Tool Description
A tool addressing transport policy-makers to screen and select suitable policy options for Mitigation Actions following the criteria ‘nationally appropriate’ and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reducing. It guides the process of screening potential Mitigation Actions, rather than aspiring to lay out a simple template approach with objective outcomes.

General Information of this tool
Objective/ function:
This tool gives guidance to structure the process of screening and priority setting for potential Mitigation Actions.

Tool developer & weblink:
GIZ: [www.transport-namas.org/resources/toolbox](http://www.transport-namas.org/resources/toolbox)

Area of application:
- Designing mitigation measures
- Quantified target
- Strategy or plan
- Policy or program
- Project

Setting: Informed decision-making process with decision makers from the public and eventually private sector as well as technical experts.

Level of complexity: Medium

Required data/information:
- long list of potential Mitigation Actions from Mitigation Action identification process
- collection of available information on each Mitigation Action option (e.g., studies, factsheets, impact estimations, etc.)

Cost: free of charge

Time needed: 0.5 to 1 day for the realisation of the screening and definition of next steps plus time for preparation and documentation of the meeting

Equipment needed: Pinboards or laptop with beamer and flipchart

Observations: flexibility to adapt the tool to different contexts / situations / countries

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

In addition to transport policy-makers, other stakeholders from government, private sector and consultancies/academics may be involved. The selection process is ideally based on sound analysis. However, this tool facilitates a screening as well in contexts where few climate policies are implemented and in-depth studies on emission reductions are rare. The tool is based on relevant literature and practical experience from several GIZ projects.
Application – in 4 steps to a Mitigation Action short list!

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

**Step 1: Collect existing information on potential Mitigation Actions from the long list**

**Step 2: Define evaluation criteria**

**Step 3: Realise the screening and create a short list**

**Step 4: Define next steps**

---

**Step 1: Collect existing information on potential Mitigation Actions from the long list**

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

**Step 2: Define evaluation criteria**

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

**Criterion 1: Paradigm shift potential / Potential for transformational change**

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

**Criterion 2: Likelihood of successful implementation**

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

**Criterion 3: GHG mitigation potential**

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

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

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

**Criterion 5: Economic and financial feasibility**

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

---
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Step 3: Realise the screening and create a short list

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

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

Table 1. Guidance on scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>++</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>–</th>
<th>– –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm shift potential / Potential for transformational change</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of successful implementation</td>
<td>High chance of success</td>
<td>Good chance of success for at least the main parts</td>
<td>Medium-good chance for most parts</td>
<td>High barriers for several parts</td>
<td>Very high implementation barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG mitigation potential (MtCO2-eq/yr)</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>0.5 – 1</td>
<td>0.1 – 0.5</td>
<td>0 – 0.1</td>
<td>only indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Benefits</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and financial feasibility</td>
<td>Very good cost-benefit ratio and very good chances to be financed</td>
<td>Good cost-benefit ratio and good chances to be financed</td>
<td>Moderate cost-benefit ratio and some barriers to be financed</td>
<td>Low cost-benefit ratio and high barriers to be financed</td>
<td>Negative cost-benefit ratio and high barriers to be financed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2. Screening Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Mitigation Action Option 1</th>
<th>Mitigation Action Option 2</th>
<th>Mitigation Action Option …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm shift potential / Potential for transformational change</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of successful implementation</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG mitigation potential</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Benefits</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and financial feasibility</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
<td>insert score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKING:</td>
<td>indicate rank</td>
<td>indicate rank</td>
<td>indicate rank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 4: Define next steps

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