

Tool: NAMA Screening Tool

by GIZ

General information

Objective / function	This tool gives guidance to structure the process of screening and priority setting for potential NAMAs
Tool developer & weblink	GIZ ¹ Link: www.transport-namas.org/resources/toolbox
Area of application	NAMA cycle <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Designing mitigation measures <input type="checkbox"/> MRV of Emissions <input type="checkbox"/> MRV of sustainable development benefits <input type="checkbox"/> Financing <input type="checkbox"/> Registration <input type="checkbox"/> Other:
	NAMA type <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Quantified target <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategy or plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Policy or program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project
Setting	Informed decision making process with decision makers from the public and eventually private sector as well as technical experts
Level of complexity	Medium
Required data / information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • long list of potential NAMAs from NAMA identification process • collection of available information on each NAMA option (e.g. studies, factsheets, impact estimations, etc.)
Cost	free of charge
Time needed	0.5 to 1 day for the realisation of the screening and definition of next steps plus time for preparation and documentation of the meeting
Equipment needed	Pinboards or laptop with beamer and flipchart
Observations	flexibility to adapt the tool to different contexts / situations / countries

¹ (original version by Stefan Bakker; updated by TRANSfer project team, Anna Rahlwes, Christian Mettke, André Eckermann)

Description

The tool aims to provide support for transport policy-makers regarding the screening and selection of suitable NAMAs in the transport sector, so that these are 'nationally appropriate' and reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. It gives guidance to structure the process of screening potential NAMAs and to set priorities, rather than a template approach with objective outcomes. In the end, selecting potential NAMAs is a political decision and will require always a tailor made process that considers the specific circumstances.

In addition to transport policy-makers, other stakeholders from government, private sector and consultancies/academics may be involved. The selection process is ideally based on sound analysis. However, this tool facilitates a screening as well in contexts where few climate policies are implemented and in-depth studies on emission reductions are rare. The tool is based on relevant literature and practical experience from several GIZ projects.

Application – in 5 steps to a NAMA short list!

The NAMA screening and priority setting process may differ from case to case. Generally speaking, the following elements seem important. The steps might be adjusted and realised in a different order:

- **Step 1) Collect existing information on potential NAMAs from the long list**
- **Step 2) Define evaluation criteria**
- **Step 3) Realise the screening and create a short list**
- **Step 4) Define next steps**

Step 1) Collect existing information on potential NAMAs from the long list

For gathering information on potential NAMAs, that form part of a NAMA long list which needs to be developed before the screening, it is recommendable to draw on the expertise of researchers and consulting firms. Results of technical studies conducted in the transport sector should form the basis of the collection process. Ideally these studies should provide representative data regarding the mitigation potential and the co- benefits of potential measures.

Step 2) Define evaluation criteria

Five criteria have been identified for the NAMA screening and selection process. However, since each country is unique and the framework for the selection process will differ, criteria can be added, deleted and/or modified to the specific context. The criteria are listed in the following. Each criterion is further characterised with a set of bullet points below. If you plan to apply for international support, it is recommended that you consider the evaluation criteria /preferences by the potential funder.

Criterion 1: Paradigm shift potential / Potential for transformational change

- Impacts beyond a one-off project or programme
- Potential for scaling-up and replication
- Structural changes compared to situation without the NAMA
- Knowledge and learning potential

Criterion 2: Likelihood of successful implementation

- Development status of the measure: idea, existing regulation, included in budget, implementation started, etc.
- Number and diversity of stakeholders, social acceptance
- Technical and operational feasibility taking capacity of main stakeholders into account
- Commitment of core decision makers
- Potential to overcome any further barriers to implementation

Criterion 3: GHG mitigation potential

- Direct emission reduction potential of the measure
- Indirect or long-term mitigation impacts

Criterion 4: Further benefits for sustainable development /co-benefits

- Social: access to transport, road safety, comfort increase
- Economic: economic growth, job creation, congestion reduction, security of energy supply
- Environmental: local air quality, noise reduction
- Institutional: improved institutional set-up and framework conditions

Criterion 5: Economic and financial feasibility

- Abatement cost per tonne of CO₂-eq
- Relation of costs² and expected benefits
- Cost of MRV (complexity in methodology; data availability & need for new data; technical capacity of core stakeholders)
- Feasibility to close funding gaps with public resources (domestic or international)
- Access to finance (domestic and international, public and private)
- Financial risks

² Consider all costs: technical design, construction, enforcement, operation and maintenance, capacity building, MRV.

Step 3) Realise the screening and create a short list

All NAMA options from the long list should be ranked according to the criteria described above. As quantification is difficult, a scoring scale can be used for priority setting (++ , + , 0 , - and - -). The following table gives broad guidance on the scoring of each criterion and the second table below can be used for the actual screening process.

Table 1: Guidance on scoring

Criteria	Scores				
	++	+	o	-	--
Paradigm shift potential / Potential for transformational change	very high	high	Middle	Low	very low
Likelihood of successful implementation	High chance of success	Good chance of success for at least the main parts	Medium-good chance for most parts	High barriers for several parts	Very high implementation barriers
GHG mitigation potential (MtCO₂-eq/yr)	>1	0.5 – 1	0.1 – 0.5	0 – 0.1	only indirect
Co-Benefits	very high	High	Middle	Low	Negative
Economic and financial feasibility	Very good cost-benefit ratio and very good chances to be financed Very high cost of MRV	Good cost-benefit ratio and good chances to be financed High cost of MRV	Moderate cost-benefit ratio and some barriers to be financed Medium cost of MRV	Low cost-benefit ratio and high barriers to be financed Low cost of MRV	Negative cost-benefit ratio and high barriers to be financed Very low cost of MRV

Table 2: Screening table

Evaluation criteria	NAMA Option 1	NAMA Option 2	NAMA Option ...
Paradigm shift potential / Potential for transformational change	insert score	insert score	insert score
Likelihood of successful implementation	insert score	insert score	insert score
GHG mitigation potential	insert score	insert score	insert score
Co-Benefits	insert score	insert score	insert score
Economic and financial feasibility	insert score	insert score	insert score
RANKING:	indicate rank	indicate rank	indicate rank

Alternatively, a ranking of options can take place, in which each option receives an ‘overall score’. The overall score across the six criteria can be based on a weighted average in which the criterion “Likelihood of successful implementation” might take a larger weight than the others. The scoring table can be filled in with relevant information as input for discussion, completion and evaluation with relevant stakeholders. Alternatively, a blank version of the table can form the starting point of a discussion with the stakeholders. In any case, the completed version of the table should be used as a basis, on which decisions on the those options that form the short list and on the way forward are taken.

Step 4) Define next steps

In case of relevant decision makers not having participated in the screening procedure, it is necessary to seek approval at the corresponding political level. Moreover, it is useful to define the number of the NAMA options from the short list which are intended to be further specified and taken to the stage of an initial NAMA concept note. Besides, we recommend to set up a short action plan defining the main tasks and responsibilities regarding major next steps to be taken.