

NAMA Facility



7th Call for NAMA Support Projects

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) and Clarification Notes

Published on 01 April 2020

Abbreviations

ASP	Applicant Support Partner
CN	Clarification Note
DPP	Detailed Preparation Phase
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions (a NAMA Facility document)
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
GID	General Information Document (a NAMA Facility document)
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NSO	NAMA Support Organisation
NSP	NAMA Support Project
OECD DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Contents

Abbreviations.....	2
I. General Issues and Selection Criteria	3
II. Eligibility of Countries.....	4
III. Eligibility of Applicants and Applicant Support Partners.....	5
IV. Eligibility of Sectors and Technologies	7
V. Eligible Support Instruments in NSPs	8
VI. Submission of the NSP Outline and Annexes	10
VII. Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP).....	12
Last but not least... ..	12

I. General Issues and Selection Criteria

FAQ 1 Does the current situation of COVID-19 impact the 7th Call?

This is an extraordinary situation with circumstances changing almost daily. The NAMA Facility is closely monitoring the effects of COVID-19 and its spread around the world. As things currently stand, the 7th Call timeline is proceeding according to the original, already lengthened schedule, and will close at 3pm CEST on 1 September 2020.

Good to know: As in previous Calls, Applicants are expected to only submit application documents via e-mail. The NAMA Facility does not require any original documents.

FAQ 2 Is it necessary for the NSP Outline to be directly linked to a specific NAMA?

No, this is not required. 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 NDC and endorsed by the national government.

FAQ 3 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 insight you were given during the feedback call with the TSU – an opportunity afforded to all non-selected Applicants – as incorporating these details will surely help your re-submission.

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 4 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.

Good to know: The second webinar during the Call (on 27 May) is dedicated to examples and case studies. This and the other webinars offered by the NAMA Facility will hopefully support you in preparing your NSP Outline.

FAQ 5 Can questions be submitted after the last Clarification Note?

No, this will not be possible to ensure a fair and competitive 7th Call. Please make sure to submit your questions at least two days before the publication date, 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. You will find more on our website.

FAQ 6 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. Keep in mind that it will be crucial to clearly demonstrate additionality of the NSP.

FAQ 7 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 achieve. 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 8 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.

FAQ 9 Does the NAMA Facility apply a minimum ratio regarding emission reductions (emission reduction/€ NAMA funding) that NSPs need to achieve?

No. While the NAMA Facility expects the emission abatement cost to be cost effective and appropriate to the sector at hand, there are no general benchmarks as abatement costs are very context-specific (e.g. sector, urban/rural and country).

II. Eligibility of Countries

FAQ 10 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 <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/DAC-List-of-ODA-Recipients-for-reporting-2020-flows.pdf>.

Please note that this list is expected to undergo a review in 2020.

FAQ 11 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 12 Can a country apply in the 7th Call if it already receives 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 7th Calls of the NAMA Facility.

FAQ 13 Are cross-border and /or regional projects eligible for funding in the 7th 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.

FAQ 14 Can a country submit more than one NSP Outline in the 7th 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.

III. Eligibility of Applicants and Applicant Support Partners

FAQ 15 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 16 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.

FAQ 17 What is the difference between an Applicant and an Applicant Support Partner?

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 Applicant Support Partner (that is a legal entity) as the contracting partner for providing 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 Applicant Support Partner would not be required.

In both cases, sections 1.4., 1.5. and 1.6. 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 Applicant Support Partner, 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 18 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 section 5.1.1 of the General Information Document.

FAQ 19 Can a legal entity act as Applicant/Applicant Support Partner and as NAMA Support Organisation (NSO)?

Yes, a legal entity can act as Applicant/Applicant Support Partner 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/Applicant Support Partners.

FAQ 20 Can the Applicant Support Partner be a consortium?

Yes, in justified cases, the Applicant Support Partner 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 Applicant Support Partner should be described in NSP Outline section 1.6 and Annex 3.

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 two eligible entities to co-operate under one NSP.

FAQ 21 How can private investors and private consultancies engage with the NAMA Facility's processes?

Private investors can benefit from the NSP e.g. from improved framework conditions and support mechanisms that are newly established. As private investments are crucial for transformation in most sectors, a close interaction between NSPs and the private sector is expected. The NAMA Facility funding itself, however, may only be used for activities in line with a public benefit purpose and according to the applicable regulations on public procurement and state aid.

Consultancies from the private sector are usually involved at several steps of the project cycle – they might be engaged in the development of NAMAs and even in formulating NSP Outlines. During both the DPP and NSP implementation, Applicants / Applicant Support Partners or NSOs might also decide to engage external service providers to work on specific tasks. As a rule, the legal entity contracted for the DPP or NSP implementation will conduct and oversee the procurement process.

Good to know: In the 7th Call General Information Document, section 5.1.1 and its Annex 3 further clarify the *public benefit purpose* and its consequences for private for-profit enterprises.

FAQ 22 Can private for-profit enterprises participate in a consortium with an international non-governmental organization (INGO) / non-governmental organization (NGO) and receive funding?

In the case of a consortium, all members must fulfil the formal requirements for legal entities as stipulated in the General Information Document, section 5.1.1 and Annex 3.

FAQ 23 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.

IV. Eligibility of Sectors and Technologies

FAQ 24 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 that there is 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 [see 6th Call [webinar](#) and [presentation](#); 5th Call [webinar](#) and [presentation](#)]. Applicants are strongly advised to consult these and other NAMA Facility dissemination sources.

FAQ 25 Are technological pilots and research projects eligible for funding?

Research projects and the piloting of new technologies that are not yet commercially available on the global market are ineligible, whereas demonstrating an available technology that is new in a certain country context would be considered eligible.

The NSP would need to demonstrate that it can achieve a relevant scale in the country context during the NSP Implementation Phase, a financing mechanism that mobilises additional financing sources and that it has a relevant direct and indirect mitigation potential. For more information on the expectation level see GID, and in particular on the assessment criteria, GID section 5.1.3.

FAQ 26 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.

V. Eligible Support Instruments in NSPs

FAQ 27 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 NAMA Support Projects. 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 Detailed Preparation Phase of selected NSP Outlines to elaborate a comprehensive funding Proposal.

FAQ 28 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 [factsheet](#), the [presentation](#) and [webinar](#) on financial mechanisms and their links to transformational change as well as the [presentation](#) and [webinar](#) on financial mechanisms and the NAMA Support Project.

FAQ 29 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 30 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 31 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 Detailed Preparation Phase.

FAQ 32 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. NAMA Support Projects 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 33 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 34 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 35 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 36 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 37 What kind of information do you 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 38 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 39 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 40 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 41 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.

VI. Submission of the NSP Outline and Annexes

FAQ 42 How many endorsement letters from national ministries must be submitted with the NSP Outline?

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.

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 43 If it is 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 44 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 45 Must NAMA Support Organisations, main implementing partners and the Applicant Support Partner 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 46 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 47 Can we replace the format of Annex 5 (business model and financial mechanism) and Annex 5 (GHG mitigation potential) with our own formats?

As a general rule, please provide a complete set of application documents based on the templates of the 7th Call.

If you consider a different format more suitable to present the requested information than the templates for Annex 5 and Annex 6, please submit these additionally. Nevertheless, please keep the information concise.

FAQ 48 As the financial support mechanism is a very important part of the NAMA Support Project, 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 7th Call, Applicants are requested to submit Annex 5 on the business model and financial mechanisms as a mandatory annex; the development of business model scenarios is optional. Additional details are to be further elaborated as part of the DPP.

FAQ 49 Can an NSP request less than EUR 5 million?

Yes, this is possible and in line with the eligibility criteria stated in section 5.1.3 of the General Information Document. As the amount would deviate from the recommended range of EUR 5 to 20 million, an explicit explanation justifying the deviation should be provided in NSP Outline section 4.

FAQ 50 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 51 Do we 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.

VII. Detailed Preparation Phase (DPP)

FAQ 52 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 Applicant Support Partner. 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 53 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 54 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 55 How long should we take to prepare the full NSP Proposal (6-15 months)?

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.

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

Last but not least...

Couldn't find an answer to your question?

In line with our clarification policy for the 7th Call, please submit your question in writing to contact@nama-facility.org.

We will publish the clarification on the NAMA Facility's website as part of the Clarification Note publication and respond to your query directly. The next Clarification Note will be published on 13 May 2020 – be sure to submit your question to the NAMA Facility by 11 May 2020 to ensure that your clarification is included.