

Sustainable development co-benefits in the NAMA Facility

Sustainable development co-benefits can be seen from two different perspectives – from a climate and from a development perspective. The challenge to reduce GHG emissions is considered the first priority within the climate approach, leading to the view that sustainable development co-benefits result from mitigation actions¹. The development perspective regards sustainable development objectives as the primary driving force while emissions reduction is considered a side effect. As emissions are practically never occurring on their own, but are always considered an unwanted externality to other core activities the fact of the matter is that programmes such as the NAMA Facility focusing on emissions reduction are dependent on other actors pursuing development objectives in order to have a foundation. The two objectives are therefore mutually dependent.

Sustainable development co-benefits and NAMA Support Projects

In the NAMA Facility the sustainable development benefits are important elements for country ownership and decisive for the long-term sustainability of a NAMA Support Project (NSP). They are also essential drivers for transformational change within a sector, including the realisation of immediate mitigation potentials. In its first three Calls the NAMA Facility explicitly asked to indicate social, economic and environmental co-benefits and their relative importance (high, medium, low), in order to make sure that the project is solidly embedded in the political agenda. NSPs are also requested to provide quantified and gender disaggregated information related to the people directly benefitting from the NSP as a common indicator with regard to sustainable development co-benefits across all NSPs.

Key observations from submitted Outlines

The analysis² of co-benefits that have been identified in NSP Outlines throughout three Calls for projects (138 Outlines have been received) shows, that:

- economic and social benefits represent the largest share of co-benefits indicated in the submitted Outlines;
- creation of jobs, cost savings, better health conditions as well as welfare improvement are the most often cited co-benefits;
- once co-benefits are identified, the requirement to categorise them as either economic, social or environmental is not always met due to possible overlaps between categories which can result from different perspectives on the effect. For instance, »creation of jobs« entails both social and economic benefits; »reduced fertilizer use« has economic as well as environmental benefits;
- an evaluation of the relative importance of co-benefits (in low, medium or high) is missing in the majority of the NSP Outlines;
- in some cases, effects that are deeply embedded in the project rationale itself, like the development of certification methodologies, improving regulatory framework etc., are mentioned as co-benefits;
- a small proportion of especially the economic and social co-benefits is quantified;
- gender disaggregation is generally weak; only few Outlines address the role of women as particularly vulnerable group and how they might profit from expected co-benefits;
- energy and transport related NSPs generally display a higher amount of co-benefits than other sectors.

¹ Holm Olsen, Karen 2013: Sustainable Development Impacts of Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions. An integrated approach to assessment of co-benefits based on experience with the Clean Development Mechanism, UNEP Risø Centre, Low Carbon Development, Working Paper No. 11.

² The following observations provide an overview of co-benefits that have been listed in NSP Outlines received throughout the first three Calls for projects. Particularly, the table is not to be understood as an indication how to fill the Outline form.

On behalf of



Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety



Department of Energy & Climate Change



DANISH MINISTRY OF ENERGY, UTILITIES AND CLIMATE



Summary of most-cited co-benefits of submitted NSP Outlines

Type of co-benefit	Energy Efficiency	Transport	Renewable Energy	Forestry	Agriculture	Waste/Waste Water Treatment
Economic						
Creation of jobs	X*	X	X	X	X	X
Cost savings (e.g. energy costs)	X	X	X			
Energy security	X		X			
Raised qualification skills	X		X			
Market/trade development	X					
Social						
Better health conditions	X	X			X	X
Welfare improvement	X			X		X
Food security					X	
Improved safety conditions	X	X				
Social inclusion		X	X			
Access to water/energy			X			
Reduced travel time and money		X				
Environmental						
Forest conservation	X		X	X		
Preservation of biodiversity				X		
Less air pollution	X	X	X			
Reduced fertilizer use					X	
Less waste						X
Reduced soil/water contamination			X		X	X
Less land degradation				X	X	
Gender disaggregation**	X	X	X		X	

* fat ticks stand for most-often cited co-benefits within the three different categories

** information on gender disaggregation is mostly provided for energy and transport related projects

Imprint

Published by: NAMA Facility, Technical Support Unit,
c/o Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH,
Koethener Straße 2–3, 10963 Berlin, Germany
Email: contact@nama-facility.org

Date: December 2015

For further information: www.nama-facility.org

