

Ambition Initiative Call for NAMA Support Projects

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) and Clarification Notes I - VI

Published on 19 May 2021

Abbreviations

ASP	Applicant Support Partner
CN	Clarification Note
DPP	Detailed Preparation Phase
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions (a NAMA Facility document)
FC	Financial Component of an NSP
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GID	General Information Document (a NAMA Facility document)
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
iNDC	Intended Nationally Determined Contributions
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NDCP	Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) Partnership
NFGA	NAMA Facility Grant Agent
NSO	NAMA Support Organisation
NSP	NAMA Support Project
OECD DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
SME	Small and medium-sized enterprises
TC	Technical Component of an NSP
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Contents

Abbreviations.....	2
I. General Issues.....	3
II. Selection Criteria	7
III. Eligibility of countries	10
IV. Eligibility of Applicants and Applicant Support Partners (ASP)	14
V. Eligibility of Sectors and Technologies	18
VI. Eligible Support Instruments in NSPs	20
VII. Submission of the NSP Outline and Annexes	25
VIII. Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP)	30
IX. Contracting	31
Last but not least... ..	32

I. General Issues

FAQ 1 What do the terms “enhanced” and “ambitious” NDCs mean in the context of the Ambition Initiative Call?

As described in section 4.1. only NSPs from countries with ambitious NDCs presented to UNFCCC until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call on 31 May 2021 will be eligible for support.

In the context of this Call, ambitious NDCs are characterised by meeting several or all of the following criteria:

- Compatibility with the globally agreed temperature limit under the Paris Agreement;
- Mitigation target that:
 - implies a significant reduction of economy-wide GHG emissions below business as usual emissions trajectories; and/or
 - includes a rapid reduction of GHG in key emitting sectors with a view to achieving decarbonization; and/or
 - implies an early peaking of GHG emissions and rapid decarbonization thereafter; and/or
 - is aligned with an existing net-zero target.

The NSP Outlines should indicate clearly how the intervention proposed under the NSP would be embedded into the respective ambitious NDCs and therefore why the NSP would meet the targets of the Ambition Initiative Call.

In the context of the Call, raising ambition of NDCs by the national governments can be characterised through (1) strengthening mitigation targets and actions over time; (2) strengthening emissions reduction goals (including the addition of sector-specific targets) or by (3) broadening the scope to include a wider coverage of sectors or gases. Countries may additionally raise ambition by moving from conditional to unconditional targets, shortening timelines, adding policies and measures.

In section 2.4 of the NSP Outline titled “Embedding”, Applicants are required to indicate how the proposed NSP would be embedded into the ambitious NDC and why the NSP would meet the targets of the Ambition Initiative Call.

FAQ 2 Can we submit an NSP for a second time, if we were not selected in the previous Call?

Yes, certainly. If you consider a re-submission make sure you take into account the feedback you were given during the feedback call with the Technical Support Unit (TSU) of the NAMA Facility – an opportunity afforded to all non-selected Applicants – as incorporating these details will surely help your re-submission.

Please also note that some of the eligibility criteria and characteristics of NSPs have changed from previous Calls to the Ambition Initiative Call, so you need to ensure that your previous submission meets those new requirements.

Good to know: While there is no preference for re-submitted NSPs and as a rule, re-submitted Outlines are treated the same as new submissions during the assessment, the NAMA Facility portfolio of NSPs includes 14 NSPs that were selected after they were resubmitted.

FAQ 3 Can an NSP Outline be submitted to obtain NAMA Facility funds for a project already underway?

A project already underway would typically not be eligible for NAMA Facility support.

To be eligible in such a scenario, the NAMA Facility-supported element would need to be one project component within a much larger project context, e.g. a transit line within a much larger metro system development, that would not be implemented without the NSP. Keep in mind that it will be crucial to clearly demonstrate additionality of the NSP.

FAQ 4 At what stage should an Applicant indicate interest to receive > EUR 25 million for the Implementation?

As described in the GID, section 4.1 “Characteristics of NAMA Support Projects”, the total funding volume requested for the implementation of the NSP should be in the range of EUR 5 – 25 million. In exceptional cases, the total funding volume might deviate from this range. In those cases, Applicants need to indicate this already in their Outline and provide a robust justification.

Please note: Funds > EUR 25 million will only be considered for achieving additional benefits going beyond economies of scale.

FAQ 5 At what point should a “successful NSPs proving a substantial upscaling potential” apply for the additional budget foreseen to support scale up, and when will a decision be taken if an NSP in implementation is eligible to receive this additional budget for specific upscaling activities?

Highly successful NSPs having substantial upscaling potential can apply for the disbursement of additional budget towards the end of Implementation Phase 2. There is no need to indicate interest already in the Outline.

The respective request will be reviewed and assessed by the NAMA Facility on the basis of the NSP’s performance during implementation, its potential for upscaling and justification for the need in additional budget which is to be used for specific upscaling activities that are relevant to the original NSP. The decision will be taken by the Donors of the NAMA Facility and will be subject to the availability of funds.

FAQ 6 Is it possible to obtain a successful NSP Outline as a reference?

No, the NAMA Facility is not authorized to share or publish NSP Outlines it has received in previous Calls.

On the NAMA Facility’s website you can find a fictional [Outline](#) that featured in a [7th Call webinar](#) and was developed by the TSU as a guide for 7th Call applicants. Please note, that this Outline does not respond to the new characteristics of the Ambition Initiative Call, e.g. enhanced NDCs, but can nonetheless provide valuable input on other characteristics of a successful NSP.

FAQ 7 Can questions be submitted after the last round of Clarification Note?

No, this will not be possible to ensure a fair and competitive Ambition Initiative Call. Please make sure to submit your questions at least two days before the publication date of the last round of Clarification Notes, i.e. by 17 May 2021, so that your enquiry can be addressed in the last round of Clarification Notes.

Good to know: There is a dedicated clarification policy and process in place, through which you can submit your question to the NAMA Facility. More information can be found on our website.

CN I-01 Does NAMA Facility have guidance on how much of the resulting GHG mitigation can be claimed by the country as domestic mitigation action?

The resulting mitigation can be accounted and claimed by the country as domestic mitigation action throughout the NSP and beyond its lifetime, i.e. donor countries may not claim these as their own mitigation actions.

CN I-02 Where can we find information about NSPs financed by the NAMA Facility that are already in the DPP or Implementation?

Information can be found on the [NAMA Facility website](#), where information on all NSPs in DPP or Implementation is provided.

CN I-03 Does the GHG mitigation achieved through technical cooperation (TC) activities implemented during the NSP implementation count as direct or indirect mitigation?

GHG mitigation achieved through TC activities counts as indirect mitigation – irrespective of whether it has been achieved during or after the NSP lifetime. Only emission reductions that are achieved by measures (partially) financed or leveraged by the financial cooperation (FC) component during the NSP period are counted as direct mitigation.

CN II-01 How will Applicants know if the NDCs of countries for which they are developing NSP Outlines are considered “enhanced” and “ambitious” according to the definition as used for the purposes of the Ambition Initiative Call?

According to the definition as used for the purposes of the Ambition Initiative Call “enhanced” NDCs are characterized by

- (1) Strengthening mitigation targets and actions over time;
- (2) Strengthening emissions reduction goals (including the addition of sector-specific targets); or by
- (3) Broadening the scope to include a wider coverage of sectors or gases.

Countries may additionally enhance their NDCs by moving from conditional to unconditional targets, shortening timelines and/or adding policies and measures.

For an NDC to be considered as “ambitious” according to the NAMA Facility’s definition, the NDC should meet several or all of the criteria:

- Compatibility with the globally agreed temperature limit under the Paris Agreement;
- Mitigation target that:
 - implies a significant reduction of economy-wide GHG emissions below business as usual emissions trajectories; and/or
 - includes a rapid reduction of GHG in key emitting sectors with a view to achieving decarbonization; and/or
 - implies an early peaking of GHG emissions and rapid decarbonization thereafter; and/or
 - is aligned with an existing net-zero target (see also GID, section 4.1).

In their NSP Outlines Applicants should indicate how the intervention proposed under the NSP would be embedded into the respective ambitious NDCs and therefore why the NSP would meet the targets of the Ambition Initiative Call (see Outline section 2.4 *Embedding*).

In the course of the Ambition Initiative Call, the NAMA Facility will not express its views on the level of ambition of individual enhanced NDCs.

Please note: In the webinar on 24 March 2021 the TSU will present more tangible examples of enhanced and ambitious NDCs (fictional examples).

CN II-02 Please further define the term "enhanced and ambitious NDCs" in the context of a low-emission country?

The definition of "enhanced and ambitious NDCs" as used for the purposes of the Ambition Initiative Call can be found in the GID, section 4.1 as well as CN-II-01. A country-specific context is taken into account in the process of assessing NSP Outlines.

CN II-03 The COVID-19 pandemic is still hampering effective public consultation and dialogue with key stakeholders in certain countries. Is it likely that the deadline of the Ambition Initiative Call might be pushed back to allow for more preparation time?

Whilst the NAMA Facility does not currently foresee to extend the deadline of the Ambition Initiative Call, we are aware of the current situation and the challenges it poses to public consultations and potentially the Outline development process. As a response to continuing lockdowns or other Covid-19 related rules, we will accept e-mails from national ministries confirming the support to the NSP during the Outline submission. The actual endorsement letter should then be presented at the latest during the in-depth assessment phase.

Please note: NSP Outlines of countries whose NDC updates have been delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic might be eligible under future calls of the Ambition Initiative if such rounds are launched. All related information will be published on the NAMA Facility website in due course.

CN II-04 Does the Ambition Initiative Call equal the 8th Call for Projects of the NAMA Facility or will the 8th Call be open towards the end of this year?

The Ambition Initiative Call equals the 8th Call of the NAMA Facility. All related information on future Calls of the Ambition Initiative or a potential 9th Call, if such rounds are launched, will be published on the NAMA Facility website.

CN II-05 Could you provide us with the list of countries that are part of the NDCP and that have Partnership Plans?

Please refer to the [website](#) of the NDC Partnership for further information.

CN II-06 Can you please provide information on how to find out if a country has submitted an enhanced NDC?

As the main source, the UNFCCC's [website](#) should be consulted to see if a country has submitted its enhanced NDC to the UNFCCC. Additionally, other websites like [climate action tracker](#) and [climate watch data](#) can be checked regularly as they closely monitor the process of an NDC submission.

CN III-01 Can Applicants submit more than one Outline to the Ambition Initiative Call?

Yes, Applicants can submit several Outlines to the NAMA Facility.

CN IV-01 Is there a maximum number of Outlines that can be submitted by one Applicant / ASP?

No, the NAMA Facility does not set an upper limit.

CN IV-02 Can you please further explain the term financial cooperation / FC in the context of NSPs?

The NAMA Facility provides funding for NSPs that are characterized as the most ambitious part of NAMAs and/or building blocks for NDC implementation. NSPs usually consist of a combination of financial and technical measures that are structured in a project concept, the so called NSP Outline and NSP Proposal.

Technical measures fall under the Technical Cooperation Component (TC), whereas financial measures are covered in the Financial Cooperation Component (FC). As part of the FC, financial support mechanisms shall be applied to overcome existing market/financial barriers hindering the deployment of GHG mitigation technologies or practices and to mobilise capital investments for carbon-neutral development pathways. For more information on financial mechanisms please refer to FAQ 36, the [podcast](#) Introduction to Annex 5a - Financial Mechanism and the [webinar](#) "Financial Mechanisms and the NAMA Support Project".

CN VI-01 Assuming that as part of an NSP in implementation items are procured, e.g. a renewable energy technology, and private sector actors contribute co-funding for the purchase of this item: Will those assets become the full property of those private actors?

Depending on the details of the case in question, generally those assets will become the property of the private actors investing. However, please keep in mind that all NSPs need to serve a public-benefit purpose and beneficiaries of NSPs must be selected in an open and transparent way.

II. Selection Criteria

FAQ 8 Is it necessary for the NSP Outline to be directly linked to a specific NAMA?

No, this is not required. The NAMA Facility does not require a NAMA to be registered with the UNFCCC nor a direct link between the NSP and a NAMA in order to be eligible for support. Despite its name, the NAMA Facility supports a wide range of mitigation actions, including sector programmes and initiatives, as long as they are in line with a country's enhanced NDC and endorsed by the national government.

FAQ 9 Do the sectors targeted by NSPs have to be mentioned in the enhanced NDC?

Yes, NSPs should target sectors explicitly included in the enhanced NDCs.

FAQ 10 Will we be penalized in scoring if we take very conservative approaches in measuring project results?

Not at all. Applicants are highly encouraged to only propose what is truly realistic to be achieved. If the NSP Proposal deviates from the initial NSP Outline in terms of proposing significantly lower ambition criteria (not only direct mitigation and financial leverage, but also transformational change), the NSP risks not being considered for the Implementation Phase. Therefore, Applicants are encouraged to base their estimates on conservative figures from the very beginning.

All assumptions underlying the mitigation potential and financial leverage should be realistic and in case of uncertainties, applicants should take a conservative approach. In particular, GHG emission reductions over the lifetime of infrastructure projects should take into account the temporal impacts of planning and timescale of investments, including allowances for permitting, planning and procurement, amongst others, in relation to the lifetime of the NSP. During the assessment of NSP Outlines, the underlying assumptions and numbers are subject to rigorous plausibility checks.

For example, in order to reach a goal of installing and operating 100 units of a mitigation technology, you would likely need to work on a lot more than 100 units, as some might not enter operation at all and some might encounter technical or financial defaults during operation. In short, not every activity that is begun will be concluded successfully. Therefore, in order to achieve 100 units, one will have to work on 100+x units and include these into the financial model and factor this in when estimating the expected GHG mitigation effect.

FAQ 11 How does the NAMA Facility assess the scalability of NSPs in the context of transformational change?

During the assessment process, it is evaluated, whether upscaling or replication is foreseen at the national or even regional level. It should be clear how the project intends to effect a transformation, including specific activities and / or financial mechanism(s) intended to scale up or replicate the successful impacts of the NSP beyond its boundaries.

CN I-04 Are projects with a focus on social issues that also support low-carbon developments prioritized in the selection process?

The NAMA Facility's focus is on supporting the implementation of mitigation actions. As we are looking for NSPs that have the potential to trigger transformational changes towards carbon-neutral development pathways, significant co-benefits (social, economic, environmental) are considered important drivers for transformational change. In short, while the focus of the NSP should be on mitigation action, social and other co-benefits are positively evaluated as part of the potential for transformational change.

CN II-07 Given that the NAMA Facility funds are considered as ODA funds, does the NAMA Facility assess only the ambition of a country's conditional NDC or are the contributions in their totality assessed (both unconditional and conditional contributions)?

The NAMA Facility will take into consideration the totality of a country's NDC, i.e. the unconditional and conditional contribution, in order to assess whether the definition of ambitious NDCs as specified in section 4.1 of the GID has been met.

CN II-08 On Green Recovery Strategies: A) How are Outlines treated from countries that have not defined a Green Recovery Strategy (yet)? B) How does the NAMA Facility evaluate whether the 'green' recovery plans of targeted countries are actually 'green'?

A) See FAQ 60.

B) The NAMA Facility assesses whether the proposed NSP activities contribute to the green recovery from the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic (support to SMEs, employment creation, gender mainstreaming etc.) against the backdrop of the NSP's contribution to the climate change mitigation. The overall quality of the recovery plans of individual countries and whether they can be considered 'green' in their totality will not be part of the NAMA Facility Outline assessment.

CN II-09 How does the engagement of CIFF as a new Donor affect the selection criteria of NSP Outlines?

The engagement of CIFF will not result in additional requirements to NSP Outlines, nor will it change the selection criteria. All selection criteria defining the NAMA Facility's approach to the assessment of NSP outlines are described in the GID.

CN II-10 Can you please further define the term "implementation ready" as used in the GID?

Readiness refers to the degree of maturity and the level of detail in the elaboration of an NSP. Activities to prepare a project to the implementation (e.g. signing agreements with the partners, establishing the financial mechanism etc.) are generally referred to as readiness activities. In that

sense, the NAMA Facility considers a NAMA Support Project to be “implementation ready”, when it can be practically implemented (incl. the planned scope and scale) after a short phase of a detailed preparation. The NAMA Facility funding cannot be used to finance research activities or conceptual development of climate change mitigation technologies.

CN IV-03 One of the NAMA Facility’s selection criteria is the financial ambition. In the GID, section 5.1.3 Outline Assessment Criteria the criterion is further specified and amongst others, is it mentioned that a “significant private sector participation” is expected. Can you please further elaborate if the private sector participation is a mandatory feature of NSPs?

No, a private sector participation is not mandatory for the NSPs. However, the financial ambition, both in terms of public and private funding leverage, is seen as key for triggering the transformational change towards a carbon-neutral development pathway. In both cases, the financial leverage is assessed relative to the sector and the country. Therefore, the NAMA Facility does not set a minimum threshold for the private and public leverage. It is important to demonstrate how the mitigation technology or practice proposed in the NSP will be financed and showcase that the NSP will create favorable market conditions for further uptake and upscaling of the mitigation technology or practice. Usually a certain level of private sector engagement is needed to create this effect and ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in the transformation.

CN IV-04 One of the NAMA Facility’s selection criteria under feasibility is the project design. In the GID, section 5.1.3 Outline Assessment Criteria the criterion is further specified and amongst others, the following detailed requirements are listed “plausible business model(s) at the investment level and appropriate financial mechanism and possibly regulation to overcome barriers and make business models viable”. For an NSP targeting a country’s forestry sector: Would the NAMA Facility also consider NSPs that do not include a classical business model but propose community-based bio-business activities at a local level, e.g. community forest management and promotion of renewable energies.

As ownership of the NSP within the local context is of high importance, working with regional or local governments and/or communities is recommendable. Measures to prove the case of long-term sustainability with the potential for upscaling, such as the promotion and support of community-based forestry and/or sustainable bio-businesses at a local level are also recommendable. Nonetheless, it will be important to demonstrate how the anticipated impacts are fed into the national level strategies/policies/agendas and how the NSP enables upscaling and replication at a national level. Additionally, the direct GHG emissions mitigation potential as well as the financial leverage, public and private, should play a prominent role within the envisaged measures.

To summarize: The answer would be yes, community-based bio-business activities could be chosen as a viable option for an NSP, as long as NAMA Facility requirements for the financial leverage and direct mitigation of GHG emissions are kept in mind.

CN IV-05 Assuming an NSP with the objective to implement mini-grids on a large scale, triggers additional investments though the successful demonstration of the technology at a ratio 1:9.75, i.e. each Euro of the NAMA Facility funding provided to the NSP mobilises further 9.75 Euro as an additional investment: Does this additional investment meet the NAMA Facility’s definition of “additional leveraged investment” as described in the GID, section 5.1.3 Outline Assessment Criteria and the Glossary?

The NAMA Facility defines “leveraged investment” as additional funds that will become available for investments in the NSP, that would not be spent on the same purpose in the absence of an NSP. Please take a look at the NAMA Facility Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, pp. 51 & 54, to better understand the nature of the financial leverage/mobilisation by the NSP.

The financial leverage can be of a private or public nature, where the public sector leverage is usually achieved by public sector instruments (e.g. tax incentives, subsidies etc.) and/or government (in-kind) contributions, and the private sector leverage is achieved through the direct participation of the private sector stakeholders in the financial mechanisms and products offered by the NSP, e.g. in a form of a collateral, equity, loan guarantee etc.

If the scenario described in the question meets these criteria, it will be considered as leveraged investments according to the NAMA Facility’s definition.

CN IV-06 How decisive is a country’s formulated NDC for the success chances of an Outline?

The submission of an enhanced and ambitious NDC, according to the NAMA Facility’s definition, until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call is one of the eligibility criteria of the Call.

In case a country’s NDC meets this definition and the submission also complies with other eligibility criteria as described in the GID, section 5.1.3 Outline Assessment Criteria, the success chances of an Outline depend solely on the quality and context of the Outline including the submitted Annexes.

CN V-01 For an NSP to have reasonable success chances: What level of readiness is expected by the NAMA Facility?

For an NSP to have reasonable success chances it should be “implementation ready”. For more information on how the NAMA Facility defines the term “implementation ready”, please refer to CN II-10.

III. Eligibility of countries

FAQ 12 Which countries are eligible, and which are excluded from receiving support from the NAMA Facility?

In order to be eligible for NAMA Facility support, the country of implementation must be listed on the so-called OECD DAC list of recipient countries throughout the entire Implementation Phase. Countries and territories not listed on this list are excluded from NAMA Facility support. The most recent OECD DAC list is published [here](#).

In addition to that, under the Ambition Initiative Call, only countries that presented enhanced and ambitious NDCs to UNFCCC until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call will be eligible for support.

FAQ 13 If a country’s enhanced NDC is under preparation, but not yet finalized and submitted by 31 May 2021, will the country be non-eligible to participate in the Ambition Initiative Call?

Yes, the submission of an enhanced NDC to UNFCCC until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call is an eligibility criterium that all Outlines need to comply with. More information on the eligibility criteria for Outlines can be found in the GID, section 5.1.3 “Outline Assessment Criteria”.

FAQ 14 Is a participation in the NDC Partnership a prerequisite for being eligible in the Ambition Initiative Call?

No, it is not a prerequisite to participate in the NDC Partnership (NDCP). However, if a country is a member of the NDC Partnership, the NSP needs to demonstrate a high level of alignment with the Partnership Plans developed within the framework of the NDCP, as far as these exist. In countries where economic advisors have been deployed with support from the NDCP, it is highly recommended to link the NSP with the work of the advisors.

FAQ 15 Does the NAMA Facility have any preference or priorities for country groups or regions?

No, the NAMA Facility does not prefer any country group or region over others.

FAQ 16 Can a country apply in the Ambition Initiative Call if it has already received support from the NAMA Facility?

Yes, it can. The NAMA Facility seeks to select the most ambitious NSPs submitted in a Call; it does not have a regional or country-specific focus. Therefore, previous funding decisions do not exclude a positive funding decision in the current Ambition Initiative Call of the NAMA Facility.

FAQ 17 Can a country submit more than one NSP Outline in the Ambition Initiative Call?

Yes, this is possible. Each NSP Outline is assessed on its own merits based on the same selection criteria, regardless of whether it comes from the same or different countries. Please note that for each NSP Outline, a complete separate NSP Outline including Annexes should be submitted.

FAQ 18 Are cross-border and /or regional projects eligible for funding in the Ambition Initiative Call?

NSPs in the cross-border but also regional contexts are eligible.

Please note that for all countries involved, the political commitment, readiness, implementation structure, etc. would be assessed. Endorsement letters from national ministries of all involved countries are required.

In addition, such cross-border or regional approaches would need to demonstrate a common “raison d’être”; for instance, several small island states of a region could join forces within one NSP in order to achieve a reasonable project size and scaling effects. However, it would be difficult to make a case for the common raison d’être simply because an organisation is active in three or four countries across a continent.

CN I-05 Are countries prioritised that have not received funding in the previous Calls?

No, the NAMA Facility has no regional or country-group specific focus. It continues to select the most ambitious yet feasible NSPs, where each NSP is assessed on its own merits according to the selection criteria outlined in GID section 5.1.3.

CN II-11 How are NSP Outlines treated that refer to national contexts in which enhanced NDCs are not presented to UNFCCC up until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call on 31 May 2021?

The NAMA Facility expects that by the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call in May a significant number of enhanced NDCs will have been presented to the UNFCCC. As stated in the GID, Outlines of NSPs that plan to intervene in a country with an enhanced NDC submitted to the UNFCCC until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call on 31 May 2021 will be eligible to participate in the Call.

Please note that further NSP Outlines of countries whose NDC updates have been delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic might be eligible under future Calls of the Ambition Initiative if such rounds are launched. All related information will be published on the NAMA Facility website in due course.

CN II-12 How are NSP Outlines treated from countries that already announced to submit enhanced NDC in summer 2021, e.g. in the run-up to COP26, but only after the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call on 31 May 2021? Would a statement of intention of the partner country to submit the NDC update at a defined date suffice in this case, e.g. as an attachment to Annex 1 *Endorsement Letter*?

As stated in the GID, Outlines of NSPs that plan to intervene in a country with an enhanced NDC submitted to the UNFCCC until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call on 31 May 2021 will be eligible to participate in this Call (for more information see CN-II-11). A statement of intention of the partner country to submit the updated NDC at a certain date will thus not suffice for a country to be eligible.

Please note: NSP Outlines of countries whose NDC updates have been delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic might be eligible under future Calls of the Ambition Initiative if such rounds are launched. All related information will be published on the NAMA Facility website in due course.

CN II-13 How are Outlines treated from countries that are part of the NDC Partnership, but that have not developed Partnership Plans? In the GID, the alignment of NSP activities with the Partnership Plans is mentioned as part of the assessment criterion for the potential of transformational change.

As stated in FAQ 14, participation in the NDC Partnership is not a prerequisite for a country and a respective NSP Outline to be eligible under the Ambition Initiative Call. The same holds true for the development of Partnerships Plans. However, if a country is a member of the NDC Partnership and has developed a Partnership Plan, the NSP should be aligned with this Partnership Plan.

Please note: Should a country propose an NSP in a sector that is not yet covered by the NDC Partnership Plan but explicitly mentioned in the country's NDC, the lack of an alignment with the Partnership Plan in this particular case will not negatively impact the assessment of an NSP Outline.

CN II-14 The eligibility criterion of submission of the enhanced NDC before the Ambition Initiative Call deadline excludes much of sub-Saharan Africa. Can you please confirm your understanding of the same?

For a response, please refer to CN-II-11.

Please note that the NAMA Facility will abstain from commenting on the plans and timelines of individual countries with respect to the process of updating their NDCs.

CN II-15 How are NSP Outlines treated that refer to national contexts in which the first NDC is characterized “ambitious”, but no enhanced NDC is presented to UNFCCC up until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call on 31 May 2021?

For a response, please refer to CN-II-11.

Please note that further NSP Outlines of countries whose NDC updates have been delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic might be eligible under future calls of the Ambition Initiative if such rounds are launched. All related information will be published on the NAMA Facility website in due course.

CN II-16 How are NSP Outlines treated from countries that are not yet a party to the Paris Agreement, but will submit an enhanced intended NDC (iNDC) to UNFCCC before the Ambition Initiative Call deadline?

As stated in the GID, Outlines of NSPs that plan to intervene in a country with an enhanced NDC submitted to the UNFCCC until the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call on 31 May 2021 will be eligible to participate in the Call. iNDCs, even if enhanced and submitted to UNFCCC, do not fulfil this criterion. For more information also refer to CN II-11.

CN III-02 Most countries ratified their iNDC, considering it as their 1st NDC. Those countries were requested to submit an updated NDC by 2020. How are NSP Outlines treated that refer to national contexts that did not ratify their iNDC, but instead prepared and submitted a new NDC to UNFCCC? In case that the new NDC meets the NAMA Facility’s definition of ambitious and enhanced as stipulated in the GID and it is submitted to UNFCCC before the closure of the Ambition Initiative Call, will the country be eligible, even though it did not update its 1st NDC to submit an enhanced 2nd NDC, but only updated the iNDC to submit an enhanced 1st NDC?

Countries that only updated their iNDC to submit an enhanced 1st NDC before the Ambition Initiative Call for Applications closes will not be eligible to participate.

CN IV-07 Will a first updated NDC envisioning a country's participation in internationally transferred mitigation outcomes (ITMO, Article 6 of the Paris Agreement) score in terms of "ambitious NDCs" according to the NAMA Facility’s definition of enhanced and ambitious NDCs?

No, the inclusion of ITMOs is not considered as an increase of the NDC’s mitigation ambition. While the ITMOs can serve to encourage countries to define a higher mitigation goal, the NAMA Facility considers them rather as a vehicle and not as an enhanced target themselves.

CN VI-02 In which form does an updated NDC need to be presented to the UNFCCC to be considered and assessed by the NAMA Facility in the framework of the Ambition Initiative Call, i.e. will only the final version of the updated NDC qualify or also interim versions of the updated NDC?

All first updated NDCs, considered as such by UNFCCC and featured in the [interim NDC registry](#), will be treated by the NAMA Facility as the country’s first updated NDC, even if they are presented as an interim version (incl. interim technical report/summary) of the updated NDC. This way, the NAMA Facility will be able to proceed with assessing their eligibility in terms of enhancement and ambition as stipulated in the GID.

IV. Eligibility of Applicants and Applicant Support Partners (ASP)

FAQ 19 Can a ministry or an entity submit more than one application, or be involved in more than one NSP Outline submission?

Yes, this is possible. There is no limit – ministries or legal entities can be involved in more than one NSP Outline submission.

FAQ 20 Does the NAMA Facility apply some sort of accreditation system for potential Applicants?

No, the NAMA Facility does not apply an accreditation system for potential Applicants. The qualification and eligibility will be assessed during the assessment phase.

For more information see GID, section 5.1.1 “Applicants in the Outline Phase” and Annex 2 “Indicative list of specific eligibility criteria for Applicants, Applicant Support Partners and NAMA Support Organizations”.

FAQ 21 Can governments be directly contracted for the Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP) or Implementation?

The NAMA Facility cannot directly contract national ministries for the DPP or implementation due to administrative reasons. If the Applicant is a national ministry, then the NAMA Facility requires the nomination of an ASP (that is a legal entity) as the contracting partner for providing the funding support during the DPP. For a potential implementation, a NAMA Support Organisation (NSO) needs to be nominated (with a legal entity) that will become contracting partner for the implementation (see also GID section 5.1.1 “Applicants in the Outline Phase” and 5.2.2 “Applicants in the Proposal Phase/NSOs”).

FAQ 22 What is the difference between an Applicant and an ASP?

The Applicant submits the NSP Outline to the NAMA Facility.

The NAMA Facility cannot directly contract national ministries for the DPP due to administrative reasons. If the Applicant is a national ministry, then the NAMA Facility requires the nomination of an ASP (that is a legal entity) as the contracting partner for receiving the funding support during the DPP.

If the legal entity submits the NSP Outline itself, the legal entity would be called the Applicant. The legal entity would be required to have the endorsement from the relevant national ministries to submit the NSP Outline. An additional ASP would not be required.

In both cases, sections 1.4 “National Ministry 1”, 1.5 “National Ministry 2” and 1.6 “Applicant / Applicant Support Partner” of the NSP Outline template must be completed and endorsement letters from the national ministries must be submitted.

Good to know: The NAMA Facility introduced these options to ensure broad accessibility for potential Applicants. In the event that a national ministry submits an NSP Outline but is unclear about the eligibility of the designated ASP, this can be discussed during the assessment. If found ineligible, the legal entity might be replaced with another as part of the assessment and contracting process for the DPP.

FAQ 23 Can the ASP be a consortium?

Yes, in justified cases, the ASP can be a consortium. The NAMA Facility does not set an upper limit to the number of organisations in a consortium but recommends keeping the number as small as possible. When a consortium is formed, the roles of all partners must be well defined, and a lead

consortium member should be identified to become the contractual partner for the NAMA Facility Grant Agent. This partner is then the funding recipient and can forward funds to the other consortium partners. In the NSP Outline, the consortium partners for the ASP should be described in NSP Outline section 1.6 “Applicant / Applicant Support Partner” and Annex 3 “Applicant or Applicant Support Partner”.

Good to know: All consortium partners will be subject to an eligibility check before the grant contract is concluded. A formalised consortium is not a prerequisite for eligible entities to co-operate under one NSP.

FAQ 24 Can a local non-governmental organisation apply?

Yes, a local non-governmental organisation can apply if it receives sufficient endorsement from the government institutions relevant for the implementation of the NSP and if it complies with the capacity requirements listed in the GID, section 5.1.1 “Applicants in the Outline Phase”.

FAQ 25 What is the difference between the Applicant and NSO and who is doing what during which phase?

The Applicant is the institution submitting the NSP Outline to the NAMA Facility, in some cases together with the ASP. The Applicant or ASP become the contracting partner for the DPP and develop the NSP Proposal during the DPP.

The NSO(s) needs to be identified during the DPP. The NSO will become the contractual partner for the potential implementation phase of the NSP and it will be responsible for executing the NSP.

FAQ 26 Can a legal entity act as Applicant/ASP and as NSO?

Yes, a legal entity can act as Applicant/ASP and NSO if it complies with the capacity requirements for NSOs. The distinction between the two roles was introduced to extend the possibility of participation in NAMA Facility Calls to entities that have the experience and capacity to *design* projects without necessarily having the mandate, experience or capacity to *implement* them.

Note that the capacity requirements for NSOs are higher than those for Applicants/ASP. For more information see GID section 5.1.1 “Applicants in the Outline Phase”, 5.2.2 “Applicants in the Proposal Phase/NSOs” and Annex 2 “Indicative list of specific eligibility criteria for Applicants, Applicant Support Partners and NAMA Support Organizations”.

FAQ 27 Is it possible to have one organization as the NSO for the technical part of the NSP and another organization as the NSO for the financial part of the NSP?

Yes, this is possible. The NAMA Facility has several NSPs in its portfolio where one NSO is responsible for the financial cooperation and another for the technical cooperation.

FAQ 28 Must an NSO already be identified at the NSP Outline submission stage?

If an NSO is not identified at NSP Outline submission, it can be identified later, up to three months into the DPP.

FAQ 29 How far is the consideration of commercial entities as ASP / NSO further enabled?

In the Ambition Initiative Call commercial entities will be eligible to act as Applicants, ASP or NSOs (see GID, section 3.4 “Applicant, Applicant Support Partner and NAMA Support Organisation”). Similar to any other organization applying as part of a Call, commercial entities will undergo a legal review, in particular concerning the public-benefit purpose of each project and the non-violation of EU state-aid law, before possible funding will be granted through the NAMA Facility.

Considering the mandatory public benefit purpose of each NSP, national and international commercial organisations are encouraged to submit NSP Outlines and NSP Proposal in a partnership with a not-for-profit organisation, e.g. a national NGO, regardless of the possibility to also submit such NSP Outlines and NSP Proposals on their own.

Please note: As specified in the GID, section 4.1 “Characteristics of NAMA Support Projects”, no individual economic advantage, commercial benefit, profit for the Applicant, ASP, NSO or any implementing partner must be generated with the use of NAMA Facility funding.

CN I-06 Can development banks act as Applicant or Applicant Support Partner or later, as NSO, even though they have no official for public-benefit status?

Yes, national, regional and international development banks are eligible for such roles, if they receive endorsement of the relevant national ministries. Development banks are public organizations set up for a public-benefit purpose.

CN I-07 Are commercial entities based in the EU eligible to act as Applicant or Applicant Support Partner?

Yes, in the Ambition Initiative Call EU based commercial entities will be eligible to act as Applicants, ASPs or NSOs, after they passed a legal review, in particular concerning the public-benefit purpose of their proposed project and the non-violation of EU state-aid law.

For more information see also FAQ 29 and GID, section 3.4 “Applicant, Applicant Support Partner and NAMA Support Organisation”).

CN II-17 In the Ambition Initiative Call commercial entities will be eligible to act as Applicants, ASP or NSOs.

A) Could you please explain if this includes only national or also international entities? B) What sort of agreements do commercial entities need to sign with the Government of the targeted country (e.g. MoU)?

A) This includes national and international commercial entities. For more information on the eligibility please refer to FAQ 29.

B) Commercial entities are not requested to sign a formal agreement with the Government of the country in which the NSP will be implemented. However, similarly to any other organization applying as part of the Ambition Initiative Call, the Government needs to endorse the NSP in an official Endorsement Letter (mandatory Annex I; please refer to the [application documents](#) of the Ambition Initiative Call).

CN II-18 Do NSOs need to be accredited for being eligible to receiving NAMA Facility funds?

The NAMA Facility does not require NSOs to go through an accreditation process. NSOs will be subject to an enhanced due diligence process initiated by the NFGA during the DPP, that encompasses an examination of the administrative and financial procedures and capacities as well as an assessment of the general capability of the NSO to implement the proposed NSP. More information on the capacity requirements to be fulfilled by NSOs can be found in the GID, section 5.2.2 and Annex 2 to the GID.

CN II-19 Is there a minimum contribution expected from national implementing partners or the NSO?

No, the NAMA Facility does not set a minimum contribution amount from public or private sector sources of funding, neither in absolute nor in relative terms.

It will be important to demonstrate that funding provided by the NAMA Facility is most efficiently used to achieve ambitious mitigation targets, in particular by leveraging additional finance. See also FAQ 40.

CN III-03 For a cross-country NSP: What kind of institution would be eligible to take over the role of Applicant / NSO? Does the institution need to have a cross-country focus, e.g. a regional resource center?

In general, for being eligible, Applicants / ASPs and NSOs need to comply with certain qualification and capacity criteria as stipulated in the GID, section 5.1.1 “Applicants in the Outline Phase”, 5.2.2 “Applicants in the Proposal Phase/NSOs” and Annex 2 “Indicative list of specific eligibility criteria for Applicants, Applicant Support Partners and NAMA Support Organizations”.

Specifically, for a cross-country NSP, the institution needs to demonstrate its linkage and relationship with all countries targeted by the NSP. In addition, implementing partners need to be identified in each of the targeted countries.

For general information on cross-border NSPs, please also refer to FAQ 18.

CN IV-08 The GID defines several capacity requirements that (non-governmental) Applicants, ASPs and NSO need to comply with for being eligible to receive NAMA Facility funds. How strict is the NAMA Facility on the compliance with those requirements, especially the one on implementation experience with a certain number of projects of a similar funding size?

Applicants, ASPs and NSP need to meet all of the capacity criteria included in the respective sections of the GID for being eligible to receive the NAMA Facility funding (GID, section 3.4 Applicant, Applicant Support Partner (ASP) and NAMA Support Organisation (NSO), 5.1.1 Applicants in the Outline Phase, 5.2.2 Applicants in the Proposal Phase/NSOs and Annex 2).

Please note that the capacity requirements for NSOs are higher than those for Applicants/Applicant Support Partners. The distinction between the two roles was introduced to extend the possibility of participating in NAMA Facility Calls to entities that have the experience and capacity to design projects without necessarily having the mandate, experience or capacity to implement them.

Good to know: Several legal entities can form an NSO or ASP consortium to combine their expertise and experience to comply with the capacity criteria for NSOs and to provide the necessary sector expertise for implementation. For more information please refer to FAQ 23.

CN IV-09 Are public Universities eligible to become Applicant / ASP and to execute the NAMA Facility funding? Would a University have to establish an alliance with a governmental ministry in order to being eligible?

Yes, a public university can apply and upon success execute the funds if it receives sufficient endorsement from the government institutions relevant for the implementation of the NSP. To prove that, besides the provision of an endorsement letter as part of the NSP Outline, no formal alliance needs to be established.

Please note that the public university as an Applicant / ASP should comply with the capacity requirements listed in the GID, section 5.1.1 “Applicants in the Outline Phase” and Annex 2.

V. Eligibility of Sectors and Technologies

FAQ 30 Are there any eligibility criteria or restrictions of the NAMA Facility regarding certain sectors and technologies?

The NAMA Facility has no sectoral focus. Therefore, in principle, NSPs from all sectors with a relevant mitigation potential are eligible. It is, however, required to demonstrate that the NSP supports transformational change towards a carbon-neutral pathway.

The NAMA Facility's interpretation of transformational change encompasses a significant technological paradigm shift that is quicker than business-as-usual, irreversible/permanent (i.e. not slipping back to the situation before the project) and backed by a strong political will and commitment to implement these changes.

Therefore, certain technologies targeting a fossil fuel switch, a reduction of gas flaring, upgrading and modernising fossil fuel-based energy generation (e.g. coal) or a replacement of rolling stock in transport with more efficient fossil fuel-based vehicles are likely to find it challenging to demonstrate the potential for transformational change towards a carbon-neutral development pathway.

Based on the assessment of proposed NSPs from previous Calls, the NAMA Facility has compiled lessons learnt for certain (sub-)sectors and technologies, including waste; transport; renewable energy; energy efficiency in buildings, appliances and cook stoves; forestry and agriculture and supply chain approaches (4th Call [webinar](#); 5th Call [webinar](#) and [presentation](#); 6th Call [webinar](#) and [presentation](#)). Applicants are strongly advised to consult these and other NAMA Facility dissemination sources.

FAQ 31 In contrast to the previous Calls, the Ambition Initiative Call now also considers NSPs that aim at piloting innovative technologies. A) Will it be mandatory for the NSP to achieve the shift from the smaller pilot phase to the large-scale project within the NSP duration of maximum 66 months? B) Could you provide some examples of such novel technologies?

A: It will be desirable to accomplish the shift to the large-scale project within the NSP's lifetime. In the Outline documents Applicants are requested to formulate key milestones associated with the smaller scale pilot phase, that need to be achieved before moving into the large-scale project phase. The specific milestones and criteria for the two stages will be determined as part of the in-depth assessments. B: There is a substantial number of novel technologies that could be piloted as part of an NSP. Some illustrative examples are grid-scale battery storage, low emission steel and cement in the built environment, organic and low-input farming (e.g. through a combination of optimised on-farm nutrient recycling, optimised crop rotations, optimised tillage system and/or agroforestry) or industry decarbonization (e.g. cement, steel or chemicals / plastics industry).

FAQ 32 Is it mandatory for NSPs to focus on innovation? Will only pilot technologies be eligible for receiving funding in the Ambition Initiative Call?

No, it is not mandatory for NSPs to focus on innovation and novel technologies. Under the Ambition Initiative Call, applications for NSPs that require a small sized pilot for novel technologies will be considered, but similarly to the previous Calls and in line with the mission and ambition of the NAMA Facility, proven technologies will remain in focus of the NAMA Facility support and will therefore remain eligible for receiving funding. The focus on novel technologies is optional for NSPs.

FAQ 33 Given the strengthened focus on innovation as part of the Ambition Initiative Call, would the NAMA Facility consider NSPs as innovative if they pilot established technologies in a new setting / context? Would these NSPs, similarly to those featuring novel technologies, be allowed to have a “piloting stage” as part of their intervention?

An NSP could not be considered as innovative if it pilots an established technology in a new setting / context. As the technology is considered to be mature, this NSP would not be eligible to have a small sized pilot before moving into a larger scale project.

FAQ 34 Are individual investment projects considered for funding if they fit into the country’s mitigation action?

The NAMA Facility supports governments and their implementing partners in implementing (sub-) sector-wide mitigation actions, rather than single investment projects such as one solar PV plant or the refurbishment of a single building. The NSP must be transformational in nature, including elements of replicability and scalability.

CN I-08 Can transformational change of a sector be focused on a sub-national level rather than at the sector at national level?

NSPs might propose to focus their work on a certain (relevant) sub-national level to enhance impact from their TC and FC. However, it will be important to demonstrate how these impacts are fed into the national level and how the NSP – along with its national implementing partners – enables upscaling and replication at national level.

CN II-20 For NSPs focusing on novel technologies: A) What is the time limit to move from the pilot phase to the large-scale project? B) Will there be an additional decision point before moving to the large-scale project, i.e. will the results from the pilot phase determine if the NSP can proceed to the next phase?

A) The NAMA Facility does not define a timeline that dictates the transition from a pilot phase to a large-scale project. However, it will be desirable to accomplish the shift to the large-scale project within the NSP’s lifetime (see also FAQ 31).

B) In the NSP Outlines, Applicants are requested to formulate key milestones associated with the pilot phase. During an in-depth assessment (following a desktop assessment during the NSP Outline phase), these milestones will be further specified, and additional criteria might be added by the NAMA Facility Board. The achievement of the milestones and criteria defined for the pilot phase will be a prerequisite for transitioning to the large-scale project.

CN II-21 As many NDCs include adaptation activities: Can an NSP also include adaptation activities or is the focus mainly on mitigation?

The NAMA Facility's focus is on supporting the implementation of ambitious mitigation actions. We are looking for NSPs that have the potential to trigger a transformational change towards carbon-neutral development pathways. While adaptation activities might be included to achieve the overall NSP outcome, the focus of the NSP should be on mitigation activities.

CN II-22 Would the NAMA Facility consider funding NSPs that are similar to other projects already being implemented in the country?

This question can only be answered on a case-by-case basis during the assessment of individual NSPs. One of the criteria applied to the NSP Outlines during the desktop assessment stage is additionality of NSPs as well as justification of the volume of the NAMA Facility funding required for the NSPs’

implementation. If additionality is demonstrated and a sound justification is provided, the existence of similar projects in the country of implementation should not result in non-eligibility of an NSP.

CN III-04 Can an NSP include CO₂ sequestration in soils as a method of achieving mitigation? Would the mitigation impact be categorized as a direct or indirect mitigation potential?

In general, an NSP can include activities of CO₂ sequestration in soils (i.e. increased capture and storage of atmospheric CO₂ in the soil carbon pool). As for any other mitigation technology, in the NSP Outline the Applicant needs to provide detailed information how this will be achieved. For CO₂ sequestration in soils it will be particularly important to clearly describe how the mitigation effect will be determined.

Whether the mitigation effect is attributed to the direct or the indirect mitigation potential will depend on the activities undertaken to achieve it. For more information, please see the question CN III-06.

CN III-05 What timeline is recommended by the NAMA Facility for an NSP focusing on novel technologies, i.e. how long should the pilot phase be?

The NAMA Facility does not strictly limit the lengths of the pilot phase, but it is desirable that the NSP accomplishes the shift to a large-scale project within the NSP's lifetime. For more information please also refer to FAQ 31 and CN II-20.

CN IV-10 Can you provide more information on NSPs piloting innovative technologies and how the phased approach would be structured?

For information on NSPs piloting innovative technologies please refer to FAQ 31, CN II-20, CN III-05, CN III-06 and the Ambition Initiative Call Webinar on NSP Outline Development Case Studies and Examples.

CN V-02 For an NSP targeting the forestry sector: A) Would the NAMA Facility consider funding sustainable commercial reforestation? B) Would it be eligible to utilize the wood, that initially counted as mitigation, as an income source for the local population?

Generally, the NAMA Facility very much welcomes NSP outlines proposing reforestation activities. A) If commercial reforestation activities are managed sustainably, and the NSP activities can be categorized as for the public benefit, these activities could be eligible for NAMA Facility funding. It will be essential that social, environmental and governance safeguards are addressed. B) If an NSP can showcase that the calculated mitigation potential and the implementation of the commercially used reforestation site can be monitored successfully, while avoiding leakage and keeping the net mitigation positive, such activities could be eligible. Generally, it needs to be kept in mind that the NAMA Facility's focus lies on mitigation activities, i.e. the NSP needs to demonstrate how mitigation will be achieved beyond the NSP implementation.

VI. Eligible Support Instruments in NSPs

FAQ 35 Does the NAMA Facility provide technical assistance for the preparation of national mitigation actions like NAMAs or for the preparation of NSP Outlines?

No, the focus of the NAMA Facility's support is on the IMPLEMENTATION of NSPs. The NAMA Facility does not provide funding for the development of national mitigation actions like NAMAs or for the preparation of NSP Outlines. Support for the development of these should be sought from other sources.

The NAMA Facility will provide funding for the DPP of selected NSP Outlines to elaborate a comprehensive funding Proposal.

FAQ 36 What financial mechanisms and products can be supported by the NSP?

NSPs are expected to propose financial mechanisms that enable the leveraging of public and private funds in order to make best use of the grant provided by the NAMA Facility to the NSP.

This leverage can be achieved through a variety of financial mechanisms and products. The chosen mechanism(s) or product(s) should be the most appropriate and feasible one(s) to overcome identified key barriers. Potential mechanisms include (but are not limited to) guarantee schemes for commercial loans, soft loan programmes, and even direct grant payments. All supported financial mechanisms need to demonstrate that the subsidy element does not crowd out commercial finance (it should “crowd in” commercial finance), that it is the most efficient and effective solution for overcoming a certain barrier and that there is a clear phase-out concept for the mechanism – or other ways are shown to ensure a sustainable impact of the financing mechanism beyond the NSP’s lifetime.

The NAMA Facility does not set a rule for the percentage blend of subsidies/credits/equity, etc., but the choice and mix of instruments should be adequately justified.

Applicants are strongly advised to consult the NAMA Facility’s [publication](#) and [webinar](#) on financial mechanisms and their links to transformational change as well as the [presentation](#) and [webinar](#) on financial mechanisms of NSPs.

FAQ 37 Is it permissible for the financial support mechanisms to evolve during the NSP implementation, e.g., starting at pilot scale and being refined for scale-up and post-NSP continuity?

Yes, this is accepted by the NAMA Facility. However, the Applicant should bear in mind the lead times for the implementation of financial instruments and the maximum NSP implementation period of 5 ½ years, and the risks of a shortened window of opportunity inherent in such a nascent mechanism to achieve the direct mitigation effects within the NSP Implementation Phase.

FAQ 38 Is it possible to use NAMA Facility support for seed funding for a local climate fund?

Yes, this is possible. The NSP should demonstrate clearly how it will mobilise additional funding and that it is ready for starting operations within the first year of the NSP Implementation Phase.

FAQ 39 Is it permissible if the NAMA Facility funds are gradually replaced by a government tax or other levies?

Yes, definitely. The NAMA Facility is open to the innovative use of domestic funds. The revenues from an appropriately levied government income could provide a sustainable source of funding. It is crucial to ensure and demonstrate a substantial level of commitment from the government to raise and already avail these domestic resources as early as during the DPP.

FAQ 40 Is there any minimum ratio for the financial leverage, i.e. between the requested grant from the NAMA Facility and the mobilised public and private finance?

No, the NAMA Facility does not request a minimum ratio for the financial leverage; however, during the assessment of NSP Outlines, the leverage ratio is taken into consideration in the country- and sector-specific context. NSPs that have been selected in previous Calls propose an average financial leverage ratio of 1:7, i.e. each euro of NAMA Facility funding provided to NSPs mobilises a further seven euros in additional investment.

FAQ 41 Is the definition of financial leverage of an NSP limited to those funds that would not be spent on the same purpose in the absence of an NSP?

Yes, this is correct.

FAQ 42 Where in the NSP Outline should an Applicant indicate funds that will be required for the NSP implementation but are not leveraged by the NSP itself (for example, an existing government program, or a complementary project approved by another international or private sector funder)?

Those budget items, if they will be essential for the implementation of the NSP, could be added in the Outline in section 4 “Expected Budget and Financing Structure of NSP Implementation Phase”. It will be important that the applicant explicitly states that those funds are available irrespective of the NSP being implemented. The amounts must not be included in the M4 and M5 indicator on public and private funds leveraged.

FAQ 43 Is it acceptable if the national government is fully involved and committed but cannot directly financially contribute to the NSP funding, to instead contribute in-kind contributions, etc.?

In-kind contributions may be counted. However, greater weight is given to directly mobilised funds by governments through public sector budgets, funds raised through taxes (and exemptions), grants, loans, guarantees etc. In the assessment process, the country context – in terms of public funds but also development of financial markets – is taken into account.

FAQ 44 If there is no public funding contribution to the NSP, but public commitment through policy interventions, reforms, tax incentives, how is this considered?

Policy commitment is encouraged, and quantifiable tax incentives would be taken into account in the assessment as enablers of transformational change. ‘Hard’ funding commitments might, depending on the specific country context in question, indicate a higher degree of ownership and sustainability of an NSP.

FAQ 45 Do Applicants / ASP need to provide information on the sources from specific partners when indicating the potential leverage of public and private funds?

Yes, the information on specific figures from both public and private sources should be provided together with an information on the status of negotiation/commitment. During the in-depth assessment, the state of commitment will be verified.

FAQ 46 What kind of information does the NAMA Facility expect on the degree to which the funding is secured?

For each distinct direct funding source used for the NSP implementation (including contributions from public institutions, private sector and from other donors), the degree to which the funding has been secured should be clarified, whether it is an existing funding stream, firmly committed or simply earmarked (e.g. included in the national budget plan approved for a certain year; or, has been in principle agreed without a formal commitment). Funding commitments from the government should be mentioned in the endorsement letter(s).

FAQ 47 Does the readiness criterion for financial mechanisms mean that all financing mechanisms should be new and created within the NSP or could existing financial mechanisms be used?

Existing mechanisms or variations thereof can be built upon provided that they specifically meet the objectives of the NSP. Examples from our current portfolio include existing loan guarantee schemes provided by national development finance institutions that have been adapted for NSPs. These

scored well during the assessment as the institutions already have the relevant frameworks, contracts and processes in place to ensure a rapid implementation and the mechanism is associated with a high level of readiness.

FAQ 48 Is the financing mechanism expected to have disbursed all funds and ceased operation by the end of the Implementation Phase of up to 5 ½ years, or can it continue to disburse even after the Implementation Phase has lapsed?

In order to mobilise additional funding, financial mechanisms like guarantee funds or credit programmes could revolve and operate beyond the Implementation Phase. Hence, it is not expected that all funds are disbursed within the Implementation Phase. However, the success of an NSP is, among others, assessed based on investments WITHIN the Implementation Phase. The financial mechanism should start disbursing in the first year of the Implementation Phase 2.

Good to know: All NSPs must provide a phase-out/exit strategy for the NAMA Facility funding.

FAQ 49 Can the NAMA Facility provide funding support to NSPs that require only a technical cooperation component (TC), whereas the financial cooperation component (FC) is instead completely financed by own resources (e.g. in case of a development bank or government budget)?

This might be considered if the NSP can demonstrate additionality and a clear and direct link between the technical cooperation provided and the financial mobilisation and investments.

FAQ 50 Are there any restrictions or limitations for the use of NAMA Facility funding for technical cooperation?

No, there are no restrictions with regard to the types of technical support measures. The NAMA Facility expects that the technical assistance is linked to and enables investments in technologies and behavioural changes driving carbon-neutral development pathways.

FAQ 51 Does the NAMA Facility apply any minimum ratio for funding requested for the financial cooperation and technical cooperation?

No, the NAMA Facility does not apply a minimum ratio between the requested funds for financial and technical support to cater for the different needs of support in different countries and sectors. Nevertheless, it is expected that the NSP can demonstrate that the TC funding provided by the NAMA Facility leverages funding from other sources for investments into climate friendly technologies.

While in the current portfolio of NSPs, the average TC to FC support ratio is 40:60, the NAMA Facility aims to increase this ratio in favour of FC support in future NSPs.

FAQ 52 Can the NAMA Facility funding be combined with funding from other funds, e.g. bilateral or international sources, such as GEF, GCF?

Yes, NAMA Facility funding can be combined with funding from other sources. However, the additionality of the NAMA Facility funding must be demonstrated.

CN I-09 Are proposals on policy research for low-carbon development eligible, given that this might be relevant for many countries?

No, policy research projects and other research projects are not eligible for funding, as this is beyond the scope of the NAMA Facility. The NAMA Facility's objective is to support countries in implementing ambitious mitigation action.

Please note: The NAMA Facility Ambition Initiative Call has a strengthened emphasis on innovation in the context of raised NDC ambition and consideration of applications for NSPs that require a small sized pilot for novel technologies before moving into a larger scale project. This focus on novel technologies is optional for NSPs (for details please refer to GID, section 6).

CN I-10 Is it required for NSPs to generate a revenue stream (to explain: projects on sustainable forest practices often do not generate a revenue)?

In general, it is not required for NSPs to generate a revenue stream. However, in the NAMA Facility's assessment a special focus lies on the sustainability and the upscaling of the project activities, which are often more likely in a set-up with an underlying and attractive business case that generates revenue streams. If sustainability and upscaling are achieved in other ways without revenues (e.g. through regulation and its enforcement), this will also be acceptable to the NAMA Facility.

CN V-03 Is it eligible for an NSP in the forestry sector to generate carbon credits or other emissions credits?

Generally, the NAMA Facility funding may be used for the generation of emission reduction certificates for the voluntary market (VER) insofar as they are of good quality, verifiable and demonstrably used to ensure the sustainable funding of climate protection projects in the fields of agriculture, forestry or land use.

However, in order to ensure the additionality of greenhouse gas reductions and of the Donors' contribution to international climate finance, no emissions certificates or other emissions credits (such as CERs or VERs) generated by NSPs may be traded on the market either during or after the NSP term. Certificates generated with the support from the NAMA Facility must be permanently cancelled.

CN V-04 Where can we find examples for business cases in the AFOLU sector?

The NAMA Facility does not provide sector-specific examples for business cases. General information on business cases and financial support mechanisms is provided in the [webinar](#) "Financial Mechanisms and the NAMA Support Project" and the [publication](#) "Financial Mechanisms in the NAMA Facility".

CN V-05 In the NAMA Facility Webinar - Ambition Initiative Call - Clarifications and FAQs you talked about the fictional NSP Outline of Totinia and mentioned another Donor's contribution to the NSP: A) Did this include the other Donor's contribution to international cooperation? B) Would these funds be considered as funds mobilized by the NSP, i.e. a contribution to the NSP's leverage?

A) In the example of Totinia, the Donor contribution refers to the investment into a hydro power pumping scheme that will be based on a contribution by the Pink Climate Fund, i.e. another climate fund that is not the NAMA Facility. B) In the example of Totinia, the Donor contribution by the Pink Climate Fund was considered as leveraged funds. The reason being the following: "As the Pink Climate Fund is requiring a contribution by other funders to establish the underwater electricity connection [...] and the government of Totinia has only been able to earmark funding of EUR 13 m., the grant of the NAMA Facility to fill the remaining gap of EUR 7 m. is crucial to ensure the realization of this project" (Totinia Outline). Generally, the NAMA Facility defines "leveraged investment" as additional funds that will become available for investments in the NSP, that would not be spent on the same purpose in the absence of an NSP.

As emphasized in the webinar, the example of Totinia is fictional and for illustrative purposes only.

CN VI-03 Are Applicants / ASPs / NSOs required to provide co-funding for the DPP / Implementation Phase, and if so, does the NAMA Facility define a minimum percentage?

No, Applicants / ASPs / NSOs are not required to provide co-funding for the DPP / Implementation Phase.

However, and this is especially important for the implementation phase, the Applicant / ASP / NSO needs to demonstrate that sufficient funding will be available to implement the proposed activities and that funding provided by the NAMA Facility is most efficiently used to achieve ambitious mitigation targets, in particular by leveraging additional finance.

VII. Submission of the NSP Outline and Annexes

FAQ 53 How many endorsement letters from national ministries must be submitted with the NSP Outline and to whom should they be addressed?

Typically, two endorsement letters are expected, as each NSP Outline should include an endorsement letter of the relevant national ministry in charge of climate change AND the national line ministry/ies concerned.

Only if the ministry in charge of climate change is also the responsible sector ministry, then one endorsement letter from this ministry would be sufficient.

The letters should be addressed to the NAMA Facility Board.

Good to know: During the assessment, the NAMA Facility does not prioritize NSPs Outlines that have been submitted by a ministry vs. those submitted by a legal entity. It is up to the submitting parties (ministries, legal entities) to decide who submits the NSP Outline.

FAQ 54 If the ministry itself is the Applicant that will submit the NSP Outline, is the endorsement letter still needed?

Yes, endorsement letters from the relevant line ministry, as well as the ministry in charge of climate change (if different) are still required in this case.

FAQ 55 Must NSOs, main implementing partners and the ASP also provide support letters with the NSP Outline submission?

No. For the submission of the NSP Outline, there is no such requirement. Only endorsement letters from the relevant ministries of the applying government are required. Additional support letters can be submitted, if available. This is in particular recommended for partners that are expected to provide financial contributions. Such support letter would help to demonstrate the level of certainty of the co-funding.

FAQ 56 What is the expected content of the endorsement letter and the level of signatory in the endorsement letters?

Annex 1 of the NSP Outline template (on the endorsement letters) lists aspects that should be considered in the governmental endorsement letters. The national ministries providing the letters are certainly free to formulate the letter as they deem appropriate. Each endorsement letter should be signed by a duly authorised representative of the ministry; the NAMA Facility does not prescribe the level of signatory.

Good to know: The NAMA Facility does not expect Applicants to submit originals of letters – a scanned version is completely sufficient. During the assessment process, endorsement letters are carefully studied as an indicator of national political commitment and embeddedness. If the endorsement letter includes a financial commitment of public funding, this can (in terms of the assessment) substantiate the NSP's aspiration of public funds leveraged.

FAQ 57 For a resubmission of an NSP Outline from the previous Call, should the ministry's endorsement letter(s) be updated, or can the endorsement letter(s) from the last Call be resubmitted?

In order to ensure the full endorsement of the national government and also demonstrate continued support, the NSP Outline should be accompanied by updated letter(s).

FAQ 58 Should the endorsement letter state the endorsement of the Ministry to the DPP or also of the Implementation Phase?

The endorsement by Ministries should cover the full NSP, that is in particular the Implementation Phase.

FAQ 59 Do the Letters of Endorsement have to be written in English or is the official country language sufficient?

All documents provided with the Outline need to be in English. Endorsement letters can be in the official country language too, but in that case an English translation will be required in addition to the version in country language.

FAQ 60 If a country has not formulated green recovery plans as a response to the Covid-19 pandemic, is it still mandatory to cover the topic of green recovery in the Outline?

Yes, even if no official green recovery plans have been formulated so far, the topic should be covered in the Outline in section 2.4 titled "Embedding". This could be done by explaining which individual measures (monetary, political, economic, etc.) have been developed in the country of NSP's intervention to mitigate negative consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic, whether these measures or some of them can be considered "green" and how the NSP can contribute to a wider uptake of green solutions to build back economies and sustain growth during and after the Covid-19 pandemic, despite no holistic green recovery plans/strategies are so far available.

To monitor an NSP's impact to meet the challenge of the Covid-19 pandemic, in the Ambition Initiative Call NSPs are asked to monitor and report on an additional mandatory core indicator: *M6 Contribution of the NSP to the country's measures to promote green recovery from the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic*. Applicants are required to cover the new M6 indicator in Annex 2 titled "Logframe". For information on other mandatory core indicators, please take a look at the GID, section 6.1 "Monitoring and Evaluation".

FAQ 61 Is it obligatory to submit the new Annex 5 "Business Case and Financial Mechanism"?

Yes, it is obligatory to submit Annex 5a "Business Case and Financial Mechanism", which must be supplemented by a mandatory additional document to showcase calculations behind the business model. For that, a template provided by the NAMA Facility (Annex 5b) or the Applicant's own spreadsheet can be used.

To summarize: With each application, Annex 5a "Business Case and Financial Mechanism" as a MS Word document as well as a separate MS Excel spreadsheet (or similar) including underlying calculations must be submitted.

Please note: Applicants are required to use formulas in the spreadsheet, instead of only providing hard-coded figures.

FAQ 62 As the financial support mechanism is a very important part of the NSP, how detailed do you expect the section to be in the NSP Outline exactly?

The financial scheme should be sufficiently elaborated to allow the NAMA Facility to assess its feasibility and appropriateness in the country and sector context. Aspects such as indicative costs,

institutional set-up, legal and governance structures should be covered to the greatest extent possible. In the Ambition Initiative Call, Applicants are requested to submit Annex 5a and Annex 5b on the Business Case and Financial Mechanism as two mandatory annexes. Additional details are to be further elaborated as part of the DPP.

FAQ 63 What are the exact differences between 'outputs', 'outcomes' and 'impacts'?

Impacts are the mid- and long-term direct and indirect effects of the NSP. Outcomes are the overarching direct project goal. It includes direct effects that can be causally attributed to the NSP interventions and that reflect the utilisation of the outputs by the target group. Outputs cover products, goods, services and regulations/standards that have arisen as a result of the NSP activities.

FAQ 64 Can we submit further annexes with additional information, i.e. will they be taken into account during the assessment process?

The NAMA Facility does not expect any additional annexes and cannot guarantee that these will be taken into account during the assessment of the NSP Outline.

FAQ 65 Where can we find additional guidance on how to fill in Annex 6 GHG mitigation potential?

On the NAMA Facility's website you can find one filled-in [fictional Annex 6](#) that was prepared in the course of the 7th Call as guidance for Applicants as well as a [podcast](#) that walks you through the Annex 6 and provides guidance on how to fill in the Annex.

CN I-11 Is there a need to provide a Theory of Change diagramme or Objective Tree in the NSP Outline?

No, there is no such requirement. Applicants are free to decide whether they want to present such diagramme/chart in the concept for further clarity. Please note: It is mandatory to submit a completed logframe as Annex 2.

CN II-23 Many countries do not agree to issue a letter of support until a full proposal has been developed. Does the NAMA Facility support Applicants in their consolidations with governments, e.g. by communicating to countries that such letters are a requirement for being eligible to apply in the Ambition Initiative Call?

The NAMA Facility does not support Applicants in receiving the Endorsement Letters from governments. To ensure embeddedness in and alignment with the country's climate change mitigation policies and development strategies, Applicants are expected to engage with the governmental stakeholders and involve relevant Ministries and public institutions already in the process of developing the NSP concept.

Good to know: The GID mentions the Endorsement Letters as a prerequisite for being eligible, and Applicants are free to share the GID with the government officials.

CN II-24 According to FAQ 56, "each endorsement letter should be signed by a duly authorised representative of the ministry; the NAMA Facility does not prescribe the level of signatory". Would the NAMA Facility accept endorsement letters from an agency or department under the relevant national ministries?

The endorsement letters serve to convey to the NAMA Facility the Government's support to the proposed NSP and to showcase embeddedness of the NSP in the country's development strategies and climate change mitigation policies. Eventually, the decision on the level of a signatory of an endorsement letter is case-based and depends largely on a country-specific context. If for a successful implementation of an NSP, the support of an agency or a department under the relevant sectoral ministry plays a crucial role, this might justify having the letter signed by a representative of the respective public institution.

CN III-06 For NSPs piloting innovative technologies: A) Should the narrative of the Outline (including Annexes) focus on the pilot phase only or should it also cover the aspects of the larger scale project? B) Does the budget (Outline section 4) need to include budgetary requirements for the pilot phase only or also for a subsequent larger scale phase?

A) The narrative of the Outline, including the Annexes, should focus on the entire NSP, i.e. the pilot phase and the shift to a larger scale project. For all information provided, the Applicants / ASPs should clearly delineate between the two phases.

In the NSP Outline template (p.7) Applicants / ASPs are requested to formulate key milestones associated with the pilot phase, that need to be achieved before moving into the large-scale project phase. During an in-depth assessment (following a desktop assessment during the NSP Outline phase), these milestones will be further specified, and additional criteria might be added by the NAMA Facility Board.

B) In the NSP Outline template, section 4 “Expected Budget and Financing Structure of NSP Implementation Phase (in EUR)”, Applicants / ASPs should include the budget for both phases. This could be done by copy-pasting the table and completing it once for the pilot phase and once for the larger scale project phase. When filling in section 1.1 “NSP Data” of the NSP Outline template, Applicants / ASPs should separately indicate the budgets for the pilot phase, the larger-scale project phase and the total amount of funding for the two phases. Please note that the total amount of funding requested shall not exceed the maximum funding volume of EUR 25 million foreseen under the Ambition Initiative Call (for details please refer to GID, section 5.1.3).

CN III-07 How does the NAMA Facility define the direct and indirect mitigation potential?

According to the NAMA Facility’s definition, only emission reductions that are achieved by measures (partially) financed or leveraged by the NSP’s financial component (FC) during the NSP’s implementation phase are counted as direct mitigation.

Emission reductions that are achieved by measures (partially) financed or leveraged by the NSP’s FC after the NSP’s implementation phase are counted as indirect mitigation.

GHG mitigation achieved through TC activities counts as indirect mitigation – irrespective of whether it has been achieved during or after the NSP’s implementation phase.

CN III-08 What kind of evidence of endorsement needs to be submitted with the Outline?

Applicants / ASPs are required to have the endorsement from the relevant national ministries to submit the NSP Outline. This needs to be confirmed in endorsement letters from the national ministries (mandatory Annex I; please refer to the application documents of the Ambition Initiative Call).

CN IV-11 Does the Outline need to explicitly address each aspect of the NAMA Facility’s definition of an enhanced ambitious NDC as it was presented in the Webinar on NSP Outline Development Case Studies and Examples?

The example presented in the [webinar](#) was just for illustrative purposes. Applicants / ASPs do not need to address all aspects of the definition! In the Outline document it will be sufficient to follow the guidance provided in the template, i.e. providing the date when the country of implementation has submitted its enhanced and ambitious NDC to UNFCCC, summarising the national climate policy context, outlining the level of ambition of the enhanced NDC along with providing a wider context of the national and (where relevant) local mitigation strategies and plans to address climate change in the sector/sub-sector where the NSP is intervening.

At the same time, in order to demonstrate why the updated NDC of the targeted country can be considered as enhanced and ambitious according to the definition provided in the GID (section 4.1 Characteristics of NAMA Support Projects (NSPs)), Applicants and ASPs are encouraged to clearly state to which aspects of this definition the updated NDC of the targeted country correspond and how.

CN IV-12 What is the maximum budget that can be requested for the NSP implementation?

As stated in the GID, section 5.1.3 Outline Assessment Criteria, the upper funding volume per NSP is EUR 25 million. In exceptional cases, the total funding volume might deviate from this range, particularly, NSPs can require higher funding if a robust justification in terms of additional benefits going beyond economies of scale is provided. The funding range does not include the funding for the DPP.

CN IV-13 Does the NAMA Facility expect letters of commitment from the private sector to provide proof of the upscaling potential?

No, the NAMA Facility does not expect a written commitment from the private sector. Nevertheless, if private sector is seen as one of the key stakeholders and key drivers behind the NSP's Theory of Change, the respective commitment of the private sector would be expected.

Overall, in the Outline, the Applicant / ASP should provide sufficient information as of how an enabling environment will be created by the NSP to allow and encourage private sector investments in the mitigation technology or practice and to achieve the anticipated upscaling.

CN V-06 Can you please provide more information on the application process?

For more information on the application process, please refer to the GID, section 5 NSP Selection Process.

CN V-07 Is there an option to receive the NAMA Facility's feedback on a project idea before officially submitting the Outline?

No, this is not possible. In line with the NAMA Facility's policy on clarifications, the TSU does not provide any individual advice on project concepts to ensure a transparent and fair competition among all applicants.

Please make use of our webinars to participate in further exchanges or use the opportunity to lodge clarification requests should you have general questions pertaining to the GID and/or application documents.

CN VI-04 In CN II-03, you clarified that due to the COVID-19 pandemic the NAMA Facility accepts e-mails from national ministries confirming the support to the NSP during the Outline submission and that the actual endorsement letter should then be presented at the latest during the in-depth assessment phase. What kind of information should be included in those e-mails?

The content of the email should be the same as it would be in the official endorsement letter. For more information on the content please refer to FAQ 56.

CN VI-05 Please clarify what documents need to be submitted for a complete application by the deadline of the Ambition Initiative Call, i.e. 31 May 2021.

The application documents consist of a template for NAMA Support Project Outlines plus six mandatory annexes (Annex 1 – 6, with Annexes 4 and 5 containing two documents each).

Please note: For Annex 1, the endorsement letters, also e-mails from national ministries confirming the support to the NSP are accepted during the Outline submission. In this case, the actual endorsement letter should be presented to the NAMA Facility during the in-depth assessment stage at the latest.

VIII. Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP)

FAQ 66 Does the NAMA Facility set an upper budget limit for the DPP?

No, there is no explicit upper limit for the DPP budgets that can be requested from the NAMA Facility. Please keep in mind that large budgets requested for the DPP could be an indicator that the NSP risks not reaching a sufficient level of readiness for implementation due to the significant amount of preparatory work still required.

The appropriateness of the requested funding will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. As part of the finalisation of the DPP concept before a funding agreement is concluded, amendments to the budget might be necessary and will be negotiated with the Applicant or ASP. The budget as part of the DPP concept is subject to approval by the NAMA Facility Board. During the DPP itself, increases to budgets are not foreseen.

FAQ 67 What were the average funding levels for DPPs in previous Calls?

The average funding support requested by NSPs from the previous Calls for their DPP was approximately EUR 250,000. Please note that the requested funding volume and timeframe for the DPP is an indication of the NPS's level of readiness.

FAQ 68 Where can co-financing for the DPP be included (Annex 4b does not include budget lines for co-financing)?

In the Outline template, there is no specific section where co-financing from Applicants / ASP for the DPP shall be included. If you foresee to provide co-financing during the DPP, please address this in Annex 4a "DPP Concept". Annex 4b "DPP budget" shall only include the funds requested from the NAMA Facility for the DPP; that is why there is no specific budget line for co-financing.

FAQ 69 What activities are eligible for support in the DPP?

Supported activities should be focused on clarifying open issues necessary for the elaboration of a high-quality, detailed NSP Proposal that allows the NSP to quickly start the full implementation after approval of the NSP Proposal. Examples of supported activities include detailed baseline studies, sensitivity analyses of business models, detailing and modelling the financial mechanism, negotiations with implementing partners, defining steering structures for implementation, etc. Feasibility studies can be supported in limited cases only if specific details still need to be clarified; however, the overall technological and economic feasibility should already have been analysed before the NSP Outline is submitted to the NAMA Facility.

FAQ 70 How long should we take to prepare the full NSP Proposal and can we only submit our NSP proposal in either month 10 or month 15, or also in month 11, 12, etc.?

NSPs are expected to decide for a DPP of either 10 months or 15 months. Within these timeframes, they are expected to prepare and submit a comprehensive NSP Proposal that is ready for implementation. The length of the DPP is determined by the state of preparation (readiness) of the NSP and by the individual project setting. For example, it might take a certain period of time to conduct an in-depth financial analysis, to receive approvals from key implementing partners and/or to set up and conduct meetings with target groups. The expected duration of these activities should be estimated and budgeted accordingly.

It is possible to submit the NSP Proposal before the chosen DPP deadline of either 10 or 15 months (not after), but in your DPP Concept you still need to indicate either 10 or 15 months for the DPP duration.

Good to know: Taking the time to ensure a good quality of the NSP Proposal should be prioritized over a shortened DPP timeframe.

CN II-25 What is the Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP)?

The ultimate purpose of the DPP is to prepare a comprehensive Proposal for the NSP implementation. For that purpose, the Applicant or ASP can engage external experts and consultants to prepare the detailed project concept, conduct the required baseline and feasibility studies for establishing the financial mechanism, verify the mitigation potential and conduct other activities that might be necessary for the detailed project preparation. For more information see GID, section 5.2 as well as FAQ 69.

CN II-26 According to the GID the DPP is divided into two phases. Entering the DPP 2 is contingent upon the achievement of the agreed milestones during DPP 1. In cases where the NSP's progress is not satisfactory according to the NAMA Facility Board, will the funds for the DPP 2 be blocked?

Yes, in cases when the NSP is not able to demonstrate sufficient progress towards the agreed milestones, the NAMA Facility Board could decide to terminate the DPP.

CN II-27 In FAQ 68 you explain that co-financing for the DPP shall not be presented in Annex 4b "DPP budget" as this shall only include the funds requested from the NAMA Facility for the DPP. A) Can you please provide more information on how to present the foreseen co-financing during implementation? B) Do NSOs have to report on the expenses for co-funding?

- A) In the Annex 5 "Detailed Budget and Financing Structure" to an NSP Proposal, NSOs have an opportunity to add an additional column to include their own contributions.
- B) NSOs do not need to report on the expenses for co-funding. The required financial reporting will only cover the NAMA Facility funds.

CN V-08 What is the difference between the DPP and the NSP implementation?

In short, the DPP of either 10 or 15 months, has the ultimate purpose of preparing a comprehensive Proposal for the NSP implementation, whereas the implementation of up to 5.5 years is the time in which the Outcomes and Outputs of the NSP will actually need to be achieved, and the planned activities implemented.

More information can be found in the GID, section 5.2 NSP Detailed Preparation Phase / Proposal Phase and section 6 NSP Implementation.

CN VI-06 Does the NAMA Facility set a maximum percentage of the DPP budget that can be used for human resources?

No, the NAMA Facility does not set an upper limit on the share of (internal or external) personnel costs in DPP budgets.

IX. Contracting

FAQ 71 What procurement rules do Applicants, ASPs and NSOs need to follow if they want to contract a consultancy as an external service provider?

In principle the regulations of the partner country are to be observed. However, the standard grant agreement that is to be signed between the grant recipient and GIZ (as the NFGA), contains

procurement rules at a minimum standard. In summary, the grant agreement stipulates basic procurement regulations, which may be further expanded upon based on the partner country's own procurement regulations. More information can be found [here](#).

FAQ 72 Item 8 in the DPP budget form in Annex 4b is called “Forwarding of Funds – a separate budget needs to be provided”. Please explain what is meant by forwarding of funds and why and in which form shall the separate budget be provided?

‘Forwarding of funds’ refers to those funds that are channelled by the main grant recipient (Applicant or ASP) to a consortium partner or implementing partner as a grant (in contrast to service contracts with consultancies).

If you intend to forward funds, you would be requested to indicate the total amount of the forwarded grant funding on the sheet of the main grant recipient of the NAMA Facility funding and include a second sheet in the excel file where this forwarded grant sum is displayed in the same budget categories as for the main sheet but limited to the amount forwarded to the consortium partner or implementing partner.

For the sake of simplicity, we strongly recommend to simply copy the main sheet and use to copied sheet to display the budget for the forwarded funds.

In case you intend to forward funds as grants to several consortium partners or implementing partners, please include a separate budget sheet for each partner.

CN II-28 Can you provide a template for the grant agreement that will be signed between the NFGA and the NSO in case of a selection for a DPP or an implementation?

The draft grant agreement will only be made available once an NSP was selected for a DPP or implementation. Part of the respective Annexes to the Grant Agreement can be found [here](#) under Grant Agreements (for contracts signed from June 2020).

CN IV-14 Which German grant funding rules apply for private companies in the Ambition Initiative Call?

The Grant Agreements to be concluded between the NAMA Facility Grant Agent and the Grantee follow the rules as stipulated in the [Financial Guidelines](#) under the national funding legislation. Financial Statements need to be submitted on the cost basis.

CN VI-07 Is there a specific limit on administration costs and if not, how will it be assessed whether the costs proposed by the NSP are reasonable?

Up to a certain percentage that cannot be communicated publicly, the NFGA accepts administrations costs by default. If an Applicant / ASP requests a higher percentage, the NFGA uses its internal guidelines to assess the appropriateness of these costs. This is done on a case-by-case basis. As part of the finalisation of the DPP concept that takes place before the conclusion of a funding agreement, amendments to the budget might be necessary and will be negotiated with the Applicant / ASP.

CN VI-08 Can the Applicant / ASP apply administrative costs also for the forwarded funds, i.e. subgrants?

No, the Applicant / ASP can only apply administrative costs for the funds that will not be forwarded as subgrants. For the latter, administrative costs can be applied separately by the subgrantee. Example: If the overall Grant Agreement covers a budget of 300,000 EUR, 100,000 EUR are forwarded as a subgrant, the Applicant / ASP can claim its administrative costs as part of its share of the budget

(i.e. 200,000 EUR), while the subgrantee can claim administrative costs as part of the budget of 100,000 EUR forwarded as a subgrant. Please note that administrative costs should be included in the funding volumes requested / forwarded (i.e. 200,000 EUR and 100,000 EUR) and not applied on top of them.

Last but not least...

This has been the last round of clarifications in the Ambition Initiative Call and hopefully, the clarifications and our webinars have been helpful for you to prepare your NAMA Support Project (NSP).

We are looking forward to receiving your NSP Outline submission latest by 31 May, 3pm CEST.