

Call for Projects 2023

Outline Phase – Clarification Note III

Published on 13 December 2023

Content

1	General issues.....	1
2	Submission of Project Outlines and Annexes.....	1
	Last but not least.....	3

1 General issues

CN III-01 We plan to implement a project in a country with a federal system of governance. In this context, can ministries at the federal state level be Project Partners in addition to national ministries?

Yes, the federal level ministries can be Project Partners, and we would strongly recommend to have them as Partners as far as it is relevant in terms of the scope of the project (e.g. certain federal states as project implementation areas). Nevertheless, it is still vital that the project is endorsed by the national government. This is needed in order to ensure the national ownership and alignment with climate strategies and sectoral development strategies at the national level.

CN III-02 Is it possible to reduce the project scope and GHG emissions mitigation target in the Project Outline in comparison to what has initially been proposed in the Project Concept? This will be done in order to ensure an alignment with and viability of a business model.

While ambition presents one of the key assessment criteria of Project Outlines, the criterion of feasibility plays an equally important role. Therefore, Applicants are encouraged to be conservative and propose feasible yet ambitious solutions which also concerns the scope of their projects.

Please note that nevertheless the project scope, activities and targets proposed as part of a Concept will be taken into account during the process of Outline assessment and compared against the project scope, activities and targets proposed in the Outline.

2 Submission of Project Outlines and Annexes

CN III-03 Should we include funding received from the Mitigation Action Facility as part of indicators in Annex 2 - Logframe?

No, you are not supposed to include funding requested from the Mitigation Action Facility as part of any indicators in your Logframe.

CN III-04 For some of Mandatory Core Indicators, the Mitigation Action Facility asks for indicators for a 10-year period after the end of a project or, "after the end of project implementation" as specified in the [Monitoring and Evaluation Framework](#). Please confirm that it means that we need to develop a target spanning the duration of a project implementation (e.g. 5.5 years) plus 10 years after that, i.e. a total of 15.5 years.

Yes, this is correct, but please note that during the Project Outline Phase this requirement is only valid for M1 indicator.

Please also note that with a submission of a Project Outline and particularly Annex 2 - Logframe, you only required to provide cumulative values, i.e. one indicator setting a target for the end of the project implementation and one indicator setting a target for the end of the 10-year period after the end of the project implementation. There is no need to set annual targets.

CN III-05 Annex 2 - Logframe asks for an impact-level indicator. Could you please explain what is expected in this regard? Are we supposed to indicate sources of verification and assumptions for an impact-level indicator?

Impact is the overall goal that the project aims to achieve. It is recommended to develop indicators related to the target sector as impact indicators. You are also required to define sources of verification that would provide evidence of the achieved impact. At the same time, please be mindful that impact presents an overarching goal, thus, it will also encompass variables and factors that are beyond the direct influence of your project. For this reason and considering the fact that impact is the highest level of the internal project logic, you are not expected to define risks / assumptions at the impact-level.

For additional information, please refer to a [video podcast](#) covering among others Annex 2 - Logframe.

CN III-06 Based on the template of Annex 2 - Logframe, it seems that we are only expected to provide one indicator per output. Please confirm whether this understanding is correct?

No, there are no such restrictions. You are free to add as many indicators per output as necessary. Nevertheless, we would recommend to limit the number of individual indicators per output to three indicators at maximum.

For additional information, please refer to a [video podcast](#) covering among others Annex 2 - Logframe.

CN III-07 According to the [Monitoring and Evaluation Framework](#), M4 and M5 indicators belong to the output-level, but in Annex 2 - Logframe, they are supposed to be included as the outcome-level indicators. Please clarify, at which level should we include indicators M4 and M5 as part of our Outline submission?

Depending on the content of the project and its internal logic, M4 and M5 indicators can be included either at the outcome or at the output level. This decision remains at the discretion of an Applicant / ASP.

At a portfolio level of the Mitigation Action Facility, aggregated indicators M4 and M5 belong to an output level.



On behalf of

Supported by:



on the basis of a decision
by the German Bundestag

Last but not least...

This has been the last round of clarifications in the Outline Phase of the Call for Projects 2023. We hope, clarifications and video podcasts have been helpful for you to prepare your Project Outline.

We are looking forward to receiving your Outlines latest **by 31 December 2023, 3pm CET.**