community-led programmes need to include explicit arrangements for the development and sharing of learning from the start, in order to maximise the potential for that learning to inform and influence future national government policy and practice.

Contents

Contents

1. Introduction

1.1 The Low Carbon Communities Challenge

The Low Carbon Communities Challenge (LCCC) was an initiative of the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). It provided financial and advisory support to 22 communities and aimed to test community-scale implementation of low carbon technologies alongside community engagement and behaviour change initiatives. The programme was also intended to help inform energy efficiency and low carbon generation policies.

The LCCC ran between 2009 and 2011 and was a £10 million capital fund programme involving 22 test-bed communities across England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Each community received a grant of up to £500,000. The programme was funded by DECC, the Department for Enterprise, Trade and Investment (Northern Ireland), the Welsh Assembly, and the Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (Sciencewise-ERC) [8]. Descriptions of the projects can be read in Appendix 1.

In October 2011 OPM was commissioned by DECC to conduct an independent evaluation of the processes, outputs and outcomes of the LCCC, this being one of the five evaluation strands (see 1.2). This involved a secondary review of the outputs from other strands of the LCCC evaluation as well as conducting new primary research with the LCCC projects and other relevant stakeholders. The findings of this work will feed into an overall programme level evaluation by DECC.

1.2 The overall evaluation of the LCCC

The LCCC was always intended to result in extensive learning from the experience of the programme, and a five-strand evaluation programme was designed to capture and disseminate the key elements of that learning. The five strands were:

- Strand 1, Energy Consumption Data & Carbon Saving Potential: This strand drew on official electricity and gas consumption statistics in each LCCC area, as well as calculating the theoretical carbon saving potential of all of the installed measures.

- Strand 2, The Householder Experience: There were two pieces of research with households: (a) two waves of household surveys in each LCCC area (pre and post intervention); and (b) a series of detailed, ethnographic case studies with individual households.

- Strand 3, The Community Practitioner Experience: Each project, up until the end of March 2011, was provided with an independent facilitator to hold local meetings with the local project team and their wider participants. These meetings provided the projects with a platform for reflection and local learning, as well as a means of feeding back their successes and challenges to DECC. This strand was co-funded by Sciencewise-ERC.

---

[8] The Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (Sciencewise-ERC) is funded by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and helps policy makers to understand and use public dialogue to inspire, inform and improve policy decisions around science and technology. See http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/

- Strand 4, Social Enterprise Action Research: This focussed on the LCCC projects that received support to set up as social enterprises, funded by the Office of Civil Society's Social Enterprise Action Research programme.

- Strand 5, Process and Outputs Evaluation: This strand was focused on process and the way in which the LCCC was run by DECC and its partners. This strand was also co-funded by Sciencewise-ERC.

1.3 This evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation, carried out by OPM, was to provide an independent, unbiased evaluation of the LCCC programme focusing on processes and outputs and what has been learned across the local project teams. It also reviewed some of the outcomes of the programme, primarily those for policy and practitioners and the self-reported qualitative impacts on projects.

The main **objectives** of this evaluation were four-fold:

3. **Process evaluation of the LCCC programme management**: which aspects of the management and administration of the LCCC worked well and less well to support local project teams to deliver their projects

4. **LCCC outputs delivered by each project in terms of:**

    - technology installed

    - engagement activities to encourage behaviour change

    - building organisational capacity and partnerships

    This evaluation objective has had two distinct elements:

    a. The first was a formal audit exercise (appended), capturing outputs from each LCCC community in respect of (a) the low carbon technologies and measures they have installed and (b) the engagement and behaviour change initiatives they have undertaken. Data on the former was collected by OPM and passed to the Energy Savings Trust (EST) which has used that data to calculate the total theoretical carbon savings from each LCCC project (as well as the LCCC as a whole).

    b. The second element was to capture the key learning from the projects' perspective, in terms of project outputs that worked well and didn't work well, and – with the benefit of hindsight and experience - what advice they would give to a project trying to do something similar.

3. **Outcomes**. The parallel evaluation in strand 2 has provided the main data for assessing the projects' impact in communities (through a centrally administered household survey in each area). This strand of evaluation was designed to complement strand 2 evaluation by exploring any additional outcome data that has been gathered ad hoc by the projects, as well as a more subjective assessment of what outcomes the projects think they have had

in their communities. It has also assessed the impact of the LCCC programme on DECC policy and practice.

4. **Future lessons** – consideration of the implications of the LCCC for future action learning and collaborative research programmes, especially in relation to community-led energy initiatives.

The evaluation was also tasked to consider, across each of the objectives above, whether the LCCC has delivered against its original objectives in the form of eight cross cutting 'big questions' (laid out in section 2.2 below).

This evaluation contributes to and builds on strands 3 and 5 of the five strand evaluation programme, combining them into a single piece of research. It will also inform the overarching report on the LCCC programme, to be published by DECC in summer 2012 which will cover all five strands of the evaluation.

The design and conduct of the evaluation was informed by the 'Requirements for Evaluating Sciencewise-ERC Projects'[9]. This involves embedding evaluation principles such as clarity of purpose, scope, approach and limits, proportionality of resources and depth of the research required to meet the evaluation objectives and transparency around approach and process.

Sciencewise-ERC is particularly interested in learning from the LCCC's public engagement and co-inquiry activities, which have been designed to enable learning locally as well as feeding into national policy development on community-led initiatives related to national policy involving science and technology.

1.4 Evaluation research

Data for this evaluation was collected in the following ways:

- A review of interim findings from the parallel strands of the evaluation, such as the review of findings from the engagement support[10] and findings from a process evaluation of the Application process (Unsuccessful applicants)[11].

- Visits to eighteen local project teams which had completed their installations, to conduct interviews with the project manager/ project management team. One local project team was not available for interview[12]. A complete list and descriptions of the projects can be found in Appendix 1, and a full list of project activities is in Appendices 2 and 3.

- OPM also designed an audit tool to collect data from local project teams on their technology outputs; data collected were passed to the Energy Saving Trust (EST) for them to calculate the theoretical carbon savings generated. The results from the use of the audit tools from 18 local project teams are in **Appendices 2 and 3**. These appendices detail **the measures and technologies installed by local project teams** and their **activities to encourage behaviour change**.

---

[9] http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/Project-files/SWP07-Requirements-for-Evaluation.pdf
[10] http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/Project-files/2403-lccc-findings-final-report-july-2011.pdf
[11] http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/Project-files/2404-lccc-process-evaluation-report-1.pdf
[12] West Oxford

- Telephone interviews with fourteen stakeholders including members of the delivery team, members of the steering group, DECC policymakers, representatives of the devolved administrations, of the community sector and of the wider research community (research council). **Topic guides for interviews** can be found in **Appendix 4**.

Visits to local project teams and interviews with stakeholders were conducted between November and December 2011.

1.5 Overview of this report

In this **introductory chapter**, we have described the **overall evaluation of the LCCC**, and the specific aims, objectives and approach to this part of the evaluation (on the process, outputs and outcomes of the LCCC). We have also provided an outline of how evaluation data was collected and from whom.

The **second chapter describes the LCCC programme** in detail. We describe the context, objectives, processes and structure for the LCCC programme. We briefly describe the types of communities in the LCCC as well the activities which the local project teams were involved in.

The **third chapter**, on **process**, describes what worked well and what could have been improved about aspects of the process including the support offered to local project teams, the timescales of the project and the role of the steering group.

In **chapter four**, we consider what worked well and less well in terms of the various **learning opportunities** offered to the local project teams, including events and online support.

Chapter five looks at the **delivery** of the LCCC, identifying the strengths and the areas for improvement, including the different organisational models used to deliver the LCCC, specific challenges during delivery, sustainability of the projects and working relationships with DECC.

Chapter six considers the **outcomes** from the LCCC, including outputs delivered, the difference being part of the LCCC made to local project groups teams and communities and the impact on DECC. Please note, however this report does not look at quantifiable data on impacts, but rather subjective perspectives from interviewees on the impacts achieved.

The final chapter, **chapter seven**, sets out our **conclusions** from the evaluation and **learning** for future programmes - particularly those relating to community-led energy initiatives.

A note on terminology
This report refers to the Department of Energy and Climate Change as DECC. The LCCC pilot communities are referred to as 'projects' or 'local project teams'. The 'delivery group' refers to the DECC team leading the delivery at central government level. 'Stakeholders' are referred to by their specific stakeholder role, e.g. policy maker, specialist support team or representative from community organisations. Dialogue by Design, appointed by DECC to undertake a programme of co-inquiry and shared learning with each local project team, are referred to as DbyD.

2. The Low Carbon Communities Challenge

2.1 The Low Carbon Communities Challenge

The Low Carbon Communities Challenge (LCCC) was an initiative of the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC). It provided financial and advisory support to 22 communities and aimed to test community-scale implementation of low carbon technologies alongside community engagement and behaviour change initiatives. The programme was also intended to help inform DECC's energy efficiency and low carbon generation policies.

The LCCC ran between 2009 and 2011 and was a £10 million capital fund programme involving 22 test-bed communities across England, Wales and Northern Ireland. Each community received a financial award of up to £500,000. The programme was funded by DECC, the Department for Enterprise, Trade and Investment (Northern Ireland), the Welsh Assembly, and the Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (Sciencewise-ERC) [13].

The LCCC arose from a number of strands of government policy including Zero Carbon Homes, EcoTowns, the adoption of the Climate Change Act, and impending changes to CERT (the Carbon Emissions Reduction Target). The design of the programme had its origins in the DECC-led Big Energy Shift public dialogue project[14], which suggested that households could benefit significantly from joined-up 'packages' of support, delivered locally in the community, to help them reduce home energy consumption and make deep cuts in their carbon emissions. Such packages were expected to include, for example, smart meters, home energy audits, access to local demonstration homes, leadership from local schools and businesses and public bodies. These packages were also expected to include more hands-on support in navigating advice and determining which energy efficiency measures and renewable technologies were right for them.

The Government believed that this type of integrated approach, involving low carbon technologies alongside community-level behaviour change, had a critical role to play. The LCCC was therefore intended to both *test different delivery packages* and to *capture the learning from this*.

2.2 Aims and objectives

The LCCC's aims and objectives were reflected in eight cross-cutting 'big questions' identified by DECC for the programme, which were:

1. Does community-led delivery drive a broad uptake of low carbon technologies and lifestyles?

---

[13] The Sciencewise Expert Resource Centre (Sciencwise-ERC) is funded by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) and helps policy makers to understand and use public dialogue to inspire, inform and improve policy decisions around science and technology. See http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/
[14] See http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/the-big-energy-shift/

2. Does a community focus change people's attitudes and beliefs in relation to larger energy solutions (e.g. acceptability of wind farms?)

3. Are community-led solutions scalable and replicable and, if so, what are the key components for any blueprint?

4. Do they enable joined up and integrated deployment of government's policies and programmes and, if so, what does this mean for government's approach to the low carbon delivery landscape?

5. How can community-led delivery be supported and sustained? What finance mechanisms, governance structures, community involvement, and ownership models work?

6. What are the wider environmental, social and economic impacts of community-led delivery?

7. What are the implications of the LCCC to the way national government designs and delivers programmes related to local action and the community sector?

8. Did the LCCC as a programme create a buzz or stimulate delivery beyond the LCCC (either in terms of influencing other communities or encouraging momentum and activities in the community post-LCCC)?

2.3 Process

Selection of projects

The invitation for applications for the Low Carbon Communities Challenge was published on the DECC website and widely promoted through community networks, such as the Low Carbon Communities Network, Transition Towns and EST's Green Communities membership. The LCCC was open to applications from local authorities/councils, local strategic partnerships or third sector organisations, applying on behalf of a community in England, Wales or Northern Ireland.

Applicants to the LCCC were required to submit an application form and these were assessed by members of the LCCC steering group (LCCC governance arrangements are described below).

Applications were assessed the following themes:

- Overall ability to deliver community-wide plans for the area and meet the objectives of the Challenge
- Delivering integrated approaches
- Build on and bring together learning, skills and resources
- Recognise communities as places
- Foster community leadership, involvement and partnerships
- Willingness to learn and capacity to quantify impacts
- Be replicable
- Be equitable and sustainable

19

Those applicants who received top scores were visited by BRE (DECC's contractor) who provided an onsite assessment.

As described below, the LCCC application process was split into two phases.

Timescales

The overall timescale of the programme was as follows:

- The invitation for applications was published on the 28th September 2009.

- Applicants to **Phase 1** were required to submit an application form by 27th November 2009. These were assessed by the LCCC steering group between 2nd and 7th December. DECC received 56 applications, of which the top 14 scoring applicants were visited by the consultancy BRE who, on behalf of DECC, provided an onsite assessment. Ten successful projects were announced on 21 December 2009. Phase 1 applicants were required to deliver their measures by March 2010.

- Applicants to **Phase 2** were required to submit a completed application form by the 30th December 2009. These were assessed by the LCCC steering group between 8th and 11th January. DECC received 239 applications, of which BRE visited the top 14 for an onsite assessment. Twelve successful projects were announced on 4 February 2010. Phase 2 applicants were required to deliver their measures between April 2010 and March 2011.

Financial grants

Average awards were in the region of £400,000 to £500,000 per project, although this varied depending on the nature of the project. Most of the projects had also secured match funding through other sources, including NESTA's *Big Green Challenge* or the London *Low Carbon Zones*. Ninety percent of the LCCC funding received by each successful applicant was allocated to capital measures, with the remaining 10% allocated to other costs including project management and engagement and behaviour change activities.

Governance

The steering group for the LCCC programme had a broad and diverse membership including policymakers from DECC, the Welsh Assembly Government and the Northern Ireland Department for Enterprise, Trade and Investment, and Sciencewise-ERC, as well as stakeholder representatives of community organisations and research and grant-making communities.

The delivery group for the LCCC consisted of the relevant DECC policy leads and a Dialogue and Engagement Specialist from Sciencewise-ERC, as well as the evaluation manager appointed to oversee all five of the evaluation strands (see section 1.2).

2.4 The LCCC projects

The range of measures and activities implemented by local project teams, and the organisational structures they used, were diverse. However, four characteristics are common to all projects:

- The projects are geographically targeted, **area-based** initiatives

- They involve **integrated packages** that provide a more joined up offering to householders

- They are testing **different models of community-scale delivery**, from projects which are led by community groups through to other projects which involve existing agencies (e.g. local authorities, energy utilities) delivering their services in a geographically-targeted way

- The approaches draw upon **sociological models of behaviour** that emphasise the potential for social norms to nudge and trigger widespread, community-wide behaviour change.

Types of projects

The projects which took part in the LCCC are diverse in terms of location, demographics, housing stock and awareness and attitudes towards low carbon living. There was a range of rural, urban and semi-rural communities encompassed within the programme. Some of the projects already had experience of low carbon initiatives (for example the Transition Towns movement or as an 'eco-town'), and had already been working together for a number of years, while others were newer to the process of applying for funding and delivering a community or energy project. Some groups used the LCCC funds to further and complement their existing projects and aspirations; other groups saw the grant as an opportunity to develop entirely new projects.

Organisational models

The LCCC local project teams represent a diversity of organisational models, in part related to how long they have been in existence as a group prior to the LCCC. Approximately less than a third of projects formed a new partnership to deliver the LCCC. Some were led by groups of residents, while others were led or worked in partnership with the local authority, a third sector organisation, or another public body. Further detail on the different models is presented in section 4.2.

Range of technologies installed and other activities

The LCCC projects demonstrate a diverse range of installations and activities, including but not limited to: energy generation (solar PV panels, wind turbines, air source heat pumps); energy efficiency measures (electric vehicles, insulation, energy saving light bulbs); other activities (food growing, car clubs, cycle parking, zero-carbon café); and engagement to raise awareness through schools and other community hubs. Installations were located on domestic (private and social) and non-domestic buildings.

Engagement and behaviour change activities

The LCCC projects were involved in a wide range of engagement and behaviour change initiatives and these are summarised here. Engagement and behaviour change activities

21

included: training sessions to residents or 'community champions' about renewable energy generation, school energy lessons and training for teachers about climate change; open days of buildings with low carbon technologies or measures installed; door knocking, leafleting and posters; community events, fairs, plays and festivals to raise awareness or celebrate local achievements. Activities also included: local project teams' visits to homes where low carbon technologies or measures had been installed to give energy and water saving advice residents on correct usage; community meetings or workshops to discuss plans for the installation of low carbon technologies; and, business, home or community building energy audits.

A complete list and full details of the projects can be found in Appendix 1, and the measures and technologies installed by projects, and their activities to encourage behaviour change, are in Appendices 2 and 3.

2.5 Co-inquiry and sharing learning

Dialogue by Design (DbyD) was appointed by DECC to undertake a programme of co-inquiry and shared learning with the 22 LCCC projects. The co-inquiry process was intended to facilitate local discussions with a view to consensus building on practical actions and steps going forward in each community, and to develop a better understanding of the specific barriers, opportunities, decision making and delivery processes experienced on the ground. It was expected that this strand of work would contribute to direct engagement between policy makers, delivery partners and the local communities.

A programme of engagement planning and review meetings was established, to provide support to local communities in extending engagement alongside opportunities to share learning at national level. The programme was delivered through a team of 14 facilitators each of whom was appointed to one or two LCCC project groups. Their key activities were to provide engagement and review support to the local project teams, and to support some of the events listed later in this section. A summary of the key elements of these activities is provided below.

Co-inquiry
Engagement support

Facilitators helped projects organise and deliver their engagement with the wider community, a crucial aspect given the LCCC's twin focus on low carbon measures alongside behaviour change. It was understood that each community would have different engagement needs so facilitators worked with groups to review needs and local interests to create a bespoke engagement plan in the early stages of every project, followed by ongoing liaison between the group and the facilitator. The engagement plan determined the resources needed for the community engagement and the support the facilitator would need to provide.

The facilitators also offered other support including training local groups to run wider meetings, facilitating development meetings with a range of stakeholders, and providing advice (including on where to get further support). Defra provided an additional fund of £100,000 to the LCCC programme to support community engagement activities. The fund was managed by DbyD alongside the delivery of engagement support. Funding of up to £4,500 per community was provided for engagement activities on submission of an application supported by an agreed engagement plan.

Review meetings

Facilitators also organised review meetings in every LCCC project, to share learning from the experience of delivering the project, to address the objective of gaining a better understanding of the barriers, opportunities, decision making and delivery processes on the ground. A pilot meeting was held in one project in June 2010 and the programme for these events was then refined and used with all remaining projects.

Phase 1 projects had their first review meetings between September and November 2010, and around half of them had a second review meeting in early 2011. Phase 2 projects had only one review meeting each, which took place between November 2010 and January 2011. As the LCCC progressed, it became apparent that a single review meeting would be sufficient for many of the groups. Depending on the progress made in the projects, the meetings focussed on the experiences of the core project team, or of both the project team plus other community members who had participated in the project, such as residents with renewable technologies installed in their homes.

Co-inquiry

The engagement planning and review meetings provided opportunities for the core project teams, sometimes with wider groups of stakeholders and residents, to reflect on their needs and aspirations, and to develop their plans and review activities together. These activities were developed to varying degrees in different projects.

Analysis and reporting

Information gathered by facilitators at the various meetings was written up and shared online within the project, and then collated, analysed and reported in the final report by DbyD in July 2011[15]. This final reporting also drew on data recorded and submitted by local project teams in writing and through video footage using cameras (and briefing) provided by the LCCC programme. Some projects took advantage of this opportunity and their footage is available on their websites.

Sharing learning

At national level, a number of opportunities were developed and delivered to encourage and enable local projects to share learning amongst themselves, and to contribute their learning to wider groups of stakeholders and to DECC policy makers. These included the following activities:

Launch event

The launch event in February 2010 was attended by members of all 22 LCCC local projects. The event included initial meetings between the groups and their facilitators. It was also attended by experts and advisers who introduced the advice and guidance they could offer over the course of the LCCC programme.

---

[15] http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/Project-files/2403-lccc-findings-final-report-july-2011.pdf

The householder experience

GfK NOP conducted two waves of household survey in each LCCC area, before and after the LCCC. The results of these surveys were provided to all projects (at baseline and follow up) to help them understand their local communities in terms of their concern about climate change, fuel poverty and attitudes towards low carbon technologies.

Online portal

An online portal was piloted over several months early in 2011 to enable local project groups to access information and share learning. Resources included webinars on different topics.

Communities and Climate Action Alliance

The LCCC project teams participated in the Communities and Climate Action Alliance (CCAA) national conference in London on 16-17 January 2011. The conference was part-funded by the LCCC to support wider sharing of experience and learning from the programme. The CCAA event attracted stakeholders from a wide range of national and local organisations to discuss the role for community action in tackling climate change and creating a low carbon society. The majority of the LCCC project teams attended, and the event included a private networking event specifically for the LCCC teams.

Four thematic policy workshops

Four thematic policy workshops were held early in 2011. These workshops brought together individuals from relevant LCCC local project teams and national policy makers from DECC to discuss each of the four themes, drawing on local experience. Reports were produced from each workshop, summarising attendance and the key issues raised. Individuals were provided with payments to reflect their contribution. The workshops were, in summary:

- 4 February 2011, Bristol. Community scale renewables. Attendance: 8 representatives from 7 local project teams, 2 DECC policy makers and 2 facilitators.

- 1 March 2011, Nottingham. Marginalised and fuel poor communities. Attendance: 4 representatives from local project teams, 3 DECC policy makers and 2 facilitators.

- 8 March 2011, London. Domestic energy efficiency. Attendance: 3 representatives from local project teams, 5 DECC policy makers and 3 facilitators.

- 8 March 2011, London. Domestic microgeneration. Attendance: 5 representatives from local project teams, 4 DECC policy makers and 3 facilitators.

Customer closeness visits and visits from DECC LCCC team

'Customer closeness' visits were made to two local project teams during December 2011 by DECC policy staff (more visits are planned in the future). During these visits DECC employees, from a range of directorates, visited low carbon installations and spoke to local people about their experiences of living and working with low carbon measures. Local project teams were

provided with payments to cover their time for preparation, presentations and support during the visits.

In addition to the customer closeness visits, staff from the DECC LCCC team visited some of the local project teams during the course of the LCCC project.

2.6 Specialist support team

A package of other types of advice was also offered to projects via a specialist support team. DECC engaged a number of organisations to provide this advice. They included organisations offering support and advice on energy-related matters, financial matters, and community engagement, such as the Energy Saving Trust (EST), Environment Agency and Carbon Leapfrog.

At the launch event, there were stands staffed by the different organisations making up the specialist support team, and DECC introduced them as a resource to help local project teams. The local project teams could choose whether or not to make use of this support, and did not have to pay for it. DECC could broker introductions between local project teams and specialist support providers if necessary.

3. Evaluation of the national LCCC process

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we discuss what worked well and less well about the LCCC process nationally, focusing on the support provided by DECC and others (see sections 2.5 and 2.6 for details); the role of the steering group; local project selection and project timescales. We draw on evidence from interviews and visits to local project teams and interviews with stakeholders and delivery team members.

3.2 What worked well?

Local project teams and stakeholders described a number of aspects of the process of the LCCC which worked well:

- The flexibility local project teams were allowed to deliver their projects and shape their own solutions

- The minimal bureaucracy involved in the LCCC, particularly when accessing funds

- The focus on deadlines which ensured action

- The added value of the engagement support

- The multi-agency representation at the steering group meetings

These points are explored in more detail below.

Hands off approach

The level of support and guidance required from the LCCC programme differed between the local project teams. A few local project teams welcomed the LCCC's hands off approach as it aligned with the 'bottom up' ethos of the LCCC. It allowed local project teams to find their own solutions and suggested that government trusted their ability and competence to deliver. This approach was also seen by several of the local project teams as necessary given the short delivery timescales. Local project teams did not equate this approach with an absence of support, however: these project teams felt that the LCCC programme was there if needed. These views echo the view of one delivery team member about the approach to support services, i.e. that the level given depended on what individual projects needed.

Those local project teams which were happy with the hands off approach also appeared to be most comfortable about delivering their projects and had - or could access - additional support and skills if needed.

Both local project teams and delivery team members were aware that the LCCC programme's ability and capacity for contact with the local project teams was affected by a number of factors.

These included the LCCC project timescales, the 2010 General Election and change of government and the issues over eligibility for Feed In Tariffs (FITs)[16].

> *"We have a team of people who understand that kind of thing and who have worked with government people and are familiar with the process. We could have felt like we didn't have support, but probably there was support there which we didn't have to access."* (Local project team)

However, and as covered in 3.3, other projects considered the 'hands off' approach by the LCCC programme to equate to a lack of support.

Minimal bureaucracy

Many of the local project teams felt that both the claims procedures for money and the administration involved in the LCCC were un-bureaucratic. Again, this was appreciated given the timeframe within which local project teams had to deliver their projects.

One of the local project teams, led by a combination of existing agencies, made the point that the way the claims procedures worked in the LCCC suited the extent to which local project teams could access money:

> *"In terms of claims procedures, that went quite smoothly. They gave us funds upfront which was good because we don't have access to a lot of money, and you have to spend large amounts of money."* (Local project team)

Deadlines ensured action and high profile project

The impact of tight timescales on local project teams' ability to deliver their projects was a key and frequently noted issue, with phase one and two project teams alike commenting negatively on this (these impacts are explained in more detail in Chapter 4). However, a couple of the projects felt that the tight deadlines might have helped projects to meet their commitments and deliver a range of impacts.

> *"In one sense funnily enough the crazy deadline actually was quite a good thing as it focused minds and meant things could not drift and without that certain things could have drifted on and on but people knew that that was the deadline when it has to be done."* (Local project team)

Added value of the engagement support

Two types of local meetings were held with local project teams as part of the LCCC process (see 2.5 for details): engagement planning meetings (aimed at helping local project teams to shape their ideas about how to engage their wider communities) and review meetings (aimed at sharing the community groups' experiences and learning).

---

[16] The issue over eligibility of FITs was about whether local project teams were eligible to receive feed in tariffs from their low carbon electricity generation, because the measures which were generating low carbon electricity had been funded through a grant from government. It is generally not possible, under EU law on state aids, for a generator to benefit from both FITs and a grant from a public body except in specific circumstances.

The evaluation suggests that views were mixed about the usefulness of these and views about what worked well in engagement support are discussed here.

Engagement meetings

Many of the local project teams felt that the support on engagement planning added value to their ideas of how to engage their communities generally or specific groups within it. Some of the local project groups felt the added value was in engaging groups they had not considered engaging with or who were considered difficult to engage with. One local project team, with a long history of community engagement used the engagement support to reach young teenagers, who had previously been difficult to engage with. Another local project team stated that the engagement support helped engagement with residents who were difficult to engage with because of past experiences, in which they had been promised things which had not materialised.

> *"They were entirely bored and relaxed (by the announcement of plans for the LCCC) because they didn't think that anything was going to happen, because of past experience." (Local project team)*

A positive appraisal of the engagement planning support also came from a few local project teams who stated they were initially sceptical that the engagement support would add value.

A couple of local project teams felt that the engagement support was useful in the context of the tight timescales for installing kit, ensuring that they retained their focus on engagement rather than allowing it to slide under the pressure of other priorities:

> *"The DbyD support was very valuable; the person did it very well. DbyD helped with an engagement plan, they kept us focused, keeping meetings organised and focused, and were a real facilitator."* (Local project team)

Review meetings

A few local project teams were positive about the value of the review meetings, particularly as a way to gather feedback from members of the community and to think about what next.

> *"The second review was better and I think it did generate some interesting ideas. We took more control of it. It was much more focused on getting feedback from the households that had been involved and also getting ideas on how we could do more engagement and get more people involved in the project." (Local project team)*

Multi-agency representation in the steering group

The steering group was seen by its members and stakeholders as a forum in which to bring together people from different backgrounds from within and outside government, allowing cross-departmental and cross-sector learning. Convening the group was also seen as a 'brave move' by DECC.

> *"DECC had taken some risks by bringing multi sectoral people around the table – there was good representation from community organisations. This was very helpful – helping civil servants understand their perspectives and vice versa." (Stakeholder, representative of community organisations)*

3.3 What could be improved?

The current evaluation indicated several areas for improvement in the process of the LCCC including:

- The timescales, including time for DECC to plan the LCCC, for local project teams to plan and apply for the LCCC and for DECC to assess and select the applications

- The level of support and contact from the LCCC programme

- The role of the steering group

- The flexibility of the support offered to local project teams

These points are explored in turn below.

Timescales

Many local project teams and steering group members felt that the timescales for the application process and the selection process were unrealistic and had contributed to difficulties at later points in the process. Whilst timescales for phase 1 projects had been tight from the outset[17], timescales for phase 2 projects should have been more generous[18] . However, in May 2010 there was a General Election and a change of administration. Because of purdah around the General Election (i.e. no new policy announcements were made), and a spending review under the new government, there were delays in sending out grant letters for phase 2 local project teams. This meant these local project teams received their grants later than expected.

Time for local project teams to prepare applications

Many local project teams felt that the timescales for applying for the LCCC were unrealistic - particularly due to the large amount of money they were applying for and so the amount of time they needed to think through and plan their bids.

The majority of local project teams and stakeholders agreed that participation in the LCCC was only achievable for well-established community groups or those partnering with a bigger organisation. Amongst the stakeholders, a couple of the representatives from community organisations were of the view that this was in part due to the limited timescales local project teams had to plan and prepare their bids, which precluded less-established groups from taking part.

Evidence from the evaluation of the unsuccessful applicants[19] supports the view that the tight timetable was problematic and, though community groups had been keen to apply, they felt at a disadvantage because they lacked the necessary time and expertise. Reasons given for the

---

[17] Phase 1 projects had between September 2009 and November 2009 to submit applications and were required to deliver their measures between the end of December 2009 and the end of March 2010
[18] Phase 2 projects had between September 2009 and end of December 2009 to submit applications and were required to deliver their measures between April 2010 and March 2011
[19] Process evaluation: Application process (Unsuccessful applicants) http://www.sciencewise-erc.org.uk/cms/assets/Uploads/Project-files/2404-lccc-process-evaluation-report-1.pdf

tight timetable being problematic included: the time it took to put together a brand new project (rather than building on an existing one); the time it took to understand and complete the lengthy application form, particularly for respondents from community groups who did not have a lot of experience of applying for funding; and, some respondents were volunteers and were preparing the application in their free time. Third sector organisations in particular felt short of time and there were requests for the timetable to be extended in future programmes.

Several stakeholders in this evaluation felt that, if government wants participation from communities that are less well-established and developed, these communities needed to be supported to apply for, as well as deliver, projects.

> *"The communities that were the most organised and could apply for it in time got the most benefit." (Representative of community organisations)*

Time for assessment and selection

The timescales for assessing applications were also seen as unrealistic by some of the steering group members who were involved in this process. These tight timescales meant there was a lack of time to consider each bid, what could be delivered and also think about the support these local project teams might need.

Role of steering group

Whilst the steering group was seen as a useful forum, some of its members, including both delivery team and stakeholders, suggested it could have been more effective at shaping and steering the project.

A few members of the group felt that whilst they were representing non-governmental perspectives their opportunity to contribute these effectively to the group was limited. Particular issues cited included lack of opportunity for non-DECC steering group members to chair meetings or shape agendas; some action points or observations not being recorded; some points raised not being listened to and insufficient clarity about the role they were being asked to play. For example, whilst the mix of people on the group was seen as good, members from community organisations were unclear as to whether they were contributing as representatives of the community or as experts bringing a community perspective to the discussions. Some interviewees suggested that the ability of the group to shape the project was limited because the project parameters were already established before the setting up of the steering group:

> *"Felt chaotic and a bit confused. Not to say it didn't produce anything but smacking of: we have to spend this money and we have to get this out. Intention has been very honourable all the way through but lacking the 'stop, take a breath.'" (Steering group member)*

This finding highlights the importance of clear Terms of Reference in a steering group, so all members have a consistent understanding of the scope of a group as well as their individual roles and contributions.

Clarity of the brief and scope

Some delivery team members and stakeholders felt that the brief to local project teams and scope of the LCCC was lacking in clarity and focus and this has impacted on the extent to which lessons can be learnt from the LCCC.

Some interviewees felt there was a mismatch between the local project teams which were selected and the evidence being called for in the evaluation, which meant that opportunities for useful learning were less than they might have been. One of the aims of the LCCC was to '*to test packages of interventions'* (as discussed in section 2.4) and there was a view within the delivery team this could not be tested. This was because the specific local project teams which had been selected to take part were not all delivering packages of interventions. This could have been improved by making this aim clearer in the brief which invited projects to take part in the LCCC.

The scope of the programme was also felt to be very wide. Several stakeholders commented on the breadth and range of projects in the LCCC and some felt that this diversity would limit learning on the replicability of projects. Some felt too that the community groups involved in the LCCC were well developed in terms of their skills, confidence and experience and that this did not reflect the national picture: this too was seen as limiting the learning from the programme.

> *"The breadth of the LCCC was staggering in terms of inputs, outputs, and outcomes, i.e. transport, waste, electricity and behaviour change. I think more focus on specific programmes would allow you to get more replicability out of it." (Stakeholder, policy maker)*

More support and contact from the LCCC programme

We noted earlier that some local project teams appreciated the LCCC's 'hands off approach'. Those who did not, felt that more contact and support at challenging times, in particular, would have been useful. For example, during the change of government and confusion over eligibility for FITs. Some stakeholders also felt that more support from the programme would have been helpful in the early stages of the project, during the application process and on specific issues such as planning permission. Stakeholders felt that this would be of particular value in helping less well established groups to participate in the LCCC.

Flexibility around other support

Specialist support team

Local project teams made two specific comments about the specialist support offered. First, the advice provided by the specialist support team was not always the advice that local project teams needed. For example, several local project teams stated they already had relationships with organisations in the specialist support team (so the specialist support team didn't add anything new) and local project teams needed support on matters that were not covered by the specialist support team, such as legal advice. Second, that DECC (and other government departments) had made assumptions about the support needed by communities and adopted a 'one size fits all approach'. The one size fits all approach was seen as inappropriate for the LCCC as it did not take into account the different stages of development of the local project teams and the different types of support required. This latter point was particularly echoed by a policy maker stakeholder, who felt strongly that there needed to be greater understanding of the developmental stages of communities, and tailored support which was designed to move communities through developmental stages.

In terms of the type of help and advice they would have preferred, local project teams identified the following: more technical expertise and advice and information on renewable energy generation and advice and support on legal issues.

31

Engagement planning meetings and review meetings

The engagement support offered was seen as limited in value by some local project teams, for a number of reasons. Some felt they knew already how to engage their communities; they wanted the flexibility to choose their own support, given the skills already contained within the group or community; and for some, the timing of meetings was not convenient. For example, some local project teams could not determine the timing of their own sessions and were being asked to take part in engagement planning meetings when their engagement plans were already complete or to take part in review meetings before they had finished installing technology.

> *"We were required to have certain sessions at certain times, to tick boxes, rather than having support when we needed it." (Local project team)*

The co-inquiry approach to supporting dialogue within communities, and between communities, other stakeholders and national policy makers, was not implemented entirely in the ways originally envisaged when the LCCC programme was designed. The short timescales for completing the installation of often very new technologies put pressure on the local teams to make those physical development activities their priority. In addition, according to members of the delivery team, there was a lack of clarity amongst local project teams, about how the co-inquiry process of distributed dialogue linked to the development of engagement plans and formal review meetings and this led to a focus on immediate pressures rather than the long term learning from the work.

The LCCC evaluation

There was a large appetite for learning from the LCCC amongst local project teams, stakeholders and delivery team members, though some local project teams had concerns about the evaluation activities. These related to the clarity of the purpose of some evaluation activities, which aspects of projects were being evaluated and the timing of activities, so that some evaluation activities were taking place too early to evaluate behaviour change or were too sporadic so that important learning was missed.

For many local project teams, however, views towards the evaluation were more neutral than the views above. A few local project teams described the process as 'fine', 'thorough', and 'not too onerous', and for many local project teams, OPM's contact with them was seen as the first evaluation activity they had taken part in.

Energy data

For a few of the local project teams who recalled receiving their energy statistics, these were described as helpful. A couple of local project teams couldn't recall receiving the energy statistics and felt these would be helpful to them.

Gfk NOP Household survey

A few local project teams appreciated the value of collecting baseline and follow up attitudinal data. However, several felt it was not clear who was carrying out the household survey and when, or how the different elements of the evaluation worked together. As the quote below demonstrates, local project teams wanted a more joined up approach to the evaluation, although the delivery team note that all projects were alerted about the follow up survey

"I think they have been back to do the second interviewing (for the household survey) but we don't know because no one ever tells us, it is frustrating because people say to us 'who is that knocking on my door'. It's helpful for us to know because otherwise we look a bit wrong footed".
(LCCC local project team)

4. Evaluation of the local LCCC process

4.1. Introduction

The range of measures and activities implemented, and the organisational models used to deliver the LCCC local projects, was diverse. In this chapter we describe what worked well and less well in the local project activities of the LCCC. We consider: the different models of community led delivery; trust and behaviour change activities; delivery challenges; timescales and sustainability. We draw on site visits to local project teams and interviews with stakeholders and delivery team members.

A summary of action on the ground is given in section 2.4, with descriptions of all the projects in Appendix 1, and details of measures and technologies installed and activities to encourage behaviour change in Appendices 2 and 3.

4.2. What worked well?

This evaluation identified a number of aspects of delivering the LCCC which worked well for the local project teams, including:

- Flexibility to use different models of community led delivery

- Trust, engagement and behaviour change activities

- Sustainability of local projects

- Building on existing resources and plans

- How local project teams met the challenges in the LCCC

- Experience of the LCCC generated invaluable learning

Flexibility to use different models of community-led delivery
The LCCC projects conform to no single shape or structure and instead represent a diversity of organisational models. This evaluation explored local project teams' organisational models in detail, as well as the strengths and weaknesses which seem to be associated with different delivery models. The range of organisational models used to deliver the projects shows that the LCCC programme has successfully supported the design and delivery of numerous different approaches to community led delivery. It has also successfully enabled valuable activities in very different communities of different sizes, with varying levels of deprivation and in rural and urban settings, as well as using a range of technologies.

A range of organisations was involved in the local projects, including local authorities, third sector organisations, non-government organisations (NGOs), social enterprises, community groups (community/resident-led), contractors, charities and utility companies. 'Third sector led'

projects were defined as projects led by a non-profit, non-governmental or social enterprise, with one or more paid members of staff. 'Community-led' projects were defined as projects led by volunteers from the community. Some examples of the organisations involved are:

- Kirklees council (local authority)

- Sustainable Blacon (third sector)

- Reepham (community group)

The involvement in the LCCC projects of these organisations varied: some projects were led by community groups, third sector organisations or local authorities; others were partnerships between community groups, third sector organisations and public bodies, such as housing associations and district or parish councils. In each case, there was a core group of one or more people from within these organisations leading the project. Examples of partnerships include:

- Isle of Wight LCCC - a partnership between a Chale parish district council, the Ellen Macarthur foundation and Southern Housing

- Lancaster LCCC - a partnership between Local & Effective Sustainable Solutions (a social enterprise), Lancaster Co-housing and Halton Community Association (third sector organisation).

A full list and description of the LCCC projects is in Appendix 1.

Local authority and third-sector led projects

Approximately one third of local project teams were third sector led, with fewer (four) led by a local authority. According to these types of projects, a benefit of these models was that they tended to be well resourced and able to draw on a large range of skills. Links with these organisations also added to the credibility of a project and provided access to guidance on specific issues such as planning regulations. One third-sector organisation leading the LCCC in a deprived community felt they were able to play an 'enabling role', bridging the gap between the LCCC project and the wider community.

> *"See ourselves as enablers – interface of the delivery of programme and what the community wanted out of it. We were in the middle making it happen. In more deprived communities need an organisation like us". (Local project team)*

Whilst it is not possible from the evaluation research to come to firm conclusions about the feasibility or likely success of the LCCC in any particular deprived area, it does seem that links with local authorities or existing third sector organisations contribute to their success: the previous experience of these organisations of delivering similar projects brought a range of expertise with it, including in risk assessment and management. All projects in deprived communities were led by a local authority, third sector organisation or a combination or these. In contrast, two of the LCCC projects not in predominantly deprived areas described an already existing range of skills and expertise within their community group, which enabled them to deliver the project themselves.

Community-led projects

About one-third of the local project teams were led by community groups: some of these felt that this represented a 'truer' model of community-led delivery, as they were working at a micro level.

Projects led by local community groups felt their model had a range of benefits. They encouraged local ownership of the LCCC, which was important for the legacy of projects. They were also expected to help enable longer term behaviour change, because people in the local area were more likely to carry on talking about and being interested in this work beyond the funding. A couple of community groups pointed to a number of off-shoot activities and enterprises which had already formed as a result of their work, as local people had become 'inspired' by others' achievements (this is discussed further in the following chapter on Impacts). One community group felt their deep local knowledge allowed them to be innovative and respond to communities' needs or concerns. Having leadership embedded in the community was seen as facilitating effective engagement and support for the LCCC activities.

Despite the clearly recognised benefits of a 'community led' model, all of the groups working on such a model saw the value of working with, or making links to, local authorities to help deliver their projects when necessary. For example, one community group reported to a steering group including parish councillors. This was felt to give the project a democratic mandate, and hence accountability to and credibility amongst local people.

> *"Community-led is at the microscopic level – when I have talked to Hook Norton and Low Carbon West Oxford it feels like they are on the same wavelength – with others it feels like the regeneration officers from the local authority department and these are people that are leading a project in a community, not from it." (Local project team)*

Organisational models

During the LCCC, some of the local project teams adopted a legal structure that would support delivery of the LCCC and the sustainability of their projects in the longer term. Those who did create a new organisations chose one of the many forms of mutual[20], as this was seen to direct strategy and 'bind' resource to the objectives the organisation was set up to pursue - in this case environmental and community/social purposes. Local project teams found setting up a mutual challenging and would have liked more access to lawyers and organisations with expertise in this topic (prioritising this over the other types of support offered as part of the LCCC – see section 4.3). Setting up a mutual provided projects with a structure for governance and accountability, the acceptance of funding and resource (for example the income from loans or from FITs) and the procurement of contractors (for example to carry out work in the delivery of the LCCC). Examples of the specific legal structures adopted or developed include:

- Industrial & Provident Societies

- Community Energy Company

---

[20] *'mutuals are organisations where employee or community ownership and engagement has a significant impact on the governance of the organisation. They can operate as employee owned, co-operative or wider social enterprises. They can include or participate in a variety of commercial arrangements, including joint ventures with government or other parties'.* Cited Cabinet Office, Mutuals Information Service http://mutuals.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/how/forms-mutual 04-02-12

- Community Interest Companies

- Social Enterprises

Trust, engagement and behaviour change activities

All local project teams responded positively when asked whether they were trusted by the community because of their 'local' role (and this extended to local authority or third sector led-projects). Community groups with a long history of working in their area specifically felt this facilitated behaviour change and engagement. In contrast, two local authority-led projects stated that engagement with their communities was more resource intensive, because they were more remote from those they were seeking to engage. Overall, there was a strong view amongst local project groups (of a range of organisational models), that they were best placed to deliver community scale low carbon work, because of their ability to engage their communities, facilitated by the greater trust they can gain because of the perception of their role being 'local'.

The majority of the LCCC local project teams recognised that engaging communities and trying to effect behaviour change was a central activity. In many cases they saw it as an activity that preceded and would continue beyond the life of the project.[21] Local project teams' experience during this programme has identified some useful lessons on how to engage effectively with local communities. Examples of these lessons include:

- Focusing on the potential for reducing fuel poverty can encourage take up of low carbon technology (such as solar panels and air source heat pumps), particularly in deprived areas.

- Face-to-face approaches such as door knocking and building personal relationships were seen as effective ways of communicating the project, encouraging involvement and raising awareness of the importance of a low carbon lifestyle.

- Being physically present in a community for the duration of a project means that those involved are visible, easily reachable and hence become part of the local landscape. One local project team got funding to build a temporary hut on the housing estate where they were working.

- Having people on hand to answer specific queries or spread word of the project in the community helps to build and entrench relationships. Many local project teams trained energy or community champions to play these roles.

- Involving schools in a project widens awareness and helps to educate young people about low carbon technologies and lifestyles. One local project team felt that getting the school on side at an early stage would help to prevent local opposition to the project in the local area.

- Having a well-known local person – for example, a councillor or celebrity – to champion the work can help to build awareness and interest, for example, one local project team working in a very deprived and ethnically diverse community went 'door knocking' over a weekend with a local Councillor.

---

[21] Timescales for engagement and behaviour change are discussed in more detail later in this report. A list of the engagement and behaviour change conducted by the communities is provided in Appendix 2.

- Having a well-defined 'unit' such as a housing estate or cohesive and stable community that is used to working well together can help to reduce conflict.

- Getting the strongest and loudest opponents on side at an early stage can help to engage the wider community. One local project team, with plans to install two wind turbines in their local area worked on getting the support of their sole and most vocal opponent and from this other (less vocal) opponents followed.

Building on existing resources and plans

Those local project teams able to draw on existing resources found it easier to cope with tight timescales. Strong partnerships, well-established community groups and already-discussed ideas for reducing carbon emissions meant local project teams could "hit the ground running". For these local project teams, the LCCC funding provided the financial resource to put these pre-existing ideas into action.

This point was made by delivery team members, local project teams and stakeholders. Having at least some of the necessary skills, relationships and structures in place was seen as essential for successful implementation. One stakeholder highlighted that this was particularly the case with the LCCC programme as limited resources were available for spending on support (10% of the grant) and one delivery team member noted that the LCCC had been intentionally targeted at communities with the necessary resources already in place.

Despite this, some stakeholders, including policy makers and community representatives argued that, though the projects of more well-established groups had been most successful, this didn't mean that similar projects could not work in other types of community. They felt that the difficulties experienced by some local project teams had not been intrinsic to the communities themselves but a function of the stringent requirements of the LCCC programme – particularly timescales, but also the focus on outcomes rather than development.

> *"When we saw the funding opportunity, we had the idea already of putting in a district boiler heater and the funding enabled it to happen. We were able to hit the ground running in the sense that we weren't starting naively because we have done similar pieces of work and had knowledge of the technology." (Local project team)*

> *"The newer groups that have been involved haven't got the infrastructure and learning, shared understanding etc that the more established ones do... For new groups they need to learn about planning regulations and all sorts of things that are new to them". (Stakeholder, research community)*

Delivery challenges generated invaluable learning about what works

Whilst some of the local project teams were very clear about the challenges of delivery, their ability to overcome them was related to their existing resources, skills and experience of specific technologies. Regardless of organisational models, all local project teams described a steep learning curve, and felt that the experience of the LCCC had built their confidence for any future similar projects, which they were keen to be part of. For local project teams which had less initial experience, the LCCC had supported and encouraged local development and provided an invaluable resource for any future work.

> *"In terms of immediate community organisations, the LCCC has contributed to ongoing development of them and supporting them. At this level the LCCC has been amazingly*

successful. I think we are left with 20 community organisations who are even more impressive than they were." (Delivery team member)

Sustainability

Many community groups had thought beyond the timescale of the grant funding and had made provision for investments to generate income to support further low carbon work in their communities. Local project teams described a number of ways in which they see the funds from the LCCC helping them to do future work:

- New enterprises set up for the LCCC project could be used as a vehicle to receive funds from investments to be put into future sustainable projects, whether the projects were delivered by the new enterprise or commissioned. One local project team had set up a registered charity, and planned to use the legacy of the FITs as a means to make sure that as many people as possible in the local community could benefit from having energy saving equipment in their homes.

- Using DECC funds as loans, which residents could use to install low carbon measures or technologies. As the loans were paid back, the funds could be used as loans again and the income from loan re-payments put towards other sustainable projects.

- Using the financial return generated by FITs to continue behaviour change and engagement activities, for example, events and home energy surveys.

- Using funds to create car clubs, with payments for car use sustaining the club and funding new cars.

One specialist support team stakeholder felt that community scale delivery of this type generated more return on investment than investing at the individual level, arguing that this meant that the loss of FITs had greater implications for communities.

> *"Communities have set up social enterprises and business plans and are expecting to provide an income which they can channel into carbon saving activities. You get much more for your carbon pound with community PV than you do with an individual having the panels on their house. The change to FITs is therefore a real shame for communities because it is a loss of income that would have been reinvested into further carbon efficiencies. Community groups respond to policy to look for ways to deliver carbon savings, but when things change it becomes very difficult for them." (Specialist support team stakeholder)*

Rising to the challenges

Delivery team interviewees felt that the LCCC had given communities the opportunity to prove their ability to deliver ambitious, large scale projects with constrained funding and short timescales. Local project teams' responses to emerging issues such as eligibility for FITs, and their ability to adapt the plans they had for the LCCC funds, were seen as evidence of communities' flexibility in the face of changing circumstances.

These views echo the development path and the achievements that many of the local project teams are proud of. A few of the local project teams also expressed gratitude to DECC for giving them the opportunity to prove what they could do.

"What I have taken away is just how good these communities are at getting things done on the ground, they get things done and find solutions rather than sit around talking about it. That is the key thing about empowering communities." (Delivery team member)

4.3 What could be improved?

A number of areas for improvement were identified from local project teams' experience of their work with the LCCC. These fall into the following themes and are explored in more detail below:

- Clarity about the scale of the challenge

- Support on technical and legal issues

- Working relationships, aspirations and expectations

- Sufficient time and resource to deliver effective engagement and behaviour change.

Scale of challenges should be stated clearly

We have noted earlier some of the challenges associated with tight timescales, confusion over eligibility of FITs, purdah and the subsequent change of Government. These, combined with the scale and ambition of the LCCC constituted a rich mix of change, uncertainty and opportunity which was unprecedented for many of the LCCC projects. The strength of feeling expressed on these issues by local project teams might be a result of communities' unpreparedness for a project of this scale and ambition. Stakeholders argued that support at the start was essential, helping local project teams to understand from the outset the level of commitment and responsibility required for success – though it is recognised that the real challenge can only be understood once delivery is underway.

It was considered important for funders and deliverers of such projects to understand how and why communities apply for funding. One community representative said: *"There will always be grateful communities who will take the money regardless of timeframe".* In other words, communities might be very keen to access funding opportunities, and not giving careful thought to the conditions attached.

Two main issues were associated with the community-led organisational model. First, many of the community groups felt the project exposed them to risks that might be acceptable for a local authority or third-sector led project, but were daunting for local community groups. For some, risks were felt to be greater because of their existing relationships and trust with their neighbours. Second, some of the community groups leading the LCCC projects had difficulties setting up as a legal enterprise and found it time-consuming. This was described as an extra step in the delivery not required of a local authority or established third sector organisation.

Support on legal and technical issues

A number of community-led projects felt their activities had been put at risk because they lacked the support to resolve some of the difficulties they faced, particularly those associated with legal and technological issues. The technological challenges facing some local project teams seem to relate to them being 'early adopters' of kit on which appropriate advice was hard to come by. This was particularly true for less well used measures or renewables, for example, a biomass district heating system. Local project teams in the LCCC programme

seemed to have different responses to these difficulties. Some felt that the LCCC programme should have been able to give them the answer, or to signpost them to who could help. Others did their own research or attended appropriate training sessions:

> *"We have some inherent expertise but a lot of this is quite radical so the expertise is thin on the ground. So I did things like took myself off and did courses on things because there was a lack of quality information available."* (Local project team)

> *"A good project needs a lot of top-down support; some of the LCCC projects have shown that there were problems with planning. For planning to be in there, already, [DECC] need to be saying we are driving this, we are committed to this happening."* (Stakeholder, representative of community organisations)

Working relationships, aspirations and expectations

Some evaluation interviewees suggested there was tension in the relationship between communities and DECC, which resulted from the issues we have described already – eligibility for FITs, delivery timescales and the change of government, as well as delivery-related challenges such as planning or legal complications. For some local project teams, these challenges were compounded by what they felt was a lack of support or certainty from the LCCC programme: there appear to have been different views about the support that the programme would and should offer to local project teams.

> *"When we were starting to set up the community energy company – the last place we would have looked is DECC as with the State Aid issue their response was 'we don't know'. Normally you can get online and look for a model but there wasn't one so then you have to employ lawyers to do this and we had no money for it. DECC could've set up a model as others needed one too."* (Local project team)

Sufficient time and resource to deliver effective engagement and behaviour change

Local project teams found engaging the wider community difficult, either because they lacked resources or because they were focused full-time on delivery. Projects also 'took a message' from the grant requirements: with only 10% specified for project management, which included engagement and behaviour change, it was seen as low priority. Some local project teams felt too that behaviour change had not been 'designed in' to the LCCC programme, but was more of an afterthought, conflated with engagement and not realistically achievable within the timescales of the LCCC project.

Local project teams and stakeholders had different views about how best to change behaviour. Some thought that installing visible measures (such as PV panels) would in itself effect behaviour change, while others acknowledged that actively talking about the visible measures was necessary to really get the message across. Others focused on the cost savings arising from behaviour change to engage their communities, which was seen as effective across all types of community, whether deprived or affluent. One representative of a community organisation and one of the local project teams disagreed that promoting the cost saving messages would effect behaviour change in the long term: they argued that communities needed more support and guidance from the LCCC programme on this issue.

> *"Took the [car club] cars to a local music festival and spoke to people, things like that are effective but they take time and mental resource. It takes a lot of time to do this and it is disproportionate to what you get out of it."* (Local project team)

41

"Putting PV on someone's roof doesn't necessarily change people's behaviour. It depends on how it's been sold to them and how they've taken it up – it's all about values."
(Local project team)

5. Evaluation of opportunities for dialogue and sharing learning

5.1 Introduction

This section covers the opportunities that the LCCC programme provided for dialogue and for wider sharing of learning beyond local project teams, what worked well about these, and what might have been done differently or improved. These opportunities included: the LCCC launch event, the online portal, the Communities and Climate Action Alliance (CCAA) conference, four policy workshops with DECC, and DECC 'customer closeness' visits to projects (see section 2.5 for details).

5.2 What worked well?

The evaluation has found that local project teams were very aware, and appreciative of the opportunities to share learning throughout the LCCC programme. The activities to share learning that worked well included:

- CCAA conference

- Thematic policy workshops

- Customer closeness visits and visits by the DECC LCCC team

- A continued appetite for sharing learning.

Responses to these activities are explored in the sections below.

CCAA conference

The CCAA conference was felt to have provided valuable opportunities for local project teams to network, share learning with each other and feed learning to a wider group of stakeholders in the field. Some stakeholder interviewees for this evaluation had attended the CCAA and agreed with local project teams that the opportunity for face-to-face meetings of local project teams and other stakeholders was extremely positive.

Part of the value attributed by local project teams and stakeholders to the CCAA conference was that it brought the LCCC local project teams together with other stakeholders in the community energy sector, enabling learning to be shared more widely. This was particularly valuable for local project teams choosing technologies installed by only a few other LCCC local project teams, giving them access to a wider spread of expertise and experience. This highlighted the value of providing local project teams with access to events with participation from a wider stakeholder group than just the LCCC projects.

> *"[The CCAA conference] was useful because it brought communities together in the same space – helping to create networks for them to access peer support from each other. Also to showcase what government was supporting. There were some senior DECC civil*

43

servants there, which showed a good commitment and profile-raising for the LCCC."
(Stakeholder, representative of community organisations)

Thematic policy workshops

Several local project teams felt the four thematic policy workshops provided them with a valuable opportunity to network with each other around a specific issue and to share their specific learning. They also highly valued the opportunity to meet face-to-face, and share learning, with DECC policy makers.

"Policy workshops – the idea was for them [DECC] *to learn from us. Was interesting to meet other people doing similar things and to hear the nitty gritty of how they have done things, that is interesting".* (Local project team)

Customer closeness visits and visits by the DECC LCCC team

At the time of interviews, one of the local projects had received a 'customer closeness' visit and two of the local projects stated they had been visited by the DECC LCCC team. Visits by DECC policy makers were valued by local project teams receiving them and the idea of the visits was supported by local project teams which had not been visited. The visits were seen as a valuable opportunity for policy makers to get an understanding of 'how things work on the ground', and for the work of communities to feed into policymaking. Local project teams felt strongly that visits gave policy makers a chance to see the impact of the LCCC project work on local communities and to hear about the issues they faced during the process. They felt too that the visits signalled DECC's support and commitment to the local project teams and to the community-led energy agenda, and lent credibility and weight to the schemes locally.

"When we had people from DECC, they met not just me working on the project but the recipients and it's important for them to see [the kit that has] been put up and the experience of the recipients and some of the volunteers." (Local project team)

Continued appetite for sharing learning

Local project teams' continued appetite for shared learning indicates the value of these opportunities to them, and their commitment to using learning to inform future policy development. Local project teams would like to share their learning beyond the LCCC programme, with other communities who may be interested in community energy generation and with policymakers at national and local level. The evaluation research identified a range of suggestions for sharing learning either during projects or as ways of adding value to future similar projects including:

- **Promotion and profile-raising**: more work could be done to publicise the LCCC and raise the profile of low carbon community projects. One local project team suggested that DECC might do this, raising the profile of the programme locally and nationally. The 'customer closeness' visits in some local project teams helped to do this and their potential could be explored further. Mass media approaches such as a TV documentary were suggested as a way of reaching a wider audience at the householder/community level.

- **Peer mentoring**: The informal peer support between some local project teams during the LCCC programme helped to build capacity across groups with different experience and expertise. DECC might broker relationships between new communities and others from whom they might learn. It would be important not to overburden groups whose success is recognised widely, but this could be avoided with careful management and planning.

- **Celebration event**: Many local project teams would welcome an event now that the main installation and delivery work had finished. This would allow them to reflect on learning across the whole programme and allow them to network and meet DECC staff, which they had limited time to do during the programme delivery.

- **Steering group follow-up:** Reconvening the steering group would encourage reflection on the evaluation findings and identification of how these could and should inform future policymaking. This would help to ensure that the learning is taken forward in a coordinated direction instead of dissipating amongst interested, but disparate, stakeholders.

"It would be good for the steering group to get back together and reflect. I mean wider than just sharing the report – discussing and saying, if we are making policy decisions, where would we next put the money. Things like the LCCC offer the opportunity to ask questions. But you need to bring people back together afterwards in order to do this." (Stakeholder, policymaker)

5.3 What could be improved?

The two areas for improvement in opportunities for sharing learning identified in the evaluation were:

- Online support

- Variations in the perceived value of learning opportunities.

These are discussed below.

Online support

The LCCC provided an online portal at the request of the local project teams who were keen for a website where they could showcase their activities and share their learning. However, when provided, the online portal was assessed by local project teams as 'OK' rather than either particularly positive or negative. According to the local project teams the online portal was not used extensively, and this affected perceptions of its value. Whilst the theoretical value of an online space is recognised, they work only if there is regular participation and a clear reason for visiting, both of which were lacking in this case. According to the project report for the online portal, participation in the website included: 25 min (average) conversations with community leaders; 8 forum discussions initiated and 4 opinion pieces posted, over the pilot period of 8 weeks.

Local project teams gave a number of reasons for not visiting the online portal. These included:

- Unappealing presentation and design – e.g. too much text

- Insufficient information provided

- A sense that it was 'another thing to do' during a very busy time: 'we were busy doing, not talking'.

- Burdensome to those local project teams whose advice and guidance was sought because they were doing well.

45

A few local project teams suggested that using existing online forums or groups, would be more successful, rather than expecting people to engage with a new set-up. Piggybacking onto existing online support mechanisms may be a more effective option for future online sharing opportunities.

The four webinars held on the online portal over the course of the pilot were attended by local project teams, with an average of 12 attendees each[22] (up to 4 of these were administrators of the online portal). One reason suggested by local project teams for the online portal not being attended extensively was the inexperience of the presenters.

"The speakers didn't add a lot. I'm not sure many people phoned into them. It needs people who know what they are talking about… Considering the presentations were focussed on practical issues they weren't necessarily the best people to speak." (Local project team)

"The first time they explained that there would be the website for the LCCC, so all the LCCC communities can communicate – we thought 'great to communicate online and share info and good practice' but they didn't set it up [at the start] and we couldn't take the time etc to go to the conferences, and then since we started I have been bombarded by so many different agencies sending us things and people approaching us to say they are experts and websites and in the end you just want to get on with what you have to do." (Local project team)

5.4 Variations in perceived value of learning opportunities

It is worth noting that some local project teams were not convinced of the value of getting involved in any learning opportunities, citing a number of reasons for this, including:

- The cost of participating, including expenses and the time taken to travel outweighing the perceived value of attending, particularly for local project teams furthest away from London. These comments were made in spite of the fact that the LCCC programme covered expenses to attend events to share learning and - in the case of the four thematic policy workshops – provided a payment to cover staff time.

- The time required to attend and the timing of the events caused problems for local project team members, as the individuals most involved in delivery often also had work commitments or were simply focusing hard on getting their project delivered

- Some local project teams felt they had more to offer than to gain from such opportunities, and did not see learning from others as beneficial in their own specific cases.

"We look at them and think 'we already know quite a lot about that' and are we going to go all the way to London and stay etc, just to get there and realise that yes, we did know a lot about it." (Local project team)

---

[22] Information taken from the Community Central LCCC project report

6. Outputs and outcomes from the LCCC programme

6.1 Introduction

The parallel evaluation strand on the householder experience (strand 2), and the evaluation of energy consumption and carbon savings in the LCCC communities (strand 1) provide the main data for assessing the overall impacts of the LCCC programme.

This chapter therefore focuses specifically on the outcomes from the LCCC programme based on the community practitioner experience (strand 3) and the process of the LCCC programme. It therefore complements evaluation strands 1 and 2 by exploring additional data on outcomes gathered by the projects, as well as a more subjective assessment of the outcomes the projects think they have achieved in their communities. It also assesses the outcomes from the LCCC programme in relation to DECC policy and practice. This section draws on interviews with local project teams, stakeholders and delivery team members.

6.2 LCCC outputs - low carbon measures

Full lists of the technologies and measures installed by each of the local project teams can be found in the completed audit tools in Appendices 2 and 3. This section offers an overview of these which is intended to illustrate the range and diversity of the scale, location and types of measure installed using the LCCC funding.

Scale and location
Some local project teams focused on a single or a few large installations, including a wind turbine, a micro hydro turbine, construction of a new community hub building and the restoration of an existing building. Others focused on a single or few types of technology and installed them on a wide scale, such as PV panels for substantial numbers of domestic buildings. However, the majority of local project teams installed a range of different technologies, on a mix of domestic and community buildings, often choosing to install a range of measures in each building.

Type of measure
Energy generation

- The most commonly installed energy-generation measure was solar PV panels. These were installed on domestic and community buildings, including social housing, schools, a community shop, a pub and a church. Solar thermal panels for heating water were also installed, although less frequently.

- Air source heat pumps, and in one case, ground source heat pumps, were installed in both domestic and community buildings.

- One local project team installed a micro hydro turbine.

Energy efficiency

- Heat-loss reduction measures included insulation (cavity wall, solid wall or loft), double glazing or secondary glazing. Many projects took other draught-proofing measures.

- More energy efficient boilers and appliances (cookers, fridges etc) were installed by several projects, particularly for domestic but also for community buildings.

- Small measures were commonly installed and ranged from shower timers and boiler jackets to powerdown plugs, energy saving lightbulbs and rainwater harvesting.

- Transport measures purchased by projects included community cars/car club and an electric minibus for community use.

- Energy metering or monitoring devices were installed by a small number of projects to encourage residents to be aware of their energy use and to try and reduce it as a consequence of their new understanding.

Other

Local food production, on allotments, was adopted by several projects as a measure relating to carbon reduction in the wider sense. One project planted an orchard as a carbon-sequestration measure.

Engagement and behaviour change activities

Full lists of the engagement and behaviour change activities the local project teams were involved in can be found in Appendices 2 and 3. Local project teams were involved in a wide range of engagement and behaviour change activities depending on what they were trying to achieve through their projects. We have themed the activities below:

- Training sessions to local people including community members, professionals and residents who were then charged as 'community champions'. Training sessions included: accredited training sessions, sessions on climate change, cycling, energy awareness.

- School visits and training in schools.

- Open days. Many local project groups were involved in organising open days of homes, demonstration days or community buildings which had low-carbon technologies or measures installed.

- Business, home or community building energy audits. Local project teams completed energy audits on buildings to raise awareness of energy efficiency and encourage uptake of low carbon technologies and measures.

- Door knocking, leafleting, visits to homes, posters and displays.

- Local project teams organised community events, activity days, fairs and plays. Some attended or organised low carbon themed, music or themed festivals to raise awareness of their work.

6.3 Difference being part of the LCCC made to the local project groups

This section explores project teams' views about what difference being a part of the LCCC made to them and their projects. A variety of impacts were identified including: creating a catalyst for change, enabling local project teams to realise existing plans, enhancing the credibility of local project teams, increasing local participation, developing skills and sharing knowledge, and generating a sustainable income for community projects.

A catalyst for change

The LCCC was seen as a unique opportunity because it was about more than just the installation of established low carbon and renewable technologies; one local project team commented on the difficulty of finding funding for a project which was also about local innovation and community delivery and about developing and testing new ways of living and working more sustainably. One local project team noted that for this reason they were *'completely dependent on the LCCC funding'.*

Local project teams saw the LCCC grant as a catalyst that enabled their groups and communities to become more sustainable and self sufficient as they begin to generate and recycle their own resources - both the energy created and/or the financial resource being directed back to the established community trust or social enterprise for reinvestment in the community.

Realising existing plans

Most local project teams had existing plans in place that addressed the wider LCCC project objectives, though for many progress had been slow and few had identified sources of secure or sufficient capital prior to their application to the LCCC. Amongst the money-raising initiatives they had considered or tried before were community share issue schemes, working with private partners or taking out loans, with the income generated by the technologies (e.g. through FITs). For a range of reasons, none of these were considered realistic or attractive options. Some local project teams had applied to their local authorities or national governments for funding (e.g. Welsh Assembly Government) but had found this to be a slower process than the application to the LCCC and often for smaller grants than those made available by the LCCC.

Across the local project teams, interviewees spoke of the LCCC programme as *'moving things on significantly'* and making their plans a reality. The grants were felt to speed up delivery significantly and in almost all cases, provided sufficient resource to finance installations fully and to meet local demand. This meant that local project teams avoided having to find supplementary sources of income before progressing. The size of the grants provided also meant projects could deliver on a scale that would make a real impact. A very important feature of the LCCC funding was that it would keep the direct benefits of the project within the local community. Local project teams embedded in their local community felt that compromising this would damage their reputation locally and the willingness of the wider community to engage with the project and with renewable and low carbon technologies.

> *"If we had asked an investor to give us the £400k it would take us 20 years to pay back!"*
> *(Local project team)*

49

Enhancing credibility

Being approved as a LCCC local project team had enhanced the credibility and legitimacy of the local project team within their communities and with external stakeholders (including with elected members, officers, private business and private finance). This was felt to have a bearing on both the delivery of the project and the impact it was able to achieve. Local communities had more respect for the skills and capabilities of the project team and were thus more willing to get involved. Some felt that opposition was also less likely, as national government funding had 'rubber stamped' the projects.

Almost half the local project teams directly referred to improved relationships with their local council and local elected members and cited the LCCC project as having enhanced their credibility and the credibility of community low carbon and renewable projects. Many local project teams feel that success with the LCCC has shown their local councils what it is possible to achieve and believe this will help facilitate an expansion of this type of activity locally.

Some of the interviewees believed the outputs of the LCCC, and the credibility attached to having delivered such a project, will also aid them in the future as they look for additional funding and resources to sustain their work and install further low carbon and renewable technologies.

The local project teams have also formed positive relationships with stakeholders from public bodies, academic institutions and the private sector, further enhancing their status and widening local interest in environmental sustainability; a small number of the project teams also now have well established and productive relationships with large private sector providers.

Successful implementation of the LCCC projects has also led to new or improved collaboration between project teams and other providers. In some local project teams, housing associations and local authorities worked in parallel, co-ordinating, for example, the regeneration and improvement of social housing by installing new windows, loft insulation, heat recovery units and other low carbon and renewable energy measures. Partnerships and collaborations between these organisations are continuing beyond the lifespan of the LCCC.

> *"You are talking about a project that has met massive obstruction locally so to have that stamp of approval from the UK government has proved really important in raising our reputation and credentials and…has influenced local people and communities." (Local project team)*

> *"[We are] working with the local authority…we will soon have one house on a peppercorn rent and we are going to retrofit it with British Gas…and put local families into the houses to demonstrate to all…what can be done. The university want to do the monitoring and testing." (Local project team)*

Increasing local participation

Local project teams report that participation has increased locally during and since the LCCC project. The scale of the projects meant local project teams were able to draw in new types of support and they had a project through which people could actively participate giving the project team a *"boost"*.

Many drew on considerable volunteer support in delivering their LCCC projects and have seen a sustained increase in the number of people engaging with them or offering their energy, time or skills locally and beyond. They are now able to draw on this network to expand and sustain their activities; projects which are a clear demonstration of community-led delivery emphasise this point particularly strongly.

"We have a really supportive partnership group, mostly made up of local residents – we don't get a huge amount of statutory involvement and…haven't got a huge amount of business near here. They are very supportive; most have lived here all their lives and just want things to improve." (Local project team)

Developing skills and sharing learning

Delivering the LCCC projects required those involved to draw on all their skills and strengths, and generated learning and built the capacities of the local project teams; for many the steepest learning curve occurred in the installation or building of technologies and measures. As they had anticipated, all local project teams were challenged by the realities and complexities of their capital projects and had considered some of these challenges in their project design. Some of those involved had spent a lot of time learning and upskilling themselves to ensure their projects were successful.

The exact mix of skills and knowledge within and between project teams varied at the outset; some felt they had much to learn, others were more confident that they had sufficient skills and knowledge. Regardless of where they started, most local project teams feel they have learned a lot from their experience, developing hard and soft skills. They learned too from others, including fellow team members partners, volunteers, community members and other stakeholders engaged with the project.

Before, during and particularly since the LCCC programme, the local project teams have seen a lot of interest from similar projects and organisations and have willingly shared their learning. Most of the local project teams expressed an explicit desire to continue to do so and emphasised the benefits of their experience and the unique lessons of the LCCC.

"We identified our skills and our needs and we filled that skills gap in order to complete in time; we knew that we didn't have the technical expertise to deliver in that time– there were massive learning curves…but we dealt with that" (Local project team)

"We have had a huge amount of interest from outside, we've had visitors, been asked to seminars and conferences, been asked to host workshops and to talk about how we have actually delivered the project." (Local project team)

Generating a sustainable income for community projects

Ownership, governance and financial models varied across projects and most local project teams have established organisational models through which to spend and recycle income from the LCCC projects (as described in chapter 4 above). Local project teams spoke of their plans for the future and the impact the LCCC grants will make in the longer term as resources are recycled.

"It's a revolving fund, so money is spent and comes back in…it isn't a case of 'we've spent it and now we need more money', we've actually turned it into an income stream to keep the project going." (Local project team)

"The list of what we can do is endless. We want many people in the village and the parish to benefit from having energy saving equipment in their homes and this is why the XXXX company has been set up, which will be registered as a charity." (Local project team)

6.4 Outcomes for communities

Whilst some local project teams feel it is too early to evaluate longer term outcomes and the scale of behaviour change resulting from the LCCC, they were confident that their projects were successful in beginning this process. Some qualitative evidence from this evaluation research supports this, with project teams reporting that residents who had renewable energy technologies installed on their homes seeming to be changing their behaviour. For example, there are examples of community members installing their own (non LCCC funded) low carbon or renewable energy technologies; school children and parents monitoring (and reducing) fuel consumption in the home; the setting up of local markets to reduce fuel use, reduce the carbon footprint of food supplies and recycle locally; and the planting of trees as carbon sinks or supplies of renewable timber.

The majority of local project teams have now completed their installations and carried out engagement and behaviour change activities and a range of impacts can be described (to be covered in the overarching evaluation report). However, the work and impact of the LCCC projects will continue beyond this stage: indeed, many of the projects anticipate the benefits increasing over time and many of the projects are evaluating the longer term impacts of the LCCC funding and activities for themselves. In the meantime, some of the immediate outcomes for communities identified in this evaluation are summarised below.

Engaging the community in low carbon and sustainable living

All local project teams had engaged with their communities prior to the LCCC but engagement with and from local communities increased significantly during the project, helping those involved to realise their ambitions of engaging local people on environmental sustainability and low carbon living. They reported *"heightened awareness"*, *"consciousness",* development of a common language and increased understanding in communities as residents began to see what low carbon living means in practice.

Some of the local project teams which had groups which were previously difficult to engage with, such as young teenagers or residents who were disillusioned because they had been promised things previously which had not materialised, felt that the LCCC programme design, combining engagement with physical outputs, had increased the likelihood of these groups becoming involved. In addition to increased engagement, local project teams noted that new groups in the community were inspired to engage and get involved increasing momentum around the projects. Most of the local project teams have also witnessed a surge in the amount of interest from outside their own cities, towns and villages and this interest continues to grow.

"There is a lot more interest in low carbon and renewables and in the co-operative idea and recycling money [locally] than there is in anything else going on in this parish so it has given us the ability to engage with more people and to bring their skills into the group." (Local project team)

"The funding gave us a massive boost in uptake of the project – we started out with 5 or 6 groups taking part and we now have about 62, so it really raised awareness." (Local project team)

"In [project location] there are over 30 languages spoken in our schools, in some cases only 3 or 4 families speak that language, so we can't translate [engagement materials] and even if we could, they might not be literate, so it was essential that schools received [installations] and [engaged with] the programme of energy efficiency and learning. The schools have a big display so the children can see how much energy they are generating and what CO2 savings they have made." (Local project team)

Behaviour change

Behaviour change was an important aspect of the LCCC. Many of the local project teams have undertaken what they defined as behaviour change activities as part of their engagement activities and see this as a key outcome of environmental sustainability and low carbon projects.

Definitions of and approaches to behaviour change vary amongst local project teams and amongst stakeholders within local project teams, but most local project teams felt the LCCC project had initiated a process of positive behaviour change that will continue to intensify for many years. Local project teams hope DECC will continue to collect evidence from them which demonstrates these longer term outcomes and provides clear evidence of behaviour change having taken place as a result of the LCCC and linked project activity at the community level.

Many local project teams felt that engagement alone was not sufficient to prompt behaviour change in relation to sustainable and low carbon living and see considerable value in undertaking this work alongside the physical installation of low carbon and renewable technologies. Many have and continue to collect their own evidence of behaviour change too – for example, collecting information on reductions in energy bills. The physical demonstration of the technologies was seen as instrumental in these changes, allowing local project teams to show communities and stakeholders what low carbon living means in day-to-day life. Some local project teams targeted what they felt were likely to be the most challenging groups within their communities (such as older people, those who live in social housing, and those whose first language is not English), in order to test the effectiveness of the LCCC approach.

"It has put the energy in front of people's eyes, for the first time they have started to think about it in a different way". (Local project team)

"There had been a lot of talk about [sustainable energy] up until then, but then people saw [the technology] and realised it was possible to get planning permission and it wasn't as noisy as they thought – that has been a huge influence." (Local project team)

"I was surprised at the effect of the capital measures; most of what we did [before in the way of] behaviour change was running events, setting up community allotments, promoting cycling, delivering workshops and I was always sceptical about capital measures, but I have been very surprised. When you walk around the estate people can see it and so they think about it". (Local project team)

"I think it will help build a momentum, a community, a culture – ultimately what we are talking about is cultural change." (Local project team)

53

Wider community outcomes

Several of the local project teams reported that participating in or witnessing the delivery of the LCCC has "*woken people up*" to the opportunity to make a difference. Local project teams and individuals in the LCCC communities and beyond see the LCCC projects as successful examples of community-led solutions and community delivery. New activities and groups have formed alongside the LCCC teams, either with direct links to these or forming as part of a wider groundswell of energy and activity.

Examples of such initiatives include: a community shop, a revived Parish council, multiple residents associations, a solar buying club, a community cinema, a community orchard, edible gardens, a visitor centre, village shows, produce markets, recycling schemes, eco-conferences, walking tracks with disabled access, cycle paths and a bridleway. Now that delivery of the LCCC project is complete, some local project teams have plans for new initiatives, including a café, a craft shop and a crèche.

Some of these outcomes were anticipated at the design stage but others were not. These include technologies exceeding manufacturer specifications and measures installed having uses and benefits beyond those intended at the outset (e.g. by saving more carbon or generating more green energy than anticipated or by more people using the village hall).

Some of the greatest positive outcomes for local communities have been social. Projects have engaged a wide range of community members and been both inclusive and cohesive - e.g. young children, older residents, and people with learning disabilities. The local project teams reported a new *"confidence"*, *"enthusiasm"* and *"sense of pride"* within communities and amongst residents, whether or not they were directly involved in the LCCC projects:

> *"The LCCC has added to the vibrancy of the community…nothing written off without it being properly examined…if someone has an idea they run with it." (Local project team)*

> *"The bulk of the impact remains to be felt still; I think we had a lot of impact in a short period of time but the biggest impact will come…you get better at what you are doing and start to identify weaknesses and address those. I think there will be a huge impact down the line." (Local project team)*

> *"Our community is changing all the time…and our ideas are growing as we grow into the project – it's still very formative". (Local project team)*

> *"I think there is a wider sense of possibility, rather than hearing [about things] getting worse and worse…and there being a feeling of despair and hopelessness, people in these groups think they can do something and are stronger together – to me that is the most important change, the social change." (Local project team)*

Local project teams are also beginning to gather statistical outcomes data using their own evaluation processes. In some cases the local project teams have academic partners monitoring these outcomes, for example local project teams are working with the University of Chester, the University of Nottingham and the University of Strathclyde. Indications of evidence that is becoming available include that one local project team reported that their local incomes recovery officer who pursues late rent payments hasn't visited any households in the area in the last six months because tenants are no longer in fuel poverty and they can pay their rent. The same local project team also reported a reduction in anti-social behaviour which they think is partly the

result of people seeing members of their community coming together and investing in the area.

6.5 Outcomes relating to DECC and wider government policy and practice

Amongst the stakeholders interviewed for this evaluation there was a lack of consensus about the nature or extent of the outcomes for DECC policy and practice resulting from the LCCC programme. Interviewees were not specific or confident about making firm claims about outcomes, and tended to suggest these might be limited. However, most were reserving judgement until they had seen the final report and developments in DECC's thinking about community-led activities. Their caution was based on a number of factors. These included:

- Change of Government: the LCCC started under the previous administration

- Community initiatives being spread across a range of policy areas, making causal relationships between any particular policy or project and change on the ground hard to determine

- Difficulty of drawing general conclusions from the programme because the communities involved could be seen to be atypical, being more prepared and more capable than most

- Move towards a commercially-oriented approach to low carbon and sustainability projects such as the Green Deal, potentially making lessons from programmes such as the LCCC less relevant (given their community focus, and grant-funded approach)

A couple of DECC policy makers interviewed were very enthusiastic about the customer closeness visits and the policy workshops and the outcomes such activities could have in terms of deepening understanding.

"When you visit these communities it really affects you, you get a different view of how these [DECC] policies work on the ground. And trying to understand what community groups are trying to achieve there, in terms of improving the areas they live in. It is important for policy officials in DECC to go out and understand the impact of what they are doing. This is happening; we are arranging community visits for officials to go to the LCCCs." (Stakeholder, delivery team)

However, in spite of this enthusiasm amongst some DECC policy makers, there were some concerns in the delivery team that the level of interest in and commitment to community-led approaches within DECC might be limited, which would impact on the potential for positive outcomes in relation to DECC policy and practice.

Some local project teams and some stakeholders were also sceptical about the extent to which the learning from the LCCC had fed into policy development or would be reflected in future initiatives. In part, this was based on the view that ongoing communication of the learning throughout the programme to stakeholders and local project teams was neither adequate nor consistent. Some interviewees suggested that the tight timescales of the Local Energy Assessment Fund (LEAF) announced in December 2011 were evidence that important lessons around timescales had not been learned. They did nonetheless recognise that LEAF demonstrates some commitment to community energy projects.

Stakeholders identified two pieces of concrete evidence of DECC having embedded the community model into its thinking:

- DECC and external stakeholders saw the Local Energy Assessment Fund (LEAF), announced in December 2011, as a sign that communities are on the agenda: some felt that the programme demonstrated a commitment to community energy projects, in part generated by the LCCC. A 'community revolving fund' is scheduled for April 2012, in response to feedback from the LCCC via the Community Online site.

- The LCCC learning is reflected in the move to involve community organisations in delivering the Green Deal within their community. This follows the recommendations of many of the local project teams, who argued that policy should not rely on a national marketing approach but partner with community organisations to drive take-up. Involving community groups in encouraging take-up of smart meters was also recommended: local people are seen as more likely than salespeople from the big energy companies or government spokespeople to gain the trust and ear of their neighbours and are hence better placed to convey the value and importance of this technology.

"It has led to more communities being interested in community-led delivery and wanting to get involved and, as a result, a knock-on effect on policy. So the Chancellor has announced the LEAF. Could we have done that without the LCCC? Possibly, but what helped is that the amount of communities which are lobbying for stuff meant that people were looking at it and thinking about it on a broader network." (Stakeholder, delivery team)

More generally, stakeholders felt that the LCCC programme had helped to create a 'buzz' and momentum around community-led delivery, alongside related initiatives such as Transition Towns. They felt that the programme had demonstrated the value of these approaches in achieving policy goals across government departments.

The interest of government more widely in the lessons from the programme and its approach is also clearly shown in the LCCC having been one of only three demonstration areas selected by the Cabinet Office in 2011 for their 'Listening to the front line' initiative. This aims to reconnect policy making with front line professionals and ensure that those who develop policy do so in close partnership with the people who are responsible for implementation.

7. Conclusions and lessons for the future

7.1 Introduction

This section sets out our conclusions and lessons for the future from the LCCC evaluation. We consider the extent to which the LCCC met its objectives by assessing evidence from the evaluation against the eight cross cutting 'big questions' (laid out in section 2.2). We draw on interviews with local project teams, stakeholders and delivery team members.

7.2 Conclusions

Through the LCCC programme, national government funding has been awarded to groups working at community level to implement low carbon measures and engage their communities in energy saving behaviours. Local project teams who received the funding were generally very positive about their projects, the vast majority of which were successfully completed within the timescales. This represents a significant achievement in terms of the community-led delivery of the low carbon agenda, particularly as most of the local project teams were new to taking on a project of this scale.

In relation to the process, the hands-off approach from the programme worked well for some local project teams, generally those who felt that they knew what they were doing and wanted to focus on delivery of their projects within the tight timescale. However, some others would have liked more support and contact from the programme. In terms of the support offered by the specialist support team, many local project teams felt they would have benefited from more tailored support, including legal, financial, governance issues. In relation to all of the strands of support available to local project teams, the overriding message was that local project teams had different needs and that a 'one size fits all' package of support may not be appropriate in this sort of programme.

There were some key challenges in relation to the earlier stages of the LCCC. Firstly, the tight timescales for the planning of the programme and for the application and awarding processes placed considerable pressure on both local project teams applying and on stakeholders involved in the design and selection process. Evidence from stakeholders and from the evaluation of unsuccessful applicants suggests that only groups that were either well-established or had a resourceful partner (local authority or third sector) could submit competent applications; this has implications in terms of thinking around the transferability of learning from the LCCC to other community initiatives, as the local project teams selected cannot be seen as typical of all communities. The second challenge was around FITs and state aid rules, a lack of clarity around which created difficulties and confusion for those local project teams who had built FITs into their projects.

The LCCC allowed local project teams flexibility in the organisational models through which they delivered their projects, enabling the programme to test what works in this respect for different types of community. It was notable that all of the local project teams in deprived areas had a delivery model led by either a local authority or a third sector organisation, whereas the more affluent areas described an existing range of skills and skills within their communities which enabled them to deliver the project themselves. Regardless of their model and their starting point, all of the local project teams faced considerable challenges in delivering their projects and felt they went on 'steep learning curves'. One of the main challenges was around technological

and legal issues, which, it was acknowledged, were related to the fact that they were 'early adopters' of these types of technologies on a community scale. Notwithstanding this, local project teams still felt that more support in dealing with these issues would have been appreciated; greater clarity from the outset on the parameters of the support and guidance available through the programme may have helped to avoid problems later on.

The majority of the LCCCs identified engaging communities and trying to effect behaviour change as a central activity which preceded and would continue beyond the life of the project. The LCCC local project teams' experience of this activity generated much learning about how to effectively engage with local communities, such as face to face methods, door knocking and developing local relationships. The engagement support was appreciated by some local project teams, although others wanted the flexibility to choose their own support, given the skills already contained in the group. For others, the timing of this activity was not convenient. Indeed, the key challenges around engaging communities arose due to tight timescales and the lack of resource, which reflected the financial structure of the grant, with 10% for project management, engagement and behaviour change. In addition to this, there were different views about how best to change behaviour and some feeling that more support was needed for communities on this issue.

It is clear that local project teams do not intend to stop their low carbon work after the LCCC funding has finished and have a variety of plans for how the LCCC funds can be recycled or invested. Examples of plans include: setting up a new enterprise for the LCCC and using this as a vehicle to receive funds from investments to be put into future sustainable projects; recycling the LCCC funds as loans to install low carbon measures; and, using the return generated by FITs to continue behaviour change and engagement activities. Many of the local project teams were clear that in the future, they would be able to apply their learning and experience from the LCCC to other low carbon community projects. Many of the local project teams are keen to build on the expertise and resources which have been built through the LCCC and are keen to work with DECC and government more generally in the future to deliver community energy initiatives.

A range of positive outcomes have been achieved through participation in the LCCC. Many of the local project teams were clear that being involved in the LCCC has made a real difference to them and their projects, notably, enabling them to realise long term plans, speeding up action on proposals they already had, building confidence, developing skills and sharing knowledge and experience, and giving credibility to their work. Local project teams were able to identify examples of how their projects had engaged the community in low carbon and sustainable living. For example, new teams and activities were being formed - such as a community cinema, a community orchard and a community shop, projects providing opportunities for local people to participate and creating a sense of social cohesion in the local area, so that residents spoke of having a renewed sense of 'confidence', 'pride' and 'enthusiasm'. Local project teams also felt that the impact of their installations would continue in the long term and had plans in place to evaluate those.

The co-inquiry approach to supporting dialogue within communities, and between communities, other stakeholders and national policy makers, was not implemented entirely in the ways originally envisaged when the LCCC programme was designed. The short timescales for completing the installation of often very new technologies put pressure on local project teams to make those physical development activities their priority. In addition, the lack of clarity about how the co-inquiry process of linked to the development of engagement plans and formal review meetings led to a focus at the time on immediate pressures rather than thinking about the longer

term learning from the work. However, once the main installations were completed, many local project teams were very keen to share the knowledge and experience they had developed.

The review meetings held with all project teams provided valuable opportunities for local people (sometimes with other stakeholders) to pause and reflect on their experience and to consider the lessons for future similar programmes. These and other events facilitated by the LCCC programme supported engagement work with communities to understand the emerging lessons from the LCCC for the projects, the partners and other stakeholders, and for policy makers. These lessons and insights were captured in reports and were fed into the four policy workshops where local project teams met face-to-face with DECC policy makers to discuss current policy topics. Other opportunities for sharing the learning from the programme (such as participation in national conferences) also enabled this learning to be shared with other local and national stakeholders in the field.

There were also a number of wider learning opportunities provided within the LCCC programme for local project teams to share learning both with each other and with DECC policy leads. These events, and the value of sharing learning, were strongly appreciated in principle. However there were some limitations in practice, with some local project teams being too busy with their projects to attend, and some feeling that they had little to learn as they were already well-informed and confident. There was strong support for the idea of learning opportunities post-programme, in order to capture and share experiences and reflections without the pressure of delivery.

It is still very early to find clear evidence of the outcomes in relation to DECC policy and practice of this sharing of learning from the programme, and there are inherent difficulties in finding specific evidence of such impacts. For example, community initiatives are spread across a range of policy areas, making causal relationships between any particular policy or project and change on the ground hard to determine. However, there is already some evidence of DECC having embedded the community led model into its thinking around new policy initiatives including in: the Local Energy Assessment Fund (LEAF); a community revolving fund; and the move to involve communities in the Green Deal and Smart Meter programmes instead of focusing on householders alone. In addition, some stakeholders felt that the LCCC was important in creating a 'buzz' and momentum around community-led delivery more generally.

7.3 Achievement of objectives

In this section we consider whether the LCCC delivered against its original objectives in the form of the eight cross cutting 'big questions'. It is not the task of this evaluation to answer all these questions definitively; these cross cutting questions are to be addressed by the five strand programme evaluation in the forthcoming overarching report on the LCCC programme. The section below simply outlines the contribution of this evaluation to these eight cross cutting 'big questions'.

1. Does community-led delivery drive a broad uptake of low carbon technologies and lifestyles?

Stakeholders and local project teams, across different models of community-led delivery, were of the view that communities are well placed to deliver the drive towards low carbon technologies and lifestyles. Reasons for this included: the greater trust they felt was associated with their role being 'local' (as opposed to being from national government or a commercial, private organisation); their deep understanding of the local area and needs within it; and, their

59

ability to engage the wider community and to bring about behaviour change. Some local project teams which were led by community groups felt they were particularly well placed to drive behaviour change in their area (as described in section 5.2). The five strand evaluation programme overall and the overarching report on the LCCC programme will provide more evidence as to whether community-led delivery can drive a broad uptake of low carbon technologies and lifestyles.

2. Does a community focus change people's attitudes and beliefs in relation to larger energy solutions (e.g. acceptability of wind farms?)

There is evidence from this evaluation that an impact of the LCCC has been to engage the community in low carbon and sustainable living (section 6.4). It may be that an effect of engaging the community in low carbon and sustainable living is to change people's attitudes and beliefs in relation to larger energy solutions. This question will also be addressed more fully by the five strand evaluation in the overarching DECC report on the LCCC programme.

3. Are community-led solutions scalable and replicable and, if so, what are the key components for any blueprint?

The current evaluation found that it was widely believed that participation in the LCCC was only achievable for well established or well developed groups, due to the delivery challenges and the tight timescales involved. However, many stakeholders, including policy makers and community representatives, believed that similar projects could in theory work in communities that did not necessarily already have well-established groups. It was widely argued that it was the stringent requirements of the LCCC programme – particularly timescales, but also the focus on outcomes rather than development – which caused challenges for the communities taking part in the LCCC. Through interviews with policy makers, stakeholders and project teams, we have identified a number of success factors for community led solutions to be replicable:

- An individual or group of individuals who are passionate about low carbon work, committed, willing and able to devote their spare time to this kind of project

- Skills, experience or confidence with specific technologies or project delivery or management

- Strong links to the community, and links to other organisations such as local authorities or third sector organisations

- For newer or less experienced groups:

    o To make community-led solutions workable for community groups which are smaller/ newer or have less experience, stakeholders pointed to the need to design support packages which are tailored to the various developmental stages of communities

    o Newer or less experienced community groups would need more time to deliver this kind of work, particularly at the planning stage to engage the community and to prepare applications.

4. Do community led solutions enable joined up and integrated deployment of government's policies and programmes and, if so, what does this mean for government's approach to the low carbon delivery landscape?

This evaluation has provided some evidence to demonstrate that community led solutions can enable deployment of government policies and programmes. Interview data from local project teams suggests they went on a steep learning curve through participating in the LCCC and this has provided invaluable experience for them to draw on for future work. In addition to the skills and resources developed, interview data suggests that participation in the LCCC created an appetite in many of the local project teams to work with central government in future, building on the resources and skills developed through the LCCC.

Further evidence for community led solutions enabling joined up and integrated deployment of policies and programmes comes from the range and number of initiatives some of the local project teams have been involved in. For example, many of the local project groups have been or are involved in other low carbon initiatives (such as Transition towns, NESTA's *Big Green Challenge* or the London *Low Carbon Zones*, described in 2.3). Finally, as discussed in section 5.3, many of the LCCCs have made plans to continue their low carbon work in the future.

These findings suggest that the government could build on the invaluable resources and appetites built up through the community-led delivery of the LCCC and work with these communities to deliver low carbon policies and programmes in the future.

5. How can community-led delivery be supported and sustained? What finance mechanisms, governance structures, community involvement, and ownership models work?

This evaluation has uncovered a number of factors that contribute to successful and sustainable community led delivery; below we summarise some of these mechanisms and characteristics.

- All the LCCC project models differ in their exact size, shape and composition. Whilst the LCCC has demonstrated the importance of flexibility; all successful models are underpinned by clear governance structures which support transparency and accountability to local people. Links to local democratic structures (such as parish councils or locally elected members) or to established and trusted local community groups (such as community development trusts or community associations) support good governance.

- Financial models which focus on community ownership and clearly bind resource to activities that benefit their local community seemed to be well received and trusted by wider communities. Some of the LCCC projects have been able to lever (as short term loans or donations) temporary or additional resource (money, materials, labour) into projects because it was clear these resources were being used for wider community benefit not private or personal gain

- Community involvement is most successful and sustained where local projects incorporate a range of local interests and enable communities to achieve and embed long held goals e.g. refurbishing community buildings, opening up new community spaces or facilities, linking local groups and improving local relationships.

- Many local project groups developed new legal structures, such as social enterprises or community energy companies. These models were highlighted by local project teams as helping to ensure the longer term sustainability of their work, for example by providing a vehicle to receive money from their investments (from FITs or loans) which ensured the money would be put towards future community sustainable energy projects. A longer term focus on these local project teams would enable a greater understanding of which models are important for the sustainability of community led solutions.

6. What are the wider environmental, social and economic impacts of community-led delivery?

The parallel evaluation strand on the householder experience (strand 2), and the evaluation of energy consumption and carbon savings in the LCCC communities (strand 1) provide the main data for assessing the overall impacts of the LCCC programme. The current evaluation therefore complements evaluation strands 1 and 2 by exploring a more subjective assessment of the outcomes the projects think they have achieved in their communities.

Local project teams described an impressive range of outcomes they perceive to have arisen through participation in the LCCC, which demonstrate the wider environmental, social and economic impacts which they believe can be achieved through community led delivery.

Some of the local project teams reported that their projects had resulted in reduced fuel bills for those living with low-carbon technologies/ measures. Whilst local project teams are currently gathering data on these outcomes, one site reported that the installation of low carbon technologies on one housing estate had led to a reduction in rent arrears through reduced fuel poverty. A range of social benefits were also identified by local projects. The projects gave community members a way to get involved, fired up their enthusiasm for getting involved in other community and voluntary projects, and there were reports of community members feeling a renewed sense of pride and confidence in the area.

Whilst the overarching evaluation report will provide more information on the wider environmental impacts of the LCCC, this evaluation provides the perceptions of local project teams of how they think they have stimulated wider pro-environmental behaviour change. For example, local project teams described examples of households within the LCCC communities installing their own (non LCCC-funded) technologies, of school children and parents monitoring (and reducing) fuel consumption in the home and the setting up of local markets to reduce fuel use.

7. What are the implications of the LCCC to the way national government designs and delivers programmes related to local action and the community sector?

Through the evaluation it has been possible to identify the implications of the LCCC to the way government designs and delivers programmes related to local action and the community sector. These are summarised here and explored in more detail below:

Lesson 1: Any future national programmes of this sort must carefully consider the timing and process at the start. Inappropriate application, planning and delivery timescales can prevent communities with fewer resources or skills from gaining access to such programmes. Advance notice of new funding streams should be identified and publicised well in advance of deadlines, to give communities of all sorts time to plan and apply.

Lesson 2: Support offered to communities needs to be tailored to their specific needs and developed with them in a collaborative manner.

Lesson 3: Government involvement in projects such as the LCCC can go beyond setting project requirements and deadlines and providing funds and also include visits to local project teams and other longer term links that help them to understand the contexts in which policy is being delivered.

Lesson 4: Local project teams and steering group members were keen to continue their involvement in the LCCC to share learning.

Lesson 5: Government can build on the successes of and lessons from the LCCC to ensure that future local energy initiatives can be supported through partnerships with known and trusted community organisations with proven experience of working at a community level

Lesson 6: National programmes have particular value in supporting community-led projects to deliver low carbon work, both for the local projects and in informing future national policy.

Lesson 7: Future national community-led programmes need to include explicit arrangements for the development and sharing of learning from the start, in order to maximise the potential for that learning to inform and influence future national government policy and practice.

8. **Did the LCCC as a programme create a buzz or stimulate delivery beyond the LCCC (either in terms of influencing other communities or encouraging momentum and activities in the community post-LCCC)?**

Evidence from our evaluation suggests that the LCCC programme has created a buzz and stimulated delivery beyond the LCCC. For example (as described in chapter 6 on outputs and outcomes), there are anecdotal reports from local project teams that participation in the LCCC has stimulated wide, active involvement from people living and working in the participating communities. Local project teams described a number of new activities and groups forming as a result of the LCCC delivery, e.g. a community shop, a revived parish council, multiple residents' associations, a solar buying club and a community cinema. According to the local project teams, participation in the LCCC also stimulated involvement from visitors, with local project teams describing renewed interest in their work from community groups and organisations. There were multiple examples of positive partnerships forming as a result of the LCCC: with public bodies, academic organisations and the private sector.

Whilst there were mixed views as to the impact of the LCCC on DECC and wider government policy and practice, some interviewees were clear that the LCCC programme had created a 'buzz' and momentum around community-led delivery. According to interviewees, this was evidenced through attendance and debate at the CCAA event; the focus on communities in the Local Energy Assessment Fund (LEAF); the move to involve communities in the Green Deal; and the community revolving fund scheduled for April 2012, which was in response to feedback from the LCCC via the Community Online site.

7.4 Lessons for the future

Based on these evaluation findings, it has been possible to identify a number of lessons for future programmes, particularly those relating to community-led energy initiatives. These are set out below.

Timescales

The challenging timescale for delivering projects was referred to repeatedly in the evaluation. The stark difference between the pace of 'real world delivery' in communities and the 'hard and fast, financial spending deadlines' of government caused tension and stress. If government is committed to working with communities in this way in the future, this tension needs either to be resolved or, if this is not possible, there needs to be an explicit discussion about tight timescales so that local project teams can consider their implications fully.

Lesson 1: Any future national programmes of this sort must carefully consider the timing and process at the start. Inappropriate application, planning and delivery timescales can prevent communities with fewer resources or skills from gaining access to such programmes. Advance notice of new funding streams should be identified and publicised well in advance of deadlines, to give communities of all sorts time to plan and apply.

Contributors to the evaluation focused on:

- Ensuring assessors have sufficient time to consider the feasibility of applications and how the local project team selection links to (or does not) the overall project objectives

- Increasing the time available for preparing applications, so that communities have enough time to determine the feasibility of their plans and consider some of the legal aspects, so helping to encourage participation from communities with limited experience of bid writing

- Consider a two-stage bid writing process: an initial short first stage would 'weed out' some groups and hence reduce the field for the second stage, during which groups should be able to access support to prepare and finalise their bids, if required

- Front-load timing, so that scoping and planning can be done thoroughly and in detail: "If you rush things at the front end then you end up spending a lot of time at the back end trying to sort out things at the end"

- Timing the main activities enabling review, reflection, sharing learning and input to government policy makers after the main physical development and installation activities have been completed makes it much easier for key community members to participate.

Support and development of communities

The processes through which communities develop their skills and capacity to achieve the ambitions of projects such as those funded by the LCCC need to be better understood and supported. This requires thinking of the effective development of local groups and communities as an outcome in itself as well as a means to an end. This in turn means giving thought to the differences between communities: not all will start at the same place nor develop in the same way.

Lesson 2: Support offered to communities needs to be tailored to their specific needs and developed with them in a collaborative manner.

Advice and support for engagement and behaviour change are valuable, and so too are technical and legal advice. A list of 'approved advisors', and guidance on sources of funding, would help to ensure that communities can easily find and access sound expert advice on these matters.

Stay involved

DECC's expertise and interest was valued by the local project teams: they would like DECC to stay involved and those who were aware of the 'customer closeness visits' thought them a good initiative. Project delivery and outcomes are likely to be enhanced if policy-makers understand how policy works 'on the ground'.

Lesson 3: Government involvement in projects such as the LCCC can go beyond setting project requirements and deadlines and providing funds and also include visits to local project teams and other longer term links that help them to understand the contexts in which policy is being delivered.

Share learning now

Channels for sharing learning are effective only if people use them and people will use them only if they find value in so doing. Whilst local project teams were less enthusiastic about sharing learning during the projects, focused as they were on delivery, they are now keen to reflect on their experiences of the LCCC: both local project teams and steering group members expressed interest in participating in further events to share learning. Changing behaviour is likely to be evident over longer time-scales than project delivery, and opportunities to continue discussions will help to ensure that this learning is not lost.

Lesson 4: Local project teams and steering group members were keen to continue their involvement in the LCCC to share learning.

Working with the power of communities

Community groups believe they are more likely to be trusted by local people in relation to implementing low carbon measures because they are perceived to be independent, not associated with self-interest and private profit, as energy and other private companies are. Therefore community groups are well-placed to engage with households, build trusting relationships over time and use this influence to encourage and embed behaviour change.

Communities are of the view they can play a vital role in encouraging the uptake and long term engagement in a scheme such as Green Deal and Smart Meters. They believe that the choices that householders might make, and their use of new technologies and monitoring equipment, can be supported and influenced by community groups as a source of trusted, independent advice. In addition, communities believe that experienced and knowledgeable community members can make the case to householders of what's good for their homes and affordable to them, and can revisit and talk to individuals on an ongoing basis. This could be a way of avoiding wasted efforts, such as simply giving people energy-saving lightbulbs or shower timers but having no way of ensuring or knowing whether they are being put to use by the recipients.

Lesson 5: Government can build on the successes of and lessons from the LCCC to ensure that future local energy initiatives can be supported through partnerships with known and trusted community organisations with proven experience of working at a community level

National programme to support community-led projects

A number of findings in this evaluation point to the value of a national programme to support community-led projects. Local project teams have benefited from the credibility and confidence resulting from national government support, opportunities to share experience with others working on similar types of activities around the UK, and access to a range of national resources. There have also been examples of learning from the LCCC being accessed by national government (e.g. policy workshops with DECC, Cabinet Office, DECC policy visits, and the CCAA conference) and evidence of wider national outcomes in the form of a 'buzz' and momentum around community-led delivery.

Lesson 6: National programmes have particular value in supporting community-led projects to deliver low carbon work, both for the local projects and in informing future national policy.

Influencing national government policy and practice

The LCCC provided some useful opportunities, later in the programme, to enable a form of co-inquiry through which local people could reflect on the specific barriers, opportunities, decision making and delivery processes on the ground, with a view to informing and influencing national government policy and practice. Evidence was found of examples where this learning had been passed directly to DECC policy makers (e.g. the four national policy workshops) and to others in government (e.g. Cabinet Office). However, these opportunities may have been more coherent and effective if it had been clear from the start that there was an expectation to develop local thinking about the policy implications of the programme (through community engagement and review activities), and for learning from the programme to have national influence.

Lesson 7: Future national community-led programmes need to include explicit arrangements for the development and sharing of learning from the start, in order to maximise the potential for that learning to inform and influence future national government policy and practice.

Appendix 1 Descriptions of the LCCC projects

This section presents a summary of each of the LCCC projects which completed their installations, including the type of area and the focus of the technologies installed[23]. The projects are summarised in the following table and described more fully below.

Summary of projects

Local project team	Type of delivery model	Type of area	Focus of technologies
England			
Ashton Hayes Parish Council	Community led	Semi rural	Domestic buildings
Chale Community Project	Third sector led	Rural, deprived	Domestic buildings
Exmoor National Park	Led by other type of public body	Rural	Community-scale renewable energy generation
Haringey Council	Local authority led	Urban	Non domestic buildings
Hook Norton	Community led	Rural	Community-scale renewable energy generation
Kirklees	Local authority led	Urban, deprived	Domestic buildings
Lancaster Co-Housing	Led by other type public body	Semi rural	Community-scale renewable energy generation
Low Carbon Living Ladock	Community led	Rural	Community-scale renewable energy generation
The Meadows	Third sector led	Urban, deprived	Domestic buildings
Middlesborough	Third sector led	Urban, deprived	Domestic buildings
Reepham	Community led	Semi rural	Domestic buildings

---

[23] The project descriptions are taken from the Low Carbon Communities Challenge Interim Report 2010/11, DECC, (July 2011) pp8-13

Sustainable Blacon	Third sector led	Urban, deprived	Domestic buildings
Transition Town Totnes	Third sector led	Urban	Domestic buildings
Whitehill-Bordon EcoTown	Local authority led	Urban	Domestic buildings
Wales			
Awel Aman Tawe	Community led	Rural	Community-scale renewable energy generation
Cwmclydach Community	Third sector led	Rural	Community-scale renewable energy generation
Lammas Community	Community led	Rural	Behaviour change focus
Northern Ireland			
Camphill Community Glencraig	Third sector led	Rural	Community-scale renewable energy generation

Description of projects

ENGLAND

Ashton Hayes Parish Council, Cheshire: In 2011, with the help of an LCCC grant, Ashton Hayes built a low carbon sports pavilion with a bank of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels that are used to help charge a community owned electric vehicle (EV), the Nissan Leaf. The building has extremely low energy use and will serve as an exemplar to the many visitors to the village and be used to help educate children on the practicalities of renewable energy systems - air source heat pumps and solar power plus intelligent building control and insulation. The EV will be managed via the Commonwheels system that also enables village residents to access fuel efficient cars when travelling around UK. The aim is to enhance rural transport for people 18 and over and encourage residents to save money by owning fewer cars while encouraging them to purchase more EVs. The community has also worked with the primary school to improve the school building's efficiency and constructed two new low carbon classrooms complete with PV arrays that will help to power the school and feed into the village microgrid. This innovative microgrid project is supported by Scottish Power Networks in conjunction with EA Technology Ltd and the University of Chester and will focus on demand side management and associated behavioural change. Many local firms and organisations have supported the community since the 'Going Carbon Neutral Project' started in early 2006 - notably the RSK group, M&M Associates and the Carbon Leapfrog Charity. The local council has also given its full backing, installing a 'carbon neutral inspired' footpath linking Ashton Hayes to the nearby railway station - resulting in a four-fold increase in rail use. The village is now being seen as a working example of the Big Society - a 23% reduced carbon footprint, thriving community owned shop, one of the country's most active 'Timebanks' and a new community owned recreation field and playground. The very active Parish Council is now working with residents to try to purchase the local pub and transform it into a sustainable meeting place.

Chale Community Project, Isle of Wight: This project is bringing an entire rural off-gas community out of fuel poverty, with an integrated approach to reducing carbon focused around the intensive renewables retrofit of 67 homes on a 1970s housing estate using a mix of air source heat pumps and solar PV panels. Additional funding is being provided by the social landlord, Southern Housing Group, to ensure all properties are upgraded to Decent Homes+ standard, specifically targeting improved windows and loft insulation. The performance of the renewables technologies will be closely metered and monitored over different time periods. It is estimated that as a result of the project, an additional 2,000 solar PVs will be installed on housing association and private properties on the Isle of Wight by the end of 2012. To maximise the impact of the project, the Ellen MacArthur Foundation is coordinating project management and communications, as well as supporting the provision of free consultancy on energy efficiency to all homes in Chale and a training programme for people interested in careers in the renewables and energy efficiency sector. The entire village will also benefit from a revolving community fund generated from the Feed-in-Tariff on a number of PV installations which will be used for future sustainability-related projects in the village.

Exmoor National Park, Somerset and Devon: The LCCC funding is being used by Carbon Neutral Exmoor to fund a range of exemplar sustainable energy projects including insulation, wood heating, solar PV, micro-hydro and wind power in villages that have been participating in community sustainable energy planning (Dunster, Parracombe, Porlock, Roadwater, Wheddon Cross and Wootton Courtenay). Using other funding sources, these villages are also working with others. For example, they have supported Dulverton, Timberscombe, Challacombe and Lynton in developing projects. A Low Carbon Communities Officer has been recruited by Exmoor National Park Authority to provide support to villages in developing local, low carbon plans to engage the community in making the transition to low carbon living. A revolving fund has been set up so that a proportion of the income generated by projects can be used to fund future low carbon initiatives. A knowledge sharing framework is being developed, which alongside the revolving fund should leave a lasting legacy for this project, enabling Exmoor to achieve carbon neutrality.

Haringey Council, North London: This project is an integrated approach involving a diverse range of interventions and partner organisations. Muswell Hill Sustainability Group provides strong community leadership with Haringey Council providing support and resources. The project includes solar PV installations on four schools to be used as a learning tool and to encourage behaviour change, a sustainable learning eco-cabin, innovative cycle parking, an eco-house display stand for public engagement events, and a community renewable energy company that has gained funding to generate income for carbon reduction measures in the community. LCCC projects are building on action already taking place within the Muswell Hill Low Carbon Zone.

Hook Norton, Oxfordshire: The project is funding innovations across the 2500-strong community, including the local primary school (i.e. solar PV and solar thermal panels to provide hot water to different parts of the school, a heat recovery system, and upgrade of the roof insulation); households (i.e. interest free loans for a whole-house retro-fit of six homes); insulating and installing renewable technologies such as wood pellet boilers, air source heat pumps, solar PV and thermal panels on a further 20 homes and the village shop; the local brewery (i.e. installing a bio-diesel tank to supply bio-diesel fuel for the vehicles of 50 households and also to fuel the 3 diesel car pool cars for the community); and a community wind turbine (i.e. installing a 40m Meteorological Mast to measure wind speed and a small 10-20kW wind turbine as part of exploring the potential for a larger community turbine). All these activities will provide income back in to a rolling low carbon fund so that the community can continue to take action for the next 10-20 years. www.hn-lc.org.uk

Kirklees Council, Yorkshire: Greening the Gap in Hillhouse has retrofitted PV systems and other energy efficiency measures onto 53 domestic properties and four privately run community centres in one of the most deprived, ethnically diverse communities in the UK. Using the assignment of FIT revenues brought in through the project a Community low carbon fund will be created to ensure further work of a similar nature can be completed in future years. The project has also: delivered multiple training initiatives supporting energy efficiency to community centre operatives and householders;

delivered installer training to several groups and been a catalyst for a green handyman training scheme; improved membership of the landlords and private rented property accreditation scheme. The project has built upon strong multi-agency partnerships aimed at carbon reduction and social wellbeing, with a team that has very successfully communicated best practice widely.

Lancaster Co-Housing, Lancashire: Halton is looking to install a hydro turbine into the River Lune, and three solar roofs; and incorporate carbon saving measures in the renovation of Halton Mill, which will provide office and workshop space for local businesses. The profits, generated from the government's clean energy cashback scheme, and from rents, will be ploughed back into further carbon reduction projects such as Halton Energy Network which will help households reduce their domestic carbon emissions.

Low Carbon Living Ladock, Cornwall: The project is a retrofit programme to upgrade homes, schools, community halls and businesses with a combination of energy efficiency measures and microgeneration technology, alongside the installation of a community-owned wind turbine. A community managed fund has been set up to ensure that the income generated is retained as a rolling resource that will benefit the wider community through further low carbon investment. In addition, a carbon sequestration project has seen over 500 fruit and nut trees planted to naturally absorb and hold carbon while providing a boost to local food production. The initial delivery of the project was led by the Cornish sustainable energy charity Community Energy Plus.

The Meadows, Nottingham: The Meadows Ozone Energy Services is a company formed by local people in the Meadows and has aspirations to change an inner city area with multiple deprivation levels to become an exemplar to other similar inner city communities. The Meadows has a housing stock of approx 4000 houses with a mixture of housing types including over 1000 Victorian terraced houses that are hard to insulate. The project seeks to demonstrate that low carbon savings can help reduce fuel poverty. They have installed solar PV panels on 25 social houses, 21 low income family houses and eight where the resident has paid fifty per cent of the costs themselves. They have also put installations on a local community garden building and three local primary schools to ensure that the learning and the value is spread across the wider community as there are over 30 languages spoken in the community so the children need to help the parents and share their learning from the schools. An energy assessor has worked with over 100 families who have experienced fuel debt to install an energy cost meter and advise them on how to save energy. The three local schools are also with the support of British Gas, becoming flagship schools for British Gas' *Project Green*.

Middlesbrough: This projects is in a mixed tenure estate of 3250 people which is among the top 20% of disadvantaged areas in England. The LCCC funded Eco-Easterside project will save residents money on household bills by reducing energy use. Two wind turbines will be installed in the grounds of Easterside and St Thomas More primary schools, and other demonstration renewable technologies will be fitted to two community buildings, which will in turn generate income for the community from the government's clean energy cashback scheme. 150 homes will be fitted with energy monitors, and householders will be helped to make sure their homes have adequate insulation. Renewable energy systems – solar hot water and air-source heat pumps – will be fitted to 20 homes. Residents will also be encouraged to reduce carbon emissions by using sustainable modes of transport and growing more of their own food.

Reepham, Norfolk: LCCC funding has supported 18 community groups in the town to develop and deliver low carbon projects covering nine activities: increased thermal performance of buildings, renewable heating and hot water, low energy lighting, renewable energy, sustainable transport, local food, energy efficient appliances, recycling and water projects. The projects cover the full range of technologies and solutions including: insulation, air source heat pumps, ground source heat pumps (bore hole and horizontal), solar thermal and solar PV, underfloor heating, energy efficient boilers, biomass boilers, biofuel (from used cooking oil) for heating, low energy and LED lighting, wind power, low emission car club vehicles, electric vehicles, allotments and energy efficient appliances. These projects have been completed across housing trust properties, schools, churches and community

buildings. Reepham LCCC projects are co-ordinated by a local community interest company. The projects have been developed and delivered by existing local organisations and community groups, with each community group having a community champion. www.reephamchallenge.org

Sustainable Blacon, Cheshire: Sustainable Blacon aims to generate a model sustainable urban community with focus on green spaces, transport energy and social enterprises. There are two strands to the programme which aims to assist people cut their fuel consumption and emissions by 20% by concentrating on behavioural change and in particular household energy expenditure: *Two Demonstration Houses* – so adults and school children in particular can see and touch improvements that they can make to their home and lifestyle and talk to local volunteers with support from paid staff and supporting advice organisations (e.g. Energy Saving Trust and Cheshire West and Chester Council); and the *Energy Management Programme* - a community-based education programme focussed on energy reduction and supported by the latest low carbon energy technologies. 150 households have been recruited to attend the 12 month programme at the end of which an optional energy efficiency makeover is available. The 150 is subdivided into three groups of 50 households each. One group has no additional energy technology ('control' group), the second has a real time device ('passive' group) advising on electricity use, the third has technology which permits programming of heating and electrical appliances ('active' group). The programme is also examining the social capital gain from this approach.

Transition Town Totnes, Devon: 'Transition Streets' involves 44 streets across Totnes (each with eight households), chosen to represent the demographics and housing stock of Totnes. Participating households undertake a programme of behaviour change called 'Transition Together' which helps them reduce their home energy bills (and also looks at water, waste, local food and transport). Participants are then eligible to apply for subsidised solar PV systems, with low income households harnessing feed in tariffs to enable the repayment of low-interest loans from the local authority.

Whitehill-Bordon Eco Town, East Hampshire: The funding is supporting a programme of energy efficiency advice and interest free loans to support in-home energy saving improvements such as the installation of PV, double glazing and boilers. Under a separate project, loft and cavity wall insulation is provided free of charge to householders. The loans have proved so popular that the scheme is now oversubscribed with 27 applications. Members of the Eco-town team provided information and discussed energy-saving techniques with residents at popular local events (e.g. 'Wood Day', 'Apple Tasting Day' and the Christmas Festival) to raise awareness about the loans and encourage behaviour change. The community project worker has also visited schools and community groups (e.g. Brownies) to talk to pupils about how they can make their homes more sustainable. The Environment Centre has also visited schools, distributed energy monitors to energy champions and provided energy savings tips to members of the community. The Eco-town team is in the process of leasing a shop in the shopping centre where they will set up an exhibition and provide a drop-in service for residents and businesses where they can come and chat about energy-saving measures.

WALES

Awel Aman Tawe: Planning consent has been secured to put two wind turbines with a capacity of 4MW on the Mynydd y Gwrhyd mountain, 20 miles north of Swansea. The LCCC money will help towards the capital costs with the rest coming from other grants and 80% from the banks. The wind farm will sell electricity and use the income to fund low carbon community regeneration in the 12 villages which surround the windfarm. The community also has plans to open a zero carbon cafe, allotments and a biodiesel pump.

The Cwmclydach Community: The Cwmclydach Community Blaenclydach is a former mining village and is one of the most deprived areas in Wales. The money from LCCC will help pay for one small hydro turbine in the nearby Cambrian Country Park that will feed the national grid and, under the government's Renewable Obligation Certificate scheme, will generate an income for the Cwmclydach Community Development Trust to ensure the long term sustainability of two community buildings. The

Trust is already working with key organisations including schools to reduce energy use and its partner the Cambrian Village Trust, has secured extra funding to extend their Café/ Bar plus install a rainwater harvesting system, PV panels and solar water heating.

Lammas Community: The funding is focused on the development of a community hub building which will serve as a hub for the village and a centre for education on low impact living for the wider world. The outcome is expected to be a replicable, integrated rural sustainable development model. The project will be delivered using a combination of green technologies (hydro electricity generation, passive solar gain, thermal mass stores, biomass heating), permaculture cultivation methods and natural building techniques.

NORTHERN IRELAND

Camphill Community Glencraig: This LCCC project is in the process of installing a 1.5 km biomass district heating system for 21 mixed buildings which includes some domestic houses, some large life sharing households for children, young adults and adults with a learning disability and their carers, as well as workshops, school buildings and cultural buildings. Fuel will be locally sourced low quality virgin wood with moisture contents up to 65%. This will reduce wood waste in the area and will help to reduce bills and dependence on fossil fuels. Engagement with the wider community is well underway creating a buzz in the area and further afield. Other Camphill Communities in Scotland and England are eagerly awaiting the outcome of the Glencraig project with the intent of benefitting from the learning and subsequent replication of the scheme. www.glencraig.org.uk or Facebook (Glencraig Biomass Project).

Appendix 2 Details of LCCC project measures and technologies

Local project teams were asked to complete an audit tool as part of this evaluation, showing the specific low carbon technologies and measures used (it assumes all measures/technologies were installed using LCCC capital funding); and the engagement activities undertaken to encourage behaviour change. Details of the LCCC measures and low carbon technologies installed are in the tables below. Details of the engagement activities undertaken to encourage behaviour change are in Appendix 3, below.

ENGLAND

Ashton Hayes Parish Council

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Solar PV Array	1	9.7 kWp	Sports Pavilion	100%
Solar PV Array	1	15 kWp	Village Primary School	100%
Low Carbon Sports Pavilion	1		Sports field	100%
Air Source Heat Pump	1	No data as yet	Sports Pavilion	100%

Chale Community Project

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
In Chale				
Air source heat pumps	65	26 x 5.5kW, 30 x 8.5kW or 1 x 14kW	Domestic	100%
Metering/Monitoring Programme	41		Domestic	100%

73

Exmoor National Park

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Wind turbine	1	12 kW	Public sector	100%
Solar PV	1	4 kW	Commercial building (pub)	92%
Solar PV	3	4 kW (12 kW total)	Community	96%
Solar PV	1	3 kW	Community	94%
Solar PV	3	2.5 kW (7.5 kW total)	Community	95%
Solar PV	1	2 kW	Community owned shop	93%
Solar hot water heating	2	8 flat plate collectors	Commercial building (pub)	100%
Solar-Energie heat pump/solar system	1	11 kW	Community	100%
Wood pellet heating system		35 kW	Community/public	100%
Wood pellet heating system		50 kW	Community	100%
Wood pellet heating system	1	48 kW	Community	96%
Wood gasification boiler and radiators	1	60 kW	Community	85%
Internal wall insulation	2	n/a	Community	68%
Sheep's wool insulation	1	n/a	Community	100%
Secondary glazing	1	n/a	Community	100%

Haringey Council

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC
Solar PV	5	Muswell Hill Methodist Church En10ergy (12kw) M&S En10ergy (15 kw) Fortismere (21.15kw) Rhodes Avenue (5.6 Kw) Alexandra Park (5.6 kw)	1 Church 1 Business (M&S) 3 Schools	100% 70% 100%

Hook Norton

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
11 Beanacre – Double glazing	18		Domestic	100%
5 Bell Hill – Secondary double glazing	4	N/A	Domestic	100%
Chapel Cottage – Solar PV	12	2.88 kWp Est 2472.2 kWh p.a.	Domestic	100%
Cornwallis – Solar PV	6	1.05 kWp Est 627 kWh p.a.	Domestic	100%
Endeavour – Solar PV	16	3.76 kWp	Domestic	100%
Erradale – Solar PV	10	1.8 kWp 1504.8 kWh	Domestic	100%
Glyndwr House – Solar PV	6	1.05 kWp Est 901.3 kWh p.a.	Domestic	100%
Glyndwr House – Solar Thermal	1	Est 1470 kWh p.a	Domestic	100%
2 The Green – Insulation	1	N/A	Domestic	100%
2 The Green – Solar Thermal	2		Domestic	100%

2 The Green – Wood Pellet Boiler	1	21KW	Domestic	100%
Hare Barn - Secondary windows	6		Domestic	100%
Hare Barn – heat recovery unit	1		Domestic	100%
Hare Barn – air source heat pump	1		Domestic	100%
Hare Cottage – ventilation - whole house ventilation system with heat recovery	1		Domestic	50%
Hare Cottage - double glazed hardwood windows	4		Domestic	100%
Hicks Lodge – solar PV	12	2.1 kWp Est 1488.5 kWh	Domestic	100%
39 Hollybush – double glazing conservatory	1	N/A	Domestic	100%
Lane End Cottage – double glazing	6	N/A	Domestic	10%
Lyra – Solar PV panels	12	2kWp peak electricity Est 2,200kWh p.a.	Domestic	100%
Monivea – Cavity Wall insulation	1	N/A	Domestic	100%
Croker house – solar PV	21 panels	3.6kWp peak electricity Est 4,000kWh p.a.	Domestic	40%
Croker house – solar thermal water heating	1	30 tube panel Est 2,200kWh p.a.	Domestic	100%
Croker house - air source heat pumps	2	14.5kW and 8.5kW Est total 33,000kWh p.a.	Domestic	100%
Endeavour - solar panels	16	3.76 kWp Est 4,000kWh p.a.	Domestic	80%
Endeavour - solar thermal water heating	1	30 tube panel Est 2,200kWh p.a.	Domestic	80%
Homestead – solar panels	12	2.1 kWp 1802 kWh p.a.	Domestic	100%
Homestead – insulation	1	N/A	Domestic	100%
Old post office – insulation	1	N/A	Domestic	100%
Old post office – solar thermal	2	N/A	Domestic	100%
Scotland Mount – solar pv	20	3.8 kWp	Domestic	100%
Hook Norton Baptist Church – solar PV		3kWp Est 3,000kWh p.a.	Community	100%
Hook Norton Primary School – solar panels	80	17.4kW peak Est 20,000kWh p.a.	Community	100%
Hook Norton Primary School- solar thermal hot water systems	3		Community	100%

Kirklees Council

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC? Percentage
1.68 kWp PV Array	x 42	1.68kWp x 42 Total Estimated Annual Outputs: • Generation 59,304 kWh	Domestic Properties – Stone built Terraced 2 storey	51%
2.1 kWp PV Array	X 11	2.1 kWp x 11 Total Estimated Annual Outputs • Generation 19,536 kWh	Domestic Properties – Stone built Terraced 2 storey	19%
3.78 kWp PV Array	1	Total Estimated Annual Outputs: • Generation 3,179	Birkbees Community Centre	4.25%
2.94 kWp PV Array	1	Total Estimated Annual Outputs: • Generation 2,523	Chinese Community Centre	2.5%
17.85 kWp PV Array	1	Total Estimated Annual Outputs: • Generation 16,817	Hudawi Community Centre	11%
8.19 kWp PV Array	1	Total Estimated Annual Outputs: • Generation 5,886	Muslim Community Centre	6%
Domestic Loft Insulation	3 Properties		Domestic – Stone built Terraced 2 storey	0.25%
Domestic Loft Insulation	6 Properties		Domestic – Stone built Terraced 2 storey	N/A Match funded through other ESTAC/Council Schemes
Loft Insulation to depth **270mm**	1 Community Centre		Muslim Community Centre	0.5%
Loft Insulation to depth **270mm**	1 Community Centre		Chinese Community Centre	0.25%
Cavity Wall Insulation	1 Community		Chinese Community Centre	1.25%

	Centre			
New Gas Central Heating Boiler, Thermostatic Controls and Central Heating Upgrades	1 Community Centre		Muslim Community Centre	2%
New Gas Central Heating Boiler, Thermostatic Controls and Central Heating Upgrades.	1 Community Centre		Chinese Community Centre	1.25%
Double Glazed Window and Door Units (formerly single glazed units)	1 Community Centre		Muslim Community Centre	N/A match funded from Kirklees Council Leisure Services Grant
Double Glazed Window and Door Units (formerly single glazed units)	1 Community Centre		Chinese Community Centre	0.75%

Lancaster Co Housing

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Solar PV system	1	21,048 kWh/yr	commercial	100%
Energy Efficiency measures in former mill building, including installing a new, air-tight roof, new double glazed windows and doors, stopping up of all holes.	1		commercial	100%

Low Carbon Ladock Community

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Wind Turbine	1	22000 kWh/year 20 kw rating	Domestic	100%
Photovoltaic	7	10761 kwh/year 10.91 kw rating	Domestic	100%
Photovoltaic	5	9220 kwh/year 10.36 kw rating	Community	100%
Solar Thermal	5	5884 kwh/year 12.74 kw rating (estimated)	Domestic	100%
Ground Source Heat Pump	1	15915 kwh/year 12 kw rating	Community	100%
Ground Source Heat Pump	1	14589 kwh/year (estimated) 11 kw rating	Domestic	100%
Air Source Heat Pump	1	12 kw rating	Domestic	100%
Air Source Heat Pump	1	16 kw rating	Community	100%
Biomass Boiler	1	10 kw rating	Domestic	100%
Biomass Boiler	1	35kw rating	Community	100%
Insulation	1	n/a	Domestic	100%
Insulation	3	n/a	Community	100%
Sequestration (Nut Orchard)	1	n/a	Community	100%

The Meadows

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Solar pv panels	Systems installed on 3 schools	Schools - kW size of each system = 7kw	Public building	100%
Solar pv panels	Systems installed on 1 community building	Community building - kW size of system = 1.2 kw	Public building	100%
Solar pv panels	Systems installed on 55 houses	Houses – kW size of system = 1.2 kw each	domestic	100%

Middlesbrough

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Wind Turbine	2	6kWh-Estimated generation 8673kW yearly each	Commercial	100%
PV Solar (LG)	8	2.02kWh – Estimated generation 1667 kWh yearly each	Domestic (RSL)	100%
PV Solar (Risen)	1	1.48kWh – Estimated generation 1234 kWh yearly	Domestic (private)	100%
PV Solar (Risen)	1	1.11 kWh – Estimated generation 7.87kWh yearly	Domestic (private)	100%
PV Solar (Conergy)	1	5.16kWh – Estimated generation 4301kWh yearly	Commercial	100%
Solar Thermal	6		Domestic (private)	100%
Air to Air Heat Pump	4	8.5kWh each	Domestic (private)	100%

Air to Air Heat Pump	1	10kWh (2 x 5kWh modules)	Commercial	100%
Cavity Wall Insulation	2		Commercial	100%
Cavity Wall Insulation	126		Domestic	100%
Loft Insulation	2		Commercial	100%
Loft Insulation	225		Domestic	100%
Owl Wireless Energy Monitors	465		Domestic	100%
Eon Computer Powerdown	350		Domestic	100%
TV Powerdown	475		Domestic	100%
Rainwater harvesting system	1		Commercial	100%

Reepham

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Wind turbine	1	11kw	School (Reepham Sixth Form College)	100%
Low emission vehicles (car club)	7 low emission vehicles	Reduces CO2 emissions by 12.6 tons per annum	Community (not-for-profit) – (Norfolk Car Club)	100%
A rated appliances in 10 community	30		Community	100%

buildings				
Major refurbishment of 8 housing trust bungalows, including air source heat pumps, radiators, solar thermal hot water and triple glazed windows	8 misubishi ashps, 8 solar thermal hot water, 40 triple glazed windows	8 Mitsubishi domestic air source heat pumps	Domestic / Housing association (Reepham Housing Association)	80%
Low energy street lighting	35 street lights	Reduces energy use by 65%	Community (Town Council)	100%
Low energy lighting	20 properties	Reduces energy use by up to 90%	Commercial (Chamber of Commerce)	100%
Ground source heat pump and low temperature warm air radiators	4 x 25meter horizontal collector	Dimplex SI 24 TE ground source heat pump	Community centre / nursery school (Stimpsons Piece)	100%
Energy efficient radiators and lighting	40 units	Reduces electricity use by 30% for heating and 50% for lighting	Community centre / library (Bircham Centre)	100%
Refurbishment including new boilers, solar thermal hot water and improved thermal performance of buildings	3 new boilers Solar thermal hot water Improved insulation		Community / childrens centre (Whitwell Hall)	100%
Ground source heat pump linked to underfloor heating	3 x 120metre bore holes	14.5 kw Dimplex SI 50 TE	St Michaels community centre	100%
Solar PV		24.53 kw	Reepham High School and Sixth Form College	100%
Allotment sites	2 sites / 6 acres		Community (Reepham Town Council & Reepham Allotments Association)	100%
Electric minibus	1 x 15 seat extended range fast charge minibus (first in UK)	Zero emission at tailpipe Zero emission whole operation as power provided by	Community (to meet the needs of local schools and community groups)	100%

		on site wind turbine and solar pv installations		
Energy efficient boiler	1		St Mary's Church	100%
Solar PV	24 panels	4.4kw	Community centre / nursery school (Stimpsons Piece)	100%
Reepham town hall - secondary glazing,	Whole building		Community building	100%
Reepham town hall – new boiler	1		Community building	100%
Reepham town hall – cavity wall insulation	1		Community building	100%
Whitwell & Reepham station – new biomass boiler & refurbishment of station house and engine shed to improve thermal performance	Biomass boiler Improve thermal performance of two large buildings	80 kw biomass boiler	Community / Charity	100%
Double glaze all windows	Whole school		Primary School	100%
Lag all pipes	Whole School		Primary School	100%
Improve thermal performance of building – secondary glazing	3		Community (Bircham centre)	100%

Sustainable Blacon

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Loft insulation	26		Domestic	100%
Energy efficient external door and frame	3		Domestic	100%
Cavity wall Insulation	6		Domestic	100%

83

Internal wall insulation	5		Domestic	100%
Draft proofing	14		Domestic	100%
Double glazing	3		Domestic	100%
Radiator panels	105		Domestic	100%
TRVs	78		Domestic	100%
Cycling and pipe insulation	3		Domestic	100%
Replacement of an average boiler with a new SEDBUK A-rated condensing boiler (gas)	5		Domestic	100%
Replacement of an average boiler with a new SEDBUK A-rated condensing boiler (gas) + full control package	2		Domestic	100%
Replacement of 2 old storage heaters with modern A-rated storage heaters	1		Domestic	100%
Install Real Time Devices	21		Domestic	100%
Install Energy Management Systems	9		Domestic	100%
Install powerdown plugs	2		Domestic	100%
A+ or A++ rated refrigerator	11		Domestic	100%
A+ or A++ rated washing machine	12		Domestic	66%
A+ or A++ rated washer-dryer	10		Domestic	100%
A rated cooker	5		Domestic	100%
A+ rated dishwasher	1		Domestic	100%
Replace some traditional light bulbs with compact fluorescent light bulb (CFL)	47		Domestic	100%
Replace all traditional light bulbs with compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFL)	3		Domestic	100%
Replace 6 existing halogen spotlights with 6 LEDs	14		Domestic	100%

Totnes Transition Town

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
PV systems	141	163,701KWh/yr	Domestic	44%
PV Systems	1	14KWp	Community Building	83%

Whitehill-Bordon EcoTown

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Photovoltaic panel	20	A range of sizes including 1.1 kWp and 3.96kWp depending on whether any other measures were installed using the loan	Domestic	60%
Boiler	14	90-93% efficiency	Domestic	17%
Double glazing	11		Domestic	19.5%
Wood burner	2		Domestic	1.5%
Gas connection	2		Domestic	1%
Energy efficient fridge and cooker	1 of each	A rated	Domestic	0.5%
Radiator	1		Domestic	0.5%

85

WALES

Awel Aman Tawe

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Plans to install 2 x 2MW wind turbine	2	12,000 Mwh/yr (P90 figure)	Commercial	5% - bank offer letter received from Coop for most of rest

Cwmclydach Community

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Micro Hydro Turbine	1	55 KWh	Community Initiative	100%

Lammas Community

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Community hub building	1	Not yet known	Community Building	100%

NORTHERN IRELAND

Glencraig Camphill Community

Type of low carbon technology/ measure installed	Number of this measure installed	If low carbon technology - Size of measure installed (Estimated generation kWh/yr or kW size)	Where the measure was installed (domestic/commercial)	Proportion of overall cost funded through LCCC?
Wood biomass boiler	1	1.2 MW output. Actual production 20th May 2011	Domestic	67%

		till 30th November 1036 MW/h		
District heating pipes	3200 m	N/A	Domestic	67%
Heat transfer stations	18 units for 23 entities	Annual heat demand approx. 2000,000 kWh/yr	Domestic	67%

Appendix 3 Engagement activities to encourage behaviour change

The tables below show the details of the engagement activities to encourage behaviour change undertaken by the projects, taken from their completed audit tools.

ENGLAND

Ashton Hayes Parish Council

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Carbon footprint survey	House to house survey by student group in May 2010. 116 households responded	University of Chester
Introductory LCCC meeting 7 October 2007	Meeting held in village school to introduce the LCCC project and to gather views about the proposed work. 40 residents attended.	GCN Group
Student work in village, May/June 2011	LCCC evaluation, Appliances survey, Electric car information and promotion of online carbon footprint tool.	University of Chester/GCN Group
Sports Pavilion opening and launch of community electric car.	Formal opening of low carbon sports pavilion (by Deputy Lieutenant of Cheshire), formal opening of play area (Mayor of Chester), launch of 'Letter from the Future' film and launch of community electric car took place as a 'mini festival' on Sunday 3rd July, 2011. It involved AHGCN, AHSRA, Primary school, Village dance class, Community shop, University of Chester, EA Technology, Fordingbridge, Scottish Power Energy Networks, CWaC.	GCN Group, AH Sports and Recreation Association
Letters from the Future film	Film	Kate Harrison/Beth Barlow and children of Ashton Hayes

Chale Green Community Project

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Training – Introduction to Renewable Technologies	BPEC Introduction to Renewable Energy, CSCS Training, First Aid, Eaga: Introduction to Solar PV, Air Source Heat Pumps, Surveying and Information gathering, Installing	David Green/IW College
Training – Domestic Energy Assessor	Level 3 Diploma in Domestic Energy Assessment including EPC training	Vince Wedlock-Ward, SHG
Energy Saving Home Visits	Initial visits to home where renewables are being installed and elsewhere in village of Chale to give energy and water saving advice – 70 visits were carried out	Ray Harrington-Vail, Footprint Trust
Chale Community Contacts	A number of people in the village volunteered to be contacts for the project	Ray Harrington-Vail, Footprint Trust
Chale Junior Gardeners Club (award winning)/orchard	A number of raised beds were built to encourage children to learn about growing their own and healthy, organic eating. Awards: Unlocking the Potential of People Awards 2011 (Peter Atkinson) runner up – Environment) Community Action Awards 2011 – runner up Best Kept Village 2011 – special award Chale Horticultural Society – award Chale Autumn Show – 1st, 2nd, 3rd Heaviest Pumpkin Competition A site for a community orchard is still be sought but there are some promising leads.	Peter Atkinson, Lorraine Cave
Future Energy Event	An information event held in Chale for members of the public wishing to find out more about renewable technologies from a wide range of suppliers.	Malcolm Groves, Ray Harrington-Vail

Discounted bus fare	The project negotiated a special discount for Chale residents to encourage bus use. Numbers using the bus service from Chale have doubled in 12 months. The £2 return fare is still running.	David Green/Malcolm Groves/Southern Vectis
Supplementary bus service run by volunteers	Bus service	Malcolm Groves/Southern Vectis
Community vision	Workshops have started and are ongoing. Local people have had the opportunity to feed into a future vision of Chale.	Malcolm Groves/Katie Steiness
Healthy Living workshops	Workshops focusing on healthy living - planned for 2012	Peter Atkinson/Katie Steiness
Chale Trails	A circular walk celebrating the heritage and biodiversity of Chale, encouraging local people and visitors to walk around the village and increase awareness of flora and fauna - planned for 2012	Mike Howell, Tony Bryant, Dave Badman

Exmoor National Park

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Meeting/workshop	Carbon Neutral Exmoor stakeholders meeting – to consider how key stakeholders identified through stakeholder analysis could contribute towards delivery of LCCC	(Exmoor National Park Authority) ENPA
Events/media activity	Dartmoor and Exmoor Low Carbon Festival 2010 – several events aimed at engaging residents and businesses of Exmoor in relation to low carbon living.	ENPA organises some of the events but encourages communities and other organisations to also organise events
Events	"The learning power of play (Roadwater)" Part of the Dartmoor and Exmoor Low Carbon Festival – organised by Roadwater Village Hall Trust – one of the LCCC funded communities. A family event demonstrating aspects of low carbon living in a 'fun' way	Roadwater Village Hall Trust/Learning from the Land
Event/training	Renewable energy tour demonstrating different renewable	ENPA

	energy technologies across Exmoor to interested members of the public	
Event	Exmoor Food Fair 'local food supermarket' – part of the annual Exmoor Food Fair event which takes place annually in Porlock. The 'local food supermarket' was organised by Porlock residents involved in the LCCC to demonstrate the comparison in food miles between local food and food bought from the supermarket	Porlock Power members
Event/press release	Carbon Neutral Exmoor celebration event – a major event organised to celebrate and raise awareness of the successful installation of all Exmoor projects funded through the LCCC. Guest speaker was Dick Strawbridge ("Scrapheap Challenge", "It's not easy being green", "Celebrity Masterchef"). Capacity audience in Moorland Hall (recipient of LCCC funding). Event was followed by buffet and evening of socialising in the Rest and Be Thankful Inn which also received LCCC funding	ENPA
Newspaper article	Double-page spread in 'Park Life' the National Park Authority's newspaper sent to every household in Exmoor	ENPA
Case studies	Development and publication on ENPA website of comprehensive case studies for all LCCC funded projects	ENPA
Event/press release	Roadwater Village hall launch event celebrating and raising awareness of completion of LCCC funded work attended by more than 100 people on a Saturday morning	Roadwater Village Hall Trust
Event/press release	Porlock launch event celebrating and raising awareness of completion of LCCC funded work	Porlock Power
Event/press release	Parracombe launch event celebrating and raising awareness of completion of LCCC funded work	Sustain Parracombe
Event / volunteering day/press release	Event to celebrate and raise awareness of LCCC work funded at Dunster FC and cricket club. Volunteers also helped to clear	Dunster FC

	vegetation and tidy up ground in preparation for the start of the cricket season	
Event/press release	Wootton Courtenay launch event celebrating and raising awareness of completion of LCCC funded work	Wootton Courtenay Village Hall Committee
Magazine article	Article in 'Exmoor Review' – the annual magazine of the Exmoor Society	Exmoor Society
Training	Energy efficiency and renewable energy training provided by community-based organisation to volunteers from communities where measures funded through the LCCC. Included guidance on how to undertake 'home energy checks'	Forum 21/ENPA
Workshop	Interim review and evaluation workshop for LCCC project	Dialogue by Design/ENPA
Event/press releases	Dartmoor and Exmoor Low Carbon Festival 2011	ENPA and communities
Event	Renewable energy event for tourism businesses using LCCC funded project to demonstrate technologies	ENPA
Event	Community renewable energy event held at venue where LCCC project funded	ENPA
Event	Renewable energy demonstration during Exmoor Food Festival 2011	Porlock Power

Haringey Council

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Business Energy Audits	22 completed, 11 further expressions of interest	Haringey Council working with Middlesex University, Global Action Plan (GAP) and London Sustainability Exchange (LSx)
Home Energy Visits	404 carried out to date to establish resident suitability for small and large energy saving measures (as listed in table above) and provide behaviour change advice	Carried out by Climate Energy

Door Step conversations	452 to date carried out by team of local volunteers to promote Green Home makeover scheme	Carried out by Climate Energy and local community volunteers acting as street representatives
LSx supported engagement events	5 carried out to date including business workshops and information sessions for residents. 5-30 in attendance at each event	Carried out by LSx
Business awards ceremony	30 local businesses in attendance all having had received environmental audits (some outside the Zone), 3 received gold awards for outstanding achievement – cutting their energy use by as much as 30%.	Global Action Plan supported event in addition to LSx and Haringey Council
Community Events	Themed events and workshop on: - Low Carbon Transport, people to try out electric bicycles plus information on car clubs, cycle training etc (30 people) - Solar PV information session, explanation of FIT and offers available (20 people) - Compost give away (500 people) - Low Carbon Loan launch event, Council providing low interest loans (2.5%) on a Pay As You Save basis to residents plus a free detailed Home Energy Retrofit Plan (40) - LED/Halogen lightbulb exchange event and demonstration of low energy lighting (20 people)	En10ergy Muswell Hill Sustainability Group Haringey Council
Community Low Carbon Zone Newsletter	8 editions delivered to 1,000 residents on a quarterly basis. Provides information on offers available, local achievements and up coming events.	Written by residents of the Low Carbon Zone and designed and printed by Haringey Council
Information evenings	Home energy saving and behaviour change x2 Solar renewables – x2 Boilers and Insulation x2 Sustainable food and farming x1 Sustainable Transport x1 20-40 attendees at all events	Muswell Hill Sustainability Group, Low carbon Zone steering group volunteer coordinator
Draught-busting workshops	4 held over 12 months 20+ people at each event highlighting the	Muswell Hill Sustainability Group, low carbon zone steering group volunteer coordinator, Muswell Hill

93

	savings from draught proofing and techniques to fit	100 Homes Project
Additional Information stalls held at community events	Stall set up along Muswell Hill Broadway - 4 weekends in March Muswell Hill Methodist church summer garden party - Jun 2011 Muswell Hill Primary School summer fair - Jul 2010 and 2011 Fortismere School fair – Jul 2010 and Jul 2011 Muswell Hill Festival - Sep 2010 and 2011 (organised by local residents and businesses) Well Oiled Festival, Finsbury Park - Sep 2011 (organised by Transition Finsbury Park) Rhodes Avenue Primary school summer fair (Jul 2010)	Stalls organised/staffed by members of Muswell Hill Sustainability Group, low carbon zone steering group volunteer coordinator, Muswell Hill 100 Homes Project.
Press and communications	Low Carbon Zone, **lamp post banners** to advertise home energy messages (continuous from November 2010) **Haringey People magazine** October 2010 – Benefits from energy savings measures news item February/March 2011 – LCZ Living ARK news item 'Taking the lead on climate change' double-page feature on the Carbon Report April/May 2011 – 'Investing in a green future' news item August/September 2011 – 'Get on board for Haringey 40:20' one-page feature October/November 2011 – 'Working towards a more sustainable Haringey' Carbon Commission launch one-page feature **Press releases:** July 2011 – 'Low carbon businesses scoop awards' (LCZ business awards) June 2011 – 'Lift off for Haringey 40:20' June 2011 – 'Haringey 40:20 launch' preview/press invite	Haringey Council with input from Low Carbon Zone steering group

| | March 2011 – 'Haringey backing Climate Week 2011'
March 2011 – 'More bays for carbon cutting car club'
February 2011 – 'Investing in a greener future' (investment in carbon reduction measures)
February 2011 – 'Free help for businesses to go green' (Muswell Hill LCZ)
February 2011 – 'Start spreading the (green) news' (LCZ ambassadors search)
December 2010 – 'Going green in Muswell Hill – Living ARK unveiled'
December 2010 – Living ARK launch media invite
November 2010 – 'Home improvements for Low Carbon Zone'
November 2010 – 'Haringey hosts launch of London Energy Saving Week'
October 2010 – 'Energy Saving Week to be launched in Haringey' | |

Hook Norton

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Green homes day	Opportunity for residents and interested people to access the homes where low carbon and other energy efficient measures have been installed.	Organised by Hook Norton Low Carbon

Kirklees Council

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Pre Installation Door knocking and expert energy and water saving door step advice across the Hillhouse and Birkby Area	Greening the Gap (GTG) Team with Kirklees Local Energy Savings Trust Advice Centre Door knock to deliver expert energy and water saving advice on a home by home basis across the Hillhouse and Birkby Area. People are alerted to the Greening the Gap scheme proposals and asked to express interest in the PV where relevant. All home owners are encouraged to take up wider grants where relevant to improve loft / cavity insulation and boilers. The ESTac advisors assessed over 340 households in the Hillhouse area (over 50% of all households). This included: -Completing an assessment and gathering data on energy usage -Getting householders interested in PV	Greening the Gap Team

95

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
	-Checking for insulation suitability and referring to schemes (5 CWI & 38 LI) -Checking households suitability for boiler replacements and giving advice on how to get the best from their heating system and save energy -Behavioural change advice including turning things off, utilizing heating controls, cooking with lids on pans, drying clothes outside.	
Information Event for householders/landlords	Around the same time that door knocking a leaflet dropping was taking place an information and 'meet the team' event was held in a local community centre. This was to enable householders and landlords to ask any questions about the scheme and to re-enforce that we were a 'trusted' provider.	GTG team
Weekends / evenings door knocking with the Local Councillor in the PV area	GTG team member and Cllr Khan go door to door through the PV target area to talk to residents and Landlords about the benefits of PV and how it works and where relevant sign up to installation. Cllr Khans multi-lingual skills were invaluable in this ethnically diverse community.	GTG Team + Cllr Khan Leader of the Council and Local elected Cllr
Birkby and Landlords Landlord Forum Evenings	GTG Team attend Landlords forum evenings to advertise the GTG project and encourage all local Landlords to take advantage of the support available to them to improve the Energy Efficiency of rented Housing Stock; i.e. through ECAS, encouraging tenants to work with Landlords to claim CESP and other funding applicable for measures. NB Private Sector Landlords whose homes were fitted with PV under GTG were required to sign up to the Kirklees Council Landlord Accreditation scheme to support the achievement of holistic standards of housing stock decency.	GTG Team with additional Private Sector Housing Liaison
Free Energy Training Day for Voluntary Organisations and Community Centre Personnel	The community centre representatives were offered a free building energy management training session to help them better understand their energy bills and rates, how to read their meters and basic measures and behaviours that would help them save energy/money.	GTG Team in conjunction with Bradford Environmental Action Team (BEAT)
Faith Forum Work environment workshop	The Kirklees Faith Forum ran an information and activities event during an afternoon at a local museum/park and held a discussion evening at the University of Huddersfield, with guest speakers. The topic was about how caring for the environment is represented in the different faiths and how the faith groups could support our messages about environmental issues.	GTG team & Kirklees Faith Forum
Training and mentoring of trainee handy people and trainee	Working with partners GTG Team designed a six month Handyperson Service Traineeship scheme which trained	GTG Team in conjunction with

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
administrators.	4 long term unemployed people (2 as administrators for the scheme and 2 as Handypersons) to help older people and people with disabilities in particular to: -get doors mended, draught proofing installed, placing radiator foil behind radiators, checking radiators are bled etc -repair furniture rather than throw it away Funding was provided through application to the Future Jobs Fund. Trainees were given the opportunity to take the City and Guilds course in Energy Efficiency, ECDL and manual handling courses For 3 out of the 4 trainees this led to permanent employment in a role related to environmental and social sustainability	The Future Jobs Fund, Anchor Staying Put and Age Concern Kirklees
Hillhouse Greening the Gap Energy monitors project	100 households were fitted with a smart energy monitor on loan and asked to provide details about their home energy use and other environmentally friendly activity on a regular basis throughout the project lifetime. Energy diaries were provided for householders to keep notes about how much energy they used each month, what they did to save energy or whether they have used more energy than usual for a particular reason and other things they did to help the environment. A few basic attitudinal and behavioural questions were asked relating to the monitors and low carbon living and climate change. Households were sent monthly 'tips' on reducing carbon/saving energy (by text or email where possible).	GTG Team
Fartown High School Energy Lessons	GTG Team worked with staff at North Huddersfield Trust School to run a couple of sessions with Yr10 pupils during one of their drop down days. Topics included: Transport, Heating and Energy use, Food, Waste and Purchasing. Take Home handouts with useful energy saving tips and web links for further interest were also devised Work is taking place to pilot training teachers about fuel tariffs/bills and saving energy with the aim of producing Lesson Plans that the teaches can incorporate into their PSCHE lessons/drop-down days year on year. If successful this will be rolled out to other secondary schools.	GTG Team + North Huddersfield Trust School

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Birkby Junior School	SITA Energy to Waste Plant visit and PV Community Walkabout	GTG Team + School
Attending the Birkby and Far Town fortnightly Multi-Agency Group and Community event meetings	Generally bi-monthly updates on work in the area Energy Efficiency Advice	GTG Team / Birkby and Far Town Multi-Agency Groups

Lancaster Co Housing

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Audits of three community buildings (pub, URC church and CofE Church)	It was hoped that a community group would take up the offer of a training day on sustainability, which would have included auditing their premises. Unfortunately, the groups approached did not feel that they could get sufficient people to go to this, so instead audits of the Greyhound pub, the URC church and St Wilfrid's church were carried out by LESS and presented in a report. A meeting was held with the pub landlord to discuss the audit report, a press release about the audit sent to local press contacts, and leaflets produced and put in the pub, to tell customers about the audit and its recommendations.	LESS
Eco-fair	The eco-fair was held in the community centre in Halton on 26th March 2011 – the end of Climate Week. There were 19 stalls, including an installer of biomass boilers, two solar PV installers, a local vegetable grower, local eggs, a local supplier of ecological cleaning products and various local organisations. Plus there was a children's corner, the centre coffee bar, soup was available, and music from local musicians. In addition Global Link's climate change exhibition, 'Trucking with Climate Change' was parked outside the centre for people to visit. Children from the local primary school visited this on the Friday before the fair, and some came back on the Saturday with their parents. Members of Halton Carbon Positive Steering group did an interview with BBC radio Lancashire on the morning of the fair and the fair had coverage in the local press and parish magazine. Around 250 people attended and feedback from stall holders was very positive.	LESS, who sub-contracted it to Global Link, the local development education centre.

Home Energy Surveys	25 Home Energy Surveys in Halton. The Home Energy Service, run by LESS, trains volunteers to visit people in their homes to collect information about their home, their energy use, and how they travel. They then get a report produced by a qualified energy officer, with recommendations on how they can reduce their fuel bills and they carbon footprint.	LESS Home Energy Service
Teacher training on climate change at local primary school	A session on climate change included in one of the school's inset days	Global Link
Publicity	A display about Halton –Carbon positive! was put in the window of the local newsagents and there were a number of articles in the local parish magazine, the Parish Prattle, plus posters and flyers advertising the eco-fair.	LESS / Global Link

Low Carbon Ladock Community

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
March 2010 Meeting at Grampound Road Village market (Everybody in parish invited by letter)	A drop in meeting where people could have individual discussions with CEP about the project	CEP and KABIN
June 2010 Open day for public to visit the Equipment installed by the project	A bus toured round the various sites, and members of public able to see equipment, ask questions about it and how it was performing	CEP
June 2010 Meeting for everybody in the parish to hear how the IPSs set up under the project will operate	Talk with slides on the structure of the IPSs.	CEP and KABIN
July 2010 Talks on Climate Change and Peak Oil	Talks to explain the need to switch to a low carbon economy	CEP
Aug 2010 Entry into Cornwall Sustainable Village of the year competition	In Oct we were declared the winners, gaining publicity for the Low Carbon project in the local papers	Transition Ladock and Grampound Road (Transition LGR)
Oct 2010 Meeting to launch the Bencom and the Co-op	Meeting to explain project and the Bencom and the Co-op. About 70 people attended	Transition LGR
March 2011 Extraordinary General Meeting of Bencom and Co-op called to make small changes to the constitution	As well as the business of the meeting a social was organised where people could have informal discussions about the project and how it was progressing	The Bencom and the Co-op. The meeting was funded by Transition LGR using Engagement money from DECC

The Meadows

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Engagement events, social events, free energy saving measures, home energy assessments, stall in a shopping centre Christmas 2010	Making a conservative estimate a total of 300 people were engaged through events and activities. The Community Energy Worker undertook approximately 200 energy assessments on peoples homes (both houses that received solar pv panels and those that didn't) British Gas provided energy saving measures including low energy kettles, light bulbs, cost meters and radiator reflective foil	The Meadows Partnership Trust and their allocated Community energy worker, with materials donated by British Gas

Middlesbrough

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Food growing activities		
Bexley Close Community Allotment weekly volunteers sessions	Twice weekly session working with local volunteers to develop and maintain the allotment. Also incorporated volunteers from the Mind Out and About project.	MEC
Bexley Close Community Allotment development	Development of beds and open ground for saleable produce for the local community. Provision of small amounts of produce for EDRA café	MEC
Bexley Close Community Allotment	Development and management of community plots for local residents.	MEC
Bexley Close Community Allotment	Delivery of OCN-accredited training in growing skills to local site users and volunteers.	MEC
Bexley Close Community Allotment open day	'Family fun' open afternoon with locally grown vegetable soup.	MEC
Dawlish Green Community Allotment	Support Platform to develop the space for saleable produce for the local community.	MEC
Easterside Children's Centre Gardening Group	Regular weekly support for parent and child session working on allotment. Also delivered OCN accredited training.	MEC

Easterside Day Nursery Gardening Group	Ongoing support to develop outdoor area for growing fruit and veg for use in children's meals.	MEC
Easterside School Gardening Group	Regular weekly support for family afterschool gardening group growing fruit and veg for use within school.	MEC
St Thomas More Nursery vegetable plot	Raised beds lowered to improve access for young people and ground prepared for planting. Provision of children's hand tools, seed potatoes and seeds together with advice and ongoing support.	MEC
Awareness raising		
St Thomas' More Primary School – support for the implementation of Eco-Schools	MEC staff support to run classroom sessions and support the staff in developing the programme. Green Flag achieved.	MEC/St Thomas More School
Easterside Primary School – support for the implementation of Eco-Schools	MEC staff support to run classroom sessions and support the staff in developing the programme. Green Flag achieved.	MEC/Easterside Primary School
Holmwood Special School – support for the implementation of Eco-Schools	MEC staff support to run classroom sessions and support the staff in developing the programme. Silver Award achieved.	MEC/Holmwood Special School
Fairtrade awareness	Fairtrade coffee morning at Easterside Church.	MEC/Easterside Church.
Recycling awareness	Recycled Christmas crafts event.	MEC/Easterside Primary School
Recycling awareness	Parents' event encouraging the wider reuse of materials.	MEC/St Thomas More School
OCN accredited training for energy champions	Series of training sessions to develop residents' skills in providing energy advice to friends and neighbours.	MEC/Easterside Partnership
Energy advice drop-in sessions	Open energy advice sessions and provision of free Owl monitors and powerdowns.	MEC/Easterside Partnership/EDRA Cyber Café/St Thomas More School/Easterside School
Elderly persons activity day	Open energy advice sessions and provision of free Owl monitors and powerdowns.	MEC/Easterside Partnership

Cycling activities		
Cycle training to National Standards at Easterside Primary School, linked to the Incentivised Bike Scheme.	Provision of Level 1 and Level 2 Bikeability training to National Standards.	MEC/Middlesbrough Council
Cycle training to National Standards at St Thomas More Primary School, linked to the Incentivised Bike Scheme.	Provision of Level 1 and Level 2 Bikeability training to National Standards.	MEC/Middlesbrough Council
Cycle training to National Standards at Holmwood Special School	Provision of Level 1 and Level 2 Bikeability training to National Standards.	MEC/Middlesbrough Council
Dr Bike at Easterside Fun Day	Open cycle surgeries for residents.	MEC/Easterside Partnership

Reepham

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Bircham centre open day	Open day of the Bircham centre	
Biofuel trial	12 month field trial of the feasibility of local houses and schools running their heating systems on a blend of liquid biofuel. The project wanted to establish whether or not it was possible to convert heating systems to run reliably on biodiesel made from a blend of used cooking oil and regular domestic heating oil	Andrew Robertson, Clean Energy Consultancy
St Mary's & St Michael's	Arts Alive weekend	
School fete	Primary school fete	
Reepham Give and Take day x 2	Give and Take day - Residents put unwanted items outside their house and others can take them	This event is organised by Reepham Town Council and the Reepham Green Team, supported by Reepham Rotary Club and Broadland District Council.
Health and wellbeing day	High School	
Whitwell and Reepham Station	First Steam Rally	
St Mary's & St Michael's	Open churches week	
Reepham Festival	Community festival	
Preserve the Earth Day	Reepham Learning Community are staging a community day at Reepham High School &	

	Sixth Form College to celebrate the installation of all the low carbon initiatives in the town, and to highlight alternative energy sources.	
Reepham Insulation Project (x2)	Reepham Rotary Club are co-ordinating a Reepham Insulation day on the Market Place. For residents to find out how much money they can save on heating bills	

Sustainable Blacon

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Blacon Sustainability Convention	Summary conference 1 November attended by 122 participants with input from baroness Worthington, Alex Masri DECC, Rt Hon Andrew Stunell MP: Department of Communities and Local Government, Mike Jones Leader Cheshire West and Chester Council, Sustainable Blacon Ltd, University of Chester, 8 sponsors (mainly private sector), 8 workshops on wide range of sustainability issues. Report on www.sustainableblacon.org.uk	Sustainable Blacon Ltd/University of Chester/Cheshire West and Chester Council
Strand 1: Demonstration Houses		
Establishment of Eco Houses	2	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Eco House visits (to date)	653	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Save Money Keep Warm Project (January – March 2012)	190 (TBC) visitors to Eco House followed by Home Energy Assessments, fitting of energy efficiency measures and advice/referral on to vulnerable householders in Cheshire West and Chester	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Meetings held in Eco House (to date)	22	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Distribution of free products to support behaviour change (ceased calculation Feb 2011)	766	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
No. of referrals to suppliers (Excluding energy efficiency makeover)	44	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Strand 2 Blacon Energy Management Programme		
Community education	Eight community education sessions (31 occasions): energy, food, carbon, water, waste,	Sustainable Blacon Ltd engaging experts to deliver input (see

103

	money saving	University of Chester Evaluation)
Energy consumption readings	Monthly gas and electricity meter readings and historical consumption data from suppliers. Consumption data transmitted to University of Chester and Alert Me	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Community engagement discussions on design of the programme Development of Community engagement plan	13	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Visit to Centre for Alternative Technology at Macchynlleth	Visit by 58 people	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Home Energy Assessments	95	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Energy efficiency makeover	82 properties	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Film and audio recordings	At community meetings	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Other		
Media mentions (to date) (including BBC Northwest Today and Tonight twice, national press, local radio and print media	51	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Thermal Imaging Camera Surveys (to date)	64	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Home Energy Checks completed (self or team) Energy Saving Trust	102	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
No of expert sessions since launch (to date)	15	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Eshots	5 to database of 95	Sustainable Blacon Ltd
Website (full hits to August 19 2011 only)	6,022	Sustainable Blacon Ltd

Totnes Transition Town

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Transition Streets Groups-small groups of neighbours getting together over 7 structured meetings using a workbook full of practical low-cost and no-cost actions to help	The Transition Streets project is all about engaging groups of neighbours to make behavioural change. 56 groups Transition Streets groups formed involving 468 households. As a result of participating and doing the actions in the workbook	Overall Transition Streets project initiated and co-ordinated by Transition Town

them reduce their energy use and other households bills,	on average each household saves around £570 per year and 1.3 tonnes of CO2 a year.	Totnes. But actions taken by individual households and Transition Streets groups,

Whitehill-Bordon EcoTown

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Hold/attend events	Attended Wood Fair and Apple Tasting Day and Supported the Christmas festival which was very successful. These were used to make sure awareness was raised across all of the community, not just those particularly interested in the Eco-town project/loans.	Community Worker in partnership with Deadwater Valley Trust and Whitehill Bordon Town Partnership
Raise awareness of the importance of saving energy	The Environment Centre (tEC) distributed energy monitors to climate champions. More monitors have been distributed by the Community worker since the project completed. tEC also provided independent energy efficiency advice to residents. tEC also worked with schools to raise children's awareness. Community worker has worked and is continuing to regularly engage with groups across the community in Whitehill Bordon.	The Environment Centre/Community Worker
Marketing	Direct marketing leaflets to promote the LCCC loans as well as the Eco-town. These were sent to all homes in the policy zone. These were brightly-coloured, high impact leaflets and were well received by the community and stakeholders. Immediate increased interest in loans. Press releases were sent to local newspapers, radio and TV. We also had a two-page article in the district-wide council magazine – which is distributed to all homes in the district. Two large banners were produced with LCCC branding and these were taken to community events to promote the project. Fliers were printed and distributed at events and left for residents to collect from public buildings. Created 'Santa's eco-grotto' where we made his grotto from wood and we powered the Christmas	Communications Officer

	lights with pedal-powered generators.	
	At this event and other community events gave away sunflower seeds which were LCCC branded and with the slogan 'Growing a greener future' to help promote behaviour change.	
	Also used social media (Twitter, Facebook and Flickr) to interact with residents about LCCC and other environmental issues.	
	Video diaries with residents as they have energy-saving improvements made to their homes were created.	
	Continuing to send e-newsletters.	
	Video advertising in the town's shopping centre.	
LCCC recipient group	Post the completion of the project, coffee evenings have been held every 6 months to discuss the project and then any other issues arising. A meeting will be held in March to talk about the impact on energy bills.	Project manager

WALES

Awel Aman Tawe

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Environmental film festival	5 short environmental films shown such as WI film about their climate change work, Plane Stupid film. Speakers introduced each film and answered questions including WI, one of Welsh Government young Climate Change Champions etc. 60 people attended	Awel Aman Tawe/Pontardawe Arts Centre
Community play on climate change	Written and acted by local people. 130 people came to event. Energy efficiency info available, displays etc. Filmed the event	Script Cafe/Awel Aman Tawe
Age of Stupid showing	30 people attended. Energy efficiency info available, displays etc.	Awel Aman Tawe/Pontardawe Arts Centre
5 climate change poetry workshops in different community venues	Each attended by 5-10 people	Awel Aman Tawe
Poetry festival and book published, 'Tonight while sleeping / Heno wrth cysgu'	Attended by Gillian Clarke, national poet of Wales. 140 people came. Energy efficiency info available, displays etc. Filmed the event.	Awel Aman Tawe/Pontardawe Arts Centre

Animation workshop	Local people made 6 short films with climate change theme. Shown at film festival	Animator and Awel Aman Tawe

Cwmclydach Community Project

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Cwmclydach Low Carbon Challenge	Targeting 100 + households to reduce energy usage. Using school children and local schools to support a three week exercise in measuring their present usage over a week and then comparing their consumption over two weeks after taking measures to reduce their energy use. Results will be measured and completed by the end of March 2012.	Cwmclydach Communities First and Severn Wye Energy

Lammas Community

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Open days	23 days - guided tours for public	Lammas
Conferences	2 ecovillage conferences held at Community Hub in 2011	Lammas, Hartwood
Courses – low impact building	4 residential courses (1 week long)	Lammas
Courses – low impact experience weeks	3 residential courses (1 week long)	Lammas

NORTHERN IRELAND

Glencraig Camphill Community

Type of engagement activity to encourage behaviour change	Details of activity	Who organised the activity
Several meetings at community level in Glencraig	Powerpoint / update on progress / open discussion	Glencraig management group

Presentations to communities near Aberdeen in Scotland on benefit of wood biomass heating including representative from forestry commission and private sawmill	Powerpoint / calculations for Camphill schools and Glencraig / possible carbon saving and cost saving demonstrated	Association of Camphill Communities of the UK and Ireland
Meetings with then Green Party leader Mr Brian Wilson MLA	Awareness raising and lobbying for support for the Glencraig scheme	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Meetings with Rockport school and Royal Belfast Golf Club.	Powerpoint presentation / discussion / tour of Glencraig / survey of Golf Club and Rockport School	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Contact with and support from Lady Sylvia Hermon MP	Discussions	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Discussions with South Eastern Education and Library Board advisor on Sustainable Development in NI Curriculum	Discussions	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Discussions with Education and Training Inspectorate NI	Explored possibility how we could integrate our project with the Learning for Sustainability within the NI Curriculum	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Discussions with Action Renewables	Explored possibilities of working together on promoting Low Carbon agenda	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Discussions with Seahill Residents Association beside Glencraig	Awareness raising of the scheme at Glencraig	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Presentation to two local alliance councillors	Tour around the community	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Presentation to the full North Down Borough Council and relevant officers	Powerpoint / open discussion	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Articles in two editions of Camphill News	Distributed worldwide	Camphill Communities Trust NI
Articles in Camphill Pages	Distributed all of UK and Ireland	Association of Camphill Communities of the UK and Ireland
Visit to Clanabogan by leading specialists in the renewables field from all NI Universities and Colleges	Tour of Clanabogan and Glencraig with presentation and discussions	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Participation in "Green Skills" Conference hosted by Carbon Zero NI.	Display and information Brochures	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Press coverage in local and regional	Editorials	Glencraig biomass

newspapers.		scheme group
Coverage in a range of specialist newspapers on the environment	Editorials	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Article in "The state of Renewable energies in Europe" 10th EurObserver Report 2010	NI case study	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Set up a facebook page on the biomass scheme at Glencraig	Special needs people and children involved in charting and updating progress	Glencraig biomass scheme group / training college
Videos uploaded on you-tube	Progress and milestones of the project	Glencraig biomass scheme group / training college
PHD student from the University of Ulster has carried out interviews with community members regarding their attitudes to a sustainable lifestyle.	Interviews and findings	PHD Student
Meeting with Director of South Eastern Regional College discussing engagement with 46 regional schools that go to SERC for Sustainable Development classes	Meetings and tour of Glencraig	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Meetings with the new Green Party leader Mr Steven Agnew	Awareness raising and lobbying for support for the Glencraig scheme he visited several times and features in the DVD	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Production of a new brochure "A Sustainable Approach".	2000 + copies distributed	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Production of a DVD "Sharing our Sustainable Approach"	For schools Universities, Colleges and wider use will also be uploaded to you-tube	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Discussions with Greenmount Agricultural College	Discussions, planning future visit	Glencraig biomass scheme group
Communication with local tree surgeons	Allowing tree surgeons to bring their wood chip to the boiler	Glencraig biomass scheme group
New Forest School project starts in Glencraig	Local schools are offered the possibility to take part in learning by doing in the forests of Glencraig coppicing wood for the biomass boiler	Glencraig training College
40 Ulster Bank Staff help clear woodlands for the forest school project	Tour of the biomass project with hands on activity	Glencraig training college
Presentation to RHI forum SWC Dungannon Campus	Powerpoint presentation of the completed scheme and viewing of the DVD	Glencraig biomass scheme group

| Dungannon Councillors and SWC Staff will visit Glencraig to see the scheme | Tour of Glencraig / exploring possibility of replication | Glencraig biomass scheme group |

Appendix 4 Topic guides for interviews

Topic guide for site visits with lead practitioner(s)

Interviewer

Before the interview, please make sure you have the following information about the site:

Whether it is a Phase 1 or Phase 2 site

Which of the five broad groupings it sits in

What 'kit' was installed as part of the project

Have reviewed the analytical framework of evaluation outputs

What other information they have provided to date

Introduction

The evaluation

OPM has been commissioned to do an independent 'wrap-up' evaluation of the LCCC, as the programme comes to an end, so we are visiting all the sites involved in Phases 1 and 2. The evaluation focuses on the outputs, impacts and learning across the whole programme: it is not about evaluating you or the communities that have taken part. The evaluation findings will inform any future programmes of this nature that DECC undertakes and future policy development on issues such as the Green Deal.

(For Phase 1 sites): You may have been involved in previous interviews carried out as part of earlier, interim evaluations - so you might feel that you're being asked the same questions over again. However, time has passed since the earlier interviews and we'd really like to understand your perspective on the whole programme now. We really want your views on what worked well and what worked less well – in order to understand what you've learned and what lessons should be passed on to DECC (and other government departments) to help them improve any future similar programmes.

The evaluation comprises four main strands:

- A review of all the previous evaluation outputs of the LCCC programme – so our work is informed by the interim evaluations in which you might have been involved

- Interviews with people in all the sites involved in the programme

- Developing an audit tool to gather data on the 'kit' (low carbon technologies) that was installed, and the engagement and behaviour change initiatives which were undertaken. Data on the technologies which were installed will be passed to the Energy Savings Trust in order that they can calculate the theoretical carbon savings made by each project and the LCCC as a whole.

- Analysing all the information and pulling it together into a final evaluation report.

Have you got any questions for me at this stage? Please feel free to ask me anything as we go through the questions.

111

Introduction

Could you just describe to me very briefly what your project involved and who was involved in its delivery?

FACILITATOR note: This will give us their spontaneous take on their activities/understanding of LCCC and might be useful to refer back to during the course of the interview – e.g., if they focus on technology alone or refer to the community involvement/behaviour change etc elements.

The process

FACILITATOR: *Earlier evaluation reports suggest that whilst some LCCCs were of the view that review meetings were of limited value to them and they were unsure how the information was going to be used by DECC, others found that these meetings gave them time and space to think and it was a useful opportunity to involve the wider community.*

How did you feel about the Dialogue by Design review meetings? Has your perception of how valuable these meetings were or are to you, changed since this resource stopped being available?

Facilitator: Earlier evaluation reports suggest DECC and the local teams did not have strong working relationships and that sites had markedly different experiences with DECC, whereby at one extreme the DECC team was seen as very remote and at the other they were seen as very supportive:

To what extent this finding reflects your views:

Whether/ what could have been done differently

Learning for DECC in relation to this

What about the evaluation programme more broadly?

PROBES: on energy statistics provided for each community, the GfK NOP household survey, the NEA social enterprise work

Being part of the LCCC

What difference did being part of the LCCC make to your project?

PROBES: helped us to think differently about our approach towards low carbon initiatives; helped us to think differently about how we could engage communities: gave us funding to buy kit; provided support to help us with planning; helped us to think about how best to change behaviours; made us more confident / ambitious; improved our reputation as a result of the work we did on this. OTHER?

To what extent were the activities / initiatives you carried out in the LCCC dependent on the programme and funding and support it provided?

PROBES: would you have done these things anyway, even without LCCC funding? Would you have not done them at all? Did you do them sooner, or on a different scale, because of LCCC?

Learning opportunities

Thinking in very broad terms, could you describe your overall experience of the LCCC programme?

     a. What worked well? Why?

     b. What worked less well? Why?

PROBES: programme management and administration? engagement support provided by DbyD; the four thematic policy workshops; networking events such as the Communities and Climate Action Conference in Jan 2011; the online portal pilot? Visits by DECC/policy staff. Any others?

FACILITATOR: explore all of the probes to give the interviewee a sense of all the things that DECC has done – and find out whether it has been helpful or unhelpful

To what extent do you feel the programme has so far enabled lessons from this process to feed into future government policy development (e.g. through the policy workshops)?

(This evaluation will continue that process)

Facilitator: *"Earlier evaluation reports suggested that DECC had not done enough to encourage learning across the projects or to feedback into DECC policy"*

Do you agree with this?

What impact did the following additions have?

     b. Communities and Climate Action Conference

     c. Community Central pilot

     d. Four thematic workshops with DECC policy makers

Prompts: did you access these additions? How useful were they? Why? What worked well and less well?

What else would have been helpful to maximise opportunities to share learning between sites?

Community leadership and involvement

The term 'community-led' means different things to different people: part of what we would like to understand is whether different approaches to community leadership are more or less effective.

What is your model of community-led delivery?

     a. With the benefit of hindsight, how important was wider community involvement to the success of your project (i.e. beyond your own membership, thinking about other people in the community?)

Facilitator to read out: *The DbyD interim report suggested that community groups' ability to engender change is rooted in their relations with community members. As peers they can provide a sense of empowerment while enjoying a certain degree of trust, as they are not seen to be seeking financial or political gain.*

How does this finding apply to your community?

    a. How would you describe the relationship between your community group and community members?

    b. Did the community trust you more because of your local role?

    c. Were there any conflicts between what you wanted to do as a project and what the wider community wanted?

    d. Did you change your approach to having a community-led project over the course of the project? If so, why?

What are the main things you have learned about community-led projects from the LCCC?

    a. What advice would you give to DECC about ensuring that future similar projects are led by the communities involved? Why do you say that?

Delivery of your project

I am interested in the delivery model for your project:

PROBES: what were the governance structures of your project? What were the finance structures? Ownership models? Other mechanisms?

    a. How did this evolve over the course of the project/as a result of LCCC? Why?

    b. Has LCCC enabled you to have a stronger model in terms of moving forward/what happens next?

Facilitator to read out: The DbyD report states: In the later review meetings, groups began to emphasise the relevance of their organisational model for the future of their projects, especially with regard to the management and use of income generated through electricity generation. Other projects stressed that the ultimate success of their projects depended on it being sustained in the long term

Thinking about this finding:

    a. What finance mechanisms, governance structures, community involvement and ownership models do you think have helped the sustainability of your project?

    b. Which of these mechanisms or models have hindered it?

Facilitator to read out: The DbyD report suggests that it was generally perceived that LCCC participation was only achievable for well-established community groups and/or groups working in partnership with a resourceful organisation, suggesting that it would be overly ambitious for 'new' and/or, smaller groups to replicate their achievements.

What do you think of this finding?

Thinking beyond the LCCC but about community led solutions generally:

    a. Do you think community led solutions can be adopted in other areas? What would help this? What are the barriers?

    b. What must haves need to be in place to ensure successful community led solutions? E.g. type of infrastructure, type of community.

Outputs

What low carbon technologies/ measures were you able to install as a result of being involved with the LCCC?

Facilitator to read: *Earlier evaluation reports suggested that the tight timetable, meant that some sites were not able to source kit, source finance and install kit within the timescale.*

In addition to the tight timescale, did any other factors help or hinder the outputs you were able to install?

    a. Overall, what worked well about installing these technologies?

    b. What worked less well?

With the benefit of hindsight, what advice would you give about technologies and measures to a project trying to do something similar?

Facilitator to read out: *DbyD's interim report suggested that some of the projects opted for technologies which were more visible from a community perspective but offered lower carbon savings.*

Did that apply to your project? What do you think about this approach with the benefit of experience?

What engagement activities to encourage behaviour change have you undertaken? Please give details of (a) what activities you did (e.g. written communications, meetings, workshops etc); (b) ***roughly*** how many people did you reach directly with these activities (e.g. on mailing lists, attended meetings?

    a. What the impact has these activities had? How do you know this?

    b. What worked well about these activities? What would you do again in similar circumstances in future?

    c. What worked less well? What would you do differently - how and why? Do you feel more equipped, as a result of LCCC, to undertake behaviour change activities?

    d. With the benefit of hindsight, what advice would you give to a project trying to do something similar?

Facilitator read out: *the DbyD report states that in their later review meetings, some community groups were concentrating on ways to* **generate or secure sustained engagement** *in their communities and beyond. They acknowledge the importance of building on the momentum of their LCCC projects.*

What has happened to you in this respect?

    a. Has your project secured sustained engagement from the community? If so, how has this been achieved? If not, why hasn't this happened and what would have helped?

What instances of building organisational capacity and partnerships have there been as a result of your LCCC project?

    a. What skills have been developed internally? What have you and others learnt as a result of the work?

    b. Have any new partnerships been created as a result of the project? or existing partnerships strengthened? Please give details.

    c. Who was involved in your immediate project group and any wider partnerships?

    d. How did these come about?

    e. What worked well?

    f. What worked less well?

    g. With the benefit of hindsight, what advice would you give to a project trying to do something similar?

What, if any, do you think are the **pros and cons** of combining installing practical and physical low carbon technologies and community engagement and behaviour change activities?

Are there advantages to offering residents/the community a 'package' of low carbon solutions rather than a single measure approach?

Impact

Overall, what impacts do you think this project has had:

on you

your organisation

your community?

Why do you think this?

What impact has the installation of these technologies had?

    a. On the communities involved in the project? (How do you know this: have you had an opportunity to ask the communities involved what impact the project has had on them?)

    b. On the capacity of your or other organisations or partnerships – for example, to engage in similar projects in the future?

What impacts do you think you have had on DECC and wider policy?

     a. Why do you think this?

     b. What impact would you like to have?

Summary and overall learning

Facilitator note: it may be that this has already been covered, depending on the previous discussion, but learning is very important. If it has been discussed, use it to sum up/ clarify but don't go over the same questions.

In this last section, I'd like to ask you about the overall lessons that DECC should take from the LCCC.

- First, thinking about the management and administration of the programme as a whole and how it has worked in your area, what do you think are the lessons that DECC should take about the way in which similar programmes are managed and administered in the future?

- Thinking now about community-led programmes such as this: what are the general lessons for DECC about how these could be adopted in other areas?

     a. What do you think are the 'critical success' factors in community-led programmes?

E.g., particular types of community; specific support (for who – lead practitioners? communities?); particular expertise locally; partnerships; involvement of specific organisations (e.g., local authorities/VCOs etc)

     b. What are the main barriers?

And what lessons does it provide for policy in this area?

E.g., Green Deal, other?

Overall, what are the implications of these lessons for how central government should design and delivery programmes related to local action and the community sector?

Wrap-up

Thank you so much for your time today and your contribution to this evaluation: we really appreciate your input. Before we close, is there anything we haven't covered so far that you think it is important for DECC and its partners to understand about the LCCC programme?

Thank you.

(Provide information about final report etc)

Topic guide for stakeholders

Introduction

The evaluation

OPM has been commissioned to do an independent 'wrap-up' evaluation of the LCCC, as the programme comes to an end. The evaluation focuses on the outputs, impacts and learning across the whole programme: it is not about evaluating you or the communities that have taken part. The evaluation findings will inform any future programmes of this nature that DECC undertakes and future policy development on issues such as the Green Deal.

The evaluation comprises four main strands:

- A review of all the previous evaluation outputs of the LCCC programme – so our work is informed by the interim evaluations in which you might have been involved

- Interviews with people in all the sites involved in the programme

- Developing an audit tool to gather data on the 'kit' (low carbon technologies) that was installed, and the engagement and behaviour change initiatives which were undertaken. Data on the technologies which were installed will be passed to the Energy Savings Trust in order that they can calculate the theoretical carbon savings made by each project and the LCCC as a whole.

- Analysing all the information and pulling it together into a final evaluation report.

This interview

We would like to speak to you as a policy maker/ stakeholder with an interest in community scale delivery. I am aware that you have been involved in previous interviews carried out as part of the earlier, interim evaluation. During this interview, we'd really like to focus on learning since 2011 and to understand your perspective on the whole programme now and, as a whole. We really want your views and perspectives on the LCCC – in order to understand what lessons should be passed on to DECC (and other government departments) and how they can shape future programmes, to help them improve any future similar programmes.

The current interview will focus on:

- How the LCCC was designed and delivered

- Perceived impact of the LCCC

- Learning from community led-delivery and for policy

The findings from the final evaluation will be used in a report to DECC and Sciencewise which will also be circulated more widely. Everything you say will remain confidential, no names will be used in the report and although quotes may be used they will not be attributable.

I would like to record the conversation, so I have an accurate record of everything that was said – though the recordings won't be transcribed. **Facilitator**: seek permission to record.

Have you got any questions for me at this stage? Please feel free to ask me anything as we go through the questions.

Background

- Could you describe your background to me very briefly:

    current role

    involvement in low carbon work/ community scale delivery

Involvement in LCCC

    nature of involvement in the LCCC

    how much have you heard about the LCCC

Facilitator note: Stakeholders will have had different forms and degrees of involvement in the LCCC so this topic guide needs to be used flexibly and questions will need to be tailored according to the interviewee. Very few stakeholders will be able to answer all sections in depth. Some will not be able to answer many at all. Phil Downing will give us more information, ahead of each interview, about each stakeholder and what we might reasonably expect from them/what is the key things we need to get from them.

Process

For steering group members only ask:

Thinking about the steering group:

    How useful and effective forum was that? *Why? What could have been improved?*

For steering group members only ask:

What are your thoughts, if any, about the approach to the evaluation of LCCC?

Facilitator: Earlier evaluation reports suggest that the delivery team and stakeholders felt that the support team had not been appropriate to fulfil team's needs and that individualised support or different specialists on the support team would have been more helpful.

Based on your reflections over the LCCC as a whole

- does that reflect your own views of the support team? how might that support have worked more effectively?

- what other lessons do you think have been learnt from the delivery of LCCC which can be used to inform future DECC programmes?

Delivery model

Thinking now about community-led programmes such as this: what are the general lessons for DECC about how these could be adopted in other areas?

    What do you think are the 'critical success' factors in community-led programmes?

    What are the main barriers?

    What are the main benefits of working in this way?

Facilitator: The DbyD report suggests that it was generally perceived that LCCC participation was only achievable for well-established community groups and/or groups working in partnership with a

resourceful organisation, suggesting that it is ambitious for younger, smaller community groups to replicate their achievements.

- What do you think of this finding?

- Thinking about community led solutions in this field generally:

  Do you think these types of community led solutions can be adopted in other areas to tackle similar issues? What would help this? What are the barriers?

  What must haves need to be in place to ensure successful community led solutions of this sort? E.g. type of infrastructure, type of community, skills etc.

Impact

Facilitator: The DbyD report suggests that for a number of communities, the LCCC project provided the focus they needed to bring people together who were keen to work in their communities but were not sure how to get involved:

Thinking about this finding: what other differences/ impact do you think being part of the LCCC had on the communities involved?

What impact do you think the programme has had on DECC [if a DECC policy maker – how has the programme changed anything you do in your own work] Interviewer note**: PRIORITY QUESTION TO ASK.**

What impacts do you think the projects had on the local communities?

What do you think have been the wider impacts beyond the LCCC?

  Beyond the specific people involved but beyond the communities?

  Beyond the whole place/ town where the LCCC took place?

  What has been the evidence for this?

What do you think are the wider social and economic impacts of community led delivery in this field?

Has LCCC provided any key lessons for policy e.g. on Green Deal, Smart Meters, Big Society? If yes, what are these lessons? Interviewer note: PRIORITY QUESTION TO ASK.

Learning

- Thinking in very broad terms, what are your overall impressions of how the LCCC programme was managed and delivered:

PROBES: engagement support and review meetings provided by DbyD; the four thematic policy workshops; networking events such as the Communities and Climate Action Conference in Jan 2011; the online portal pilot? Various visits to communities? The LCCC Interim Report? Any others?

FACILITATOR note - for each of the above probes ask the following questions and try and get a sense of the perceived value of each activity out of all the stuff that DECC did.

  what worked well? Why?

  what worked less well? Why?

  (if worked less well) how could this aspect have been improved?

Facilitator to read out: Earlier evaluation reports suggest that it was agreed by community sector, policy makers and delivery team, (at the point when interviews took place) DECC had done little to communicate about what had been learnt from the LCCC.

Interviewer note: the following two questions above are priority to ask, particularly for those who cannot answer other questions on the guide

What do you think of this finding? Have you heard much about the learning from LCCC? Would you liked to have heard more [if yes, then how?]

What do you think could have been done to improve these communications of lessons?

What impact did the following additions have?

4 thematic policy workshops

the CAA conference

any others?

To what extent do you feel the programme has so far enabled lessons from this process to feed into future government policy development (e.g. through the policy workshops)? **Facilitator note**: this evaluation will continue that process

What lessons should be fed through?

(IF NOT ALREADY COVERED) Overall, what are the implications of the LCCC for how the government supports and delivers a transition to the low carbon delivery landscape? WHAT HAPPENS NEXT??!

(IF NOT ALREADY COVERED) Overall, what are the implications of the LCCC to the way national government designs and delivers programmes related to local action and the community sector

Wrap-up

Thank you so much for your time today and your contribution to this evaluation: we really appreciate your input. Before we close, is there anything we haven't covered so far that you think it is important for DECC and its partners to understand about the LCCC programme?

Thank you.

(Provide information about final report etc)