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CLIMATE CHANGE

1. Global: Technology Needs Assessment [UNEP]

*COMMENTS FROM CANADA*

1. The primary objective of Technology Needs Assessments is that they are actionable and create a platform from which identified projects are packaged as "finance-able", which will include the engagement of the private sector. This objective needs to have greater profile within the project proposal.

2. We support the approach envisaged by this project that TNAs will enable a national consensus on priority technologies that can feed into a technology action plan compatible with NAMAs or holistic long-term country-driven strategies. The project proposal also identifies the key risk that TNAs may not have strong country commitment, and notes the importance of stakeholder engagement. It will be critical for the project to focus on how to mainstream TNAs into a country's national decision-making process that will avoid having a completed TNA sit on a shelf, rather than move towards an implementation phase.

3. The project proposal should identify improvements to existing TNAs and undertaking new TNAs as separate activities, since they will necessarily involve different levels of resource needs.

4. Project components include design of mechanisms to provide critical technology information, as well as cooperation mechanisms to share TNA experiences. Very little detail is provided on how these mechanisms would function. Where would they be housed? (e.g. UNEP/UNDP?). Further elaboration should be provided to enable a more complete understanding of the relation and contribution of these mechanisms to the TNA development process.

5. Clarity is required on what is meant by "multi-country" TNAs, since TNAs by definition are country driven. Perhaps this is a reference to project-bundling more so than actual TNAs?

*COMMENTS FROM GERMANY*

6. The project proposal is fully in line with the GEF programme on Technology Transfer.
7. The proposal has indicated that the initial set of countries will be chosen with a goal of regional diversity; Ghana, Senegal, Uganda, Argentina, Bahamas, Thailand, Cambodia have signaled interest. In these countries the revised TNA Handbook (2nd edition) will be field-tested.

8. The budgeting for an average country has been estimated to be around 200,000 US$ which is in line with earlier experience on the first handbook. National budget should be adjusted according to the size of the countries and its ability to participate with own resources.

9. We welcome the project and look forward to its implementation.

**COMMENTS FROM SWITZERLAND**

**Overall Commentaries**

10. The support to countries with regard to the preparation of Technology Needs Assessment documents or where they already have been prepared to update/strengthen them with a view to participation in technology transfer activities is a statutory task under UNFCCC/Kyoto Protocol supported by COP decisions.

11. Switzerland supports the timely implementation of enabling activities endorsed by COP decisions which contribute to effective implementation of the climate convention. Being a statutory task Switzerland would welcome the funding of such activities to be arranged from the GEF trust fund budget and not from the SCCF.

12. The development of tools and provision of technology information in support of TNA preparation by UNEP is welcomed.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

13. Switzerland recommends timely endorsement of this important project.

14. In GEF-5 TNA preparation or equivalent enabling activities enhancing the participation of NAI Parties in technology transfer and development should be funded from GEF’s Trust fund budget.