



## Technology Needs Assessments (TNA) Phase IV

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10171

**Countries**

Global (Kiribati, Comoros, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Maldives, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Sudan, St. Kitts and Nevis, Timor Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, Yemen)

**Project Title**

Technology Needs Assessments (TNA) Phase IV

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 01702

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Climate Change

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

## Non- Expedited Enabling Activity req (PIF)

### Part 1: Project Information

#### Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Yes. The project is aligned with CCM-EA under the CCM focal area of the GEF-7 Programming Directions.

#### Agency Response

#### Project description summary

Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Yes, the project is structured around one single component that aims to deliver one outcome - Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) processes conducted by national stakeholders in the 15 participating countries, and TNA/TAP results available to be integrated into national planning processes and to be funded and implemented by interested stakeholders.

#### Agency Response

## Co-financing

Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GESFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Yes. Table C shows indicative co-financing, which is classified by type and as recurrent expenditure.

## Agency Response

### GEF Resource Availability

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion GEFSEC, 4/15/2019 - Yes. The project includes 15 LDCs and SIDS, which are eligible to finance their TNAs through the CCM set-aside.

## Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

The STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA****Agency Response****The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

**Agency Response****The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

**Agency Response****The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

### Agency Response

#### Focal area set-aside?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/15/2019 - Yes. The project includes 15 LDCs and SIDS, which are eligible to finance their TNAs through the CCM set-aside.

### Agency Response

#### Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Not quite. There is no information supporting how the proposed activities are cost effective in comparison to alternatives.

**Recommended action:** Please briefly describe how the proposed activities are proven to be cost effective in comparison to feasible alternatives.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared. The agency has provided adequate details on the basis for cost effectiveness, which is characterized by the umbrella approach and its coordination through regional centres.

### Agency Response

UN Environment, 4/25/2019 - Comment taken. This has been further elaborated in section "*D. DESCRIBE, IF POSSIBLE, THE EXPECTED COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROJECT*" of the EA request.

On the global level, the UNEP DTU Partnership (UDP) is an important partner to the project because it is a recognized authority under the UNFCCC and it is the architect behind the guidance that is developed for Technology Needs Assessments.

For cost-effectiveness purposes, rather than having UDP organize global workshops, the project contracts the Regional Centres to arrange and conduct the regional workshops and events. This approach has proven to be very efficient: while building the regional hubs' capabilities (which serve as the regional help desk for countries undergoing the TNA process), the project can leverage their networks/connections within the countries and rely on their cultural sensitiveness within the different regions. In addition, over the past TNA phases, the countries have highly valued these peer exchanges on a regional level.

In this next phase IV, the TNA programme will explore new approaches to further enhance peer to peer exchanges and learning as an autonomous way of building national capacity to do Technology Needs Assessments. This will come out of the on-going discussions on the Enabling Activity programme, on regional networks.

As far as other alternatives are concerned, if we compare to the Enabling Activities project, the TNA is more cost effective. Indeed, the Enabling Activities approach is built around a US\$ 10 million umbrella project (providing international technical support) alongside stand-alone country projects of US\$ 500,000 each. In the case of the TNA project, both the country activities and the international technical support are all included under the US\$ 270,000 allocation that each country receives.

Finally, the ultimate purpose of the TNA projects is to identify priority technologies to attract investment in the different countries. In this instance, the TNAs are recognized as an efficient and good tool to prepare pipelines of investments for GCF proposals.

## **Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification**

### **Background and Context.**

**Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - The PIF submission does refer to lessons learned, but more detail regarding specific lessons and how they are applied to this proposal would be appreciated. For example, the PIF states that "the continuation of the three previous phases of TNAs, this project benefits from lessons learnt and best practices from previous experience" and that this is applied to three specific areas - national trainings, P2P exchange, and national events and roundtables, but does not provide specific lessons and their application.

**Recommended action:** Please briefly expound on the idea introduced above regarding lessons learned from the previous phases of this initiative and how it has been applied to the design of the current phase.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Cleared. The Secretariat appreciates the additional detail provided on the interesting lessons learned from the first three phases of the global support project and how they've informed the fourth phase.

### Agency Response

UN Environment, 4/25/2019 - Comment taken. Main lessons learned from the previous phases have been further elaborated under section "*A.2) Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects*" of the EA request. These main lessons learned are the following:

- Even though the TNA project seeks to address a highly complex set of issues (climate change) with limited resources, TNA Phase II and III are showing that the TNA/TAP process is receiving stronger attention from decision makers in governments since (i) countries had to come up with their NDCs, and (ii) the CTCN and the green climate fund became operational. The TNA is seen as a good tool (i) to identify the technologies a country needs to implement its NDC, (ii) to generate technical assistance requests for CTCN and (iii) to create a pipeline of projects for GCF and other funding sources. It is to be noted however that a number of countries – especially LDCs - are not sufficiently equipped to prepare funding requests after the TNA/TAP process has been completed, and many of them need improved data and analysis to confirm the feasibility and bankability of the prioritized climate technology actions included in their TAPs.

- In many countries, national capacity is rather low. Capacity building and training is critical to ensure the process results in quality outputs for the countries. This is even more important since the TNA Phase III project, where participating countries are essentially LDCs and SIDSs (as for the TNA Phase IV). For this reason, additional trainings are planned and offered to countries now (i.e. since TNA Phase III) with one additional regional training and a training at national level on the tools used for the TNA/TAP process. In addition, participating countries strongly value peer-to-peer exchange which is now further enhanced since TNA Phase III project, with the inclusion of an additional regional training workshop bringing the countries together.

- The engagement of the financial/funding community, private sector and the banking and investments sectors remains a challenge despite the efforts made by the TNA countries to bring these stakeholders on board. For private sector and investors, the challenge is that engagement depends on their business interests and therefore they can be best engaged once the priority technologies have been identified. They can then provide valuable inputs, notably for the barrier analysis and development of the TAP. Donors and development partners participate in the TNA/TAP process but there is a need for more emphasis by TNA country governments on disseminating and "selling" their climate technology priorities to their in-country funding community at the end of the TNA/TAP process.

## Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

### Is the project framework sufficiently described?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Yes. This is the fourth phase of the TNA global support project. The project will provide participating countries with targeted financial and technical support to prepare new or updated and improved TNAs, including TAPs, for prioritized technologies that reduce GHG emissions, support adaptation to climate change, and are consistent with Nationally Determined Contributions and national sustainable development objectives. The structure of the project is sufficiently detailed at this stage of project development.

## Agency Response

### Stakeholders.

**Does the PIF include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/15/2019 - Yes. The PIF submission includes an indicative matrix of stakeholders to be consulted, and indicates that national stakeholders will be identified, consulted and brought on-board when project execution begins. The submission indicates that the primary task of national TNA teams will be to draw-up a specific list of stakeholders for consultation based on the priority sectors from their NDC

selected for their TNA/TAP process.

### Agency Response

#### Gender equality and women's empowerment.

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Yes. Gender analysis on technology transfer is being integrated in TNA guidance tools and methodologies in the current TNA phase III project and a specific guidebook for developing a gender-responsive TNA has been developed. This will be further improved and applied into the Phase IV project. In addition, gender considerations will be taken into account in the engagement of various stakeholders in the process and in the identification of key decision-makers, target users and national champions.

Additionally, the project development team will prepare a Gender Action Plan to detail how gender equality and women empowerment will be mainstreamed in the TNA Phase IV project. This Gender Action Plan will be included in the CEO endorsement document.

### Agency Response

#### Part III. Endorsement/ Approval by OFP

##### Country endorsement

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Yes. The submission includes 15 LOEs signed by the OFPs of the respective participating countries.

## Agency Response

### Response to Comments

**Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)**

Gef Secretariat comments?

#### GEF Secretariat Comment

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Not yet.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - The agency has mostly addressed the Secretariat's comments, however, we have additional questions regarding the visibility of additional requests for financing for TNAs in the GEF-7 period. This is related to ensuring equitable access to all countries who may wish to finance a TNA, in the context of financing several countries included in this phase of the project which already have TNAs.

Additionally, further detail regarding the incremental cost reasoning for the four countries which already have TNAs (Comoros, Ethiopia, Saint Kitts & Nevis, and Niue) and some specific results and outcomes from these cases would be highly appreciated.

GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - Cleared. The Agency has provided justification for inclusion for the four countries which already have TNAs, which is listed below in the agency response - none of these countries have barrier analyses nor TAPs.

## Agency Response

UN Environment, 05/01/2019:

The countries listed above have completed so-called "1st generation" TNAs with no barrier analysis and no TAPs (which was the case also with most of the countries that were supported under TNA Phase I, Phase II and now Phase III):

- The Ethiopia TNA dates from 2007, it is the "1st generation" of TNAs and has no barrier analysis and no Technology Action Plan (the country was originally part of TNA Phase I, but withdrew).

- Saint Kitts & Nevis' TNA is also from 2007 and a "1st generation", meaning no barrier analysis and no TAP
- Comoros' TNA is from 2006, no barrier analysis and no TAP
- Niue's TNA is from 2003, no barrier analysis and no TAP

A paragraph has been added in the updated EA request at the end of section "*A.2) Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects*" to clarify this matter.

Since TNA Phase I (2009), UN Environment has been supporting countries under Poznan Strategic Programme in developing the "new generation" of TNAs which include the barrier analysis and the TAP. Countries that had done their "first generation" of TNAs were eligible by the GEF to join the new Global TNA project. Section *A.2) Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects* of the EA request also includes a table which lists all the countries that have benefited from the second generation TNAs (i.e. Phase I, II and III).

Indeed, on the UNFCCC website (<http://unfccc.int/ttclear/tna/reports.html>), you will notice that several countries have more than one technology needs assessment listed, for example:

- Mauritania, which was part of the TNA Phase II global project (completed in 2018) had also performed a TNA in 2003;
- Thailand, which was part of the TNA Phase I global project (completed in 2013) had also completed a TNA in 2000.

The history of TNAs is as follows:

1. Developing country parties have been conducting TNAs since COP7. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) initially funded 92 non-Annex I parties' TNAs, 78 supported by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and 14 by UN Environment.
2. Later, in response to Decision 4/CP.13 (Development and transfer of technologies under the Subsidiary Body on Implementation) which was adopted at COP 13 in Bali (Indonesia), the GEF created a strategic programme to scale up the level of investment for technology transfer and proposed a new funding window to support TNAs.
3. In November 2009, UN Environment started the implementation of the new GEF-financed Global TNA project (TNA Phase I) and introduced a new feature in the process (with a view to facilitate the implementation of follow-up actions): the Technology Action Plan (TAP), an action plan consisting of a group of measures to address identified barriers to the development and transfer of a prioritized technology. In addition, beneficiary countries also develop preliminary project concepts of concrete actions for the implementation of their prioritized technologies.

4. TNA Phase I ended in April 2013: out of the targeted 36 countries, 30 countries completed their TNAs and TAPs (including project ideas) and 2 countries only completed their TNAs. TNA Phase II ended in October 2018: out of the 27 target countries, 22 countries completed their TNAs and TAPs (including project ideas). TNA Phase III started last year and covers 23 countries.

Finally, at this stage, UN Environment does not intend to approach the GEF with another TNA request under the GEF-7 cycle. This is supported by the following elements:

- When we initiated the development of the EA request for the TNA Phase IV project, we reached out to all the LDCs and SIDS that had not yet benefited from the “second generation” TNA. On top of the 15 countries included in the current proposal, there were a few additional countries that expressed interest but did not send their Letter of Endorsement on time (i.e. Bahamas, Cabo Verde and Angola).
- We have only reached out to a few countries that were not LDCs and SIDS, because they had approached us in the past to ask for joining the TNA project, but there may be others (i.e. non-SIDS and non-LDC) that want to conduct a TNA with their STAR allocation.
- Finally, there are several countries that expressed their desire to update their TNA but we have not yet reached out to them as we think we need to reflect a bit first on what updating the TNAs would entail – the project’s strategy would be different than the current one.

### **Other Agencies comments?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

**Agency Response PIF Updated.**

### **GEFSEC DECISION**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO clearance/approval recommended?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 4/16/2019 - Not yet. Please refer to the flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2019 - Not yet. Please refer to the item directly above regarding the four countries which already have TNAs, as well as any visibility of forthcoming TNA requests during GEF-7.

GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - Cleared. The agency has clarified that it does not foresee additional requests for TNAs during GEF-7, and that the participating countries were chosen through and open call for interest to those LDCs and SIDs who had not yet undertaken TNAs.

**Additional Comments**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/16/2019	4/25/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2019	5/1/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		