United Nations FCCC/SBI/2012/INF.4

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
23 April 2012

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation
Thirty-sixth session
Bonn, 14–25 May 2012

Item 12(b) of the provisional agenda
Development and transfer of technologies
Matters relating to the Climate Technology Centre and Network: selection of the host and constitution of the advisory board

Report on the evaluation of proposals for hosting the Climate Technology Centre

Summary

This report was prepared by the evaluation panel for the selection of the host of the Climate Technology Centre. It presents the assessment by the evaluation panel of the proposals received for hosting the Climate Technology Centre and a shortlist ranking three proponents. This report also includes information on how the criteria for the evaluation were applied, as requested by decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 137(d).

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–7	3
	A. Background and mandate	1–5	3
	B. Scope of the note	6	4
	C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation	7	4
II.	Call for proposals process	8–17	4
	A. Issuance of the call for proposals	8–11	4
	B. Response to inquiries	12–13	5
	C. Receipt and opening of proposals	14–17	5
III.	Assessment process and methodology	18–34	6
	A. Constitution of the evaluation panel	18	6
	B. Evaluation process and modalities	19–21	6
	C. Evaluation methodology	22–34	7
IV.	Evaluation results	35–48	10
	A. Scores and ranking of the proponents	35–39	10
	B. Assessments findings and shortlist ranking three proponents	40–47	12
	C. Acknowledgement	48	13
Annexes			
I.	Process and timetable followed for the evaluation		14
II.	Consolidated assessments for the shortlisted proposals		15

I. Introduction

A. Background and mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 117, established a Technology Mechanism, which includes a Technology Executive Committee (TEC) and a Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) with their respective functions.

2. In order to make the Technology Mechanism fully operational in 2012, the COP, by decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 133, adopted the terms of reference of the CTCN and decided to launch the selection process for the host of the Climate Technology Centre (CTC) upon the conclusion of its seventeenth session. The COP also decided that the selection process shall be conducted in an open, transparent, fair and neutral manner in accordance with the process outlined in that decision, and informed by United Nations practices.

3. In this context, the COP further requested the secretariat:

(a) To prepare and issue a call for proposals (CFP) in accordance with the above decision, by 16 January 2012, and invite interested organizations, including consortia of organizations, to submit their proposals in response to the CFP by 16 March 2012;

(b) To provide responses to inquiries from interested organizations in consultation with the evaluation panel referred to in paragraph 3(d) below;

(c) To compile the executive summaries contained in the submitted proposals and make them available simultaneously on the UNFCCC website;

(d) To convene an evaluation panel, consisting of three members from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (Annex I Parties) and three from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties) as nominated by the TEC from within its membership, by the end of February 2012:

(i) To conduct an assessment of the proposals received based on the methodology described in the criteria to be used to evaluate and select the host of the CTC contained in 2/CP.17, annex VIII;

(ii) To prepare an evaluation report with a shortlist ranking up to five proponents, including information on how the criteria for the evaluation have been applied, and make it available for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) at its thirty-sixth session.

4. The secretariat was further requested to discuss the key elements of the potential host agreement with the top-ranked proponent, and, if needed, with the second-ranked and third-ranked proponents, and to report the outcome of its discussion to the SBI at its thirty-seventh session for its consideration, with a view to recommending it for consideration and approval by the COP at its eighteenth session.

5. By decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 138, the COP requested the SBI:

(a) To agree on, at its thirty-sixth session, a ranked list of up to three proponents based on the outcome of the assessment conducted by the evaluation panel;

(b) To recommend the host of the CTCN to the COP for its approval at its eighteenth session.

B. Scope of the note

6. This report has been prepared in response to the mandate described in paragraph 3(d) above. It presents the assessment by the evaluation panel of the proposals received in response to the CFP for the host of the CTC, including a ranked shortlist of three proponents that met the minimum thresholds as decided in decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 10. This report also presents how the criteria for the evaluation have been applied, and highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, in particular those shortlisted.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

7. The COP, by decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 138(a), requested the SBI to agree, at its thirty-sixth session, on a ranked list of up to three proponents based on the outcome of the assessment conducted by the evaluation panel, and to recommend, at its thirty-seventh session, a decision on the host of the CTC for consideration and approval by the COP at its eighteenth session. The SBI may also choose to suggest any appropriate action arising from the consideration of the report, including with regard to the request to the secretariat outlined in paragraph 4 above.

II. Call for proposals process

A. Issuance of the call for proposals

8. In pursuant to decision 2/CP.17, the secretariat issued a CFP on the UNFCCC website[1] on 16 January 2012, and invited interested organizations, including consortia of organizations, to submit their proposals by 16 March 2012. The information on the issuance of the CFP was also communicated to Parties and observer States to the UNFCCC by an official notification[2] issued on 16 January 2012 and to public audiences by a press release[3] on 19 January 2012.

9. The CFP consisted of the letter of transmittal and the following annexes:

(a) Annex 1: Terms of reference of the Climate Technology Centre and Network;

(b) Annex 2: Information required to be included in the proposal;

(c) Annex 2A: Template for cost sheet;

(d) Annex 2B: Sample requests;

(e) Annex 2C: Template for statements of work of past activities;

(f) Annex 3: Criteria and methodology to be used to evaluate and select the host of the Climate Technology Centre;

(g) Annex 4: Terms and conditions for submitting a proposal;

(h) Annex 5: Declaration by proponent and disclosure requirement;

(i) Annex 6: Letter of intent to submit a proposal;

[1] <http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/technology/items/6602.php>.

[2] <http://unfccc.int/files/parties_and_observers/notifications/application/pdf/notification_callforproposals_hostctc.pdf>.

[3] <http://unfccc.int/files/press/press_releases_advisories/application/pdf/pr20121901_ctc.pdf>.

(j) Annex 7: Profile form.

10. Furthermore, the CFP stated that the proposal must include information in sufficient scope and detail to demonstrate that the proponent has the necessary capability, experience, knowledge, expertise, financial strength and capacity to perform the functions of the CTCN as contained in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 123, in a satisfactory manner, as well as an executive summary of the proposal.

11. In responding to the CFP, proponents were requested to submit the proposal in a sealed envelope/package to the premises of the secretariat no later than 16 March 2012 at 12 noon Central European Time (CET).

B. Response to inquiries

12. The secretariat was requested by the COP to provide responses to inquiries from interested organizations following the issuance of the CFP, in consultation with the evaluation panel. Potential proponents were informed in the CFP that inquiries related to the CFP could be submitted in writing to the secretariat by 3 February 2012. The potential proponents were also informed that all inquiries would be compiled and responded to no later than 24 February 2012, and that the responses would be shared with all proponents and posted on the UNFCCC website.[4]

13. Inquiries were received by 3 February 2012 from five interested organizations, and the UNFCCC secretariat prepared responses to those inquiries in consultation with the evaluation panel. The compilation of responses was made publicly available through the UNFCCC website.[5]

C. Receipt and opening of proposals

14. Nine proposals were received before the deadline of 16 March 2012 at 12 noon CET. The nine proposals, in the order of opening, were from:

(a) A consortium of 13 organizations, led by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP);[6]

(b) Research Institute for Petroleum Industry (RIPI), Iran (Islamic Republic of);

(c) Det Norske Veritas AS, Norway;

(d) Global Environment Facility, United States of America;

(e) Technology Information Forecasting and Assessment Council (TIFAC), India;

(f) International Clean Energy Partnership Association (ICEPS e.V.), Germany;

[4] <http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/technology/items/6602.php>.

[5] <http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/technology/items/6602.php>.

[6] The members of the consortium are: UNEP, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Asian Institute of Technology, the Bariloche Foundation (Argentina), the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (South Africa), the Energy and Research Institute (India), Environment and Development Action in the Third World (Senegal), the Tropical Agricultural Research and Higher Education Center (Costa Rica), the World Agroforestry Centre, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (Germany), the Energy Research Centre of the Netherlands, the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (United States of America) and the UNEP Risoe Centre, including expertise from the UNEP-DHI Centre.

(g) South–South Global Assets and Technology Exchange (South–South GATE), China;

(h) Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica (ITCR), Costa Rica;

(i) Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology (BPPT), Indonesia.

15. The proposals were opened on 16 March 2012, at 3:00 p.m. CET by the procurement office of the secretariat, and examined to check whether they included the required information, namely the signed declaration and disclosure requirement by the proponent contained in annex 5 of the CFP, the signed and completed profile form contained in annex 7 of the CFP and the information listed in annex 2 of the CFP.

16. Of the nine proposals, eight fulfilled the information requirements set out in the CFP. One proposal did not meet the mandatory requirements for information and was therefore considered non-responsive and not further evaluated by the evaluation panel.[7]

17. The list of proponents was published on 19 March 2012, and the executive summaries of the eight responsive proposals were posted on the UNFCCC website on the same day.[8]

III. Assessment process and methodology

A. Constitution of the evaluation panel

18. In response to decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 137(d), the TEC nominated the members of the evaluation panel from within its membership on 17 February 2012, during the second meeting of the TEC. The evaluation panel consists of three members from Annex I Parties and three from non-Annex I Parties. The evaluation panel, with the support of the TEC, agreed not to disclose its membership at this stage, in the interests of safeguarding the neutrality and integrity of the selection process.

B. Evaluation process and modalities

19. Taking into consideration the standard practice of the United Nations for the evaluation of responses to a CFP, the evaluation panel agreed to use the following modalities and process for conducting the evaluation:

(a) Individual assessments and scoring of proposals by evaluation panel members, including narratives providing the rationale for the scoring. The scoring, in the first instance, was based on the merits of the individual proposal, to establish the absolute, and not the relative, quality of the proposals. Evaluation panel members completed the evaluation independently and did not discuss and compare scoring values with the other evaluation panel members during this step in the evaluation process;

(b) Consolidation of all individual scores by the secretariat and the calculation of average scores for each subcriterion, yielding the average total technical score for each proposal;

(c) Joint evaluation by the evaluation panel: review by the evaluation panel of the average and individual ratings of the proposals, the individual rationales for the rating

[7] Proposal from ICEPS e.V.

[8] Available at <http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/technology/items/6602.php>.

and the resulting ranking, with a view to collectively verifying the scoring results. The ratio of value for money was also calculated for proposals meeting the threshold, as specified in decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 10, and was taken into consideration by the evaluation panel.

20. In accordance with the standard practice of the United Nations, all communication between interested organizations, proponents and the evaluation panel and team was channelled through a particular e-mail address and was managed by the secretariat in consultation with the evaluation panel.

21. The process and timetable followed for the evaluation is shown in annex I.

C. Evaluation methodology

1. Mandate on evaluation methodology

22. The COP, by decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 137(d), requested the evaluation panel to prepare an evaluation report with a shortlist ranking up to five proponents. By the same decision, in its annex VIII, the COP defined the criteria and methodology to be used to evaluate the proposals to host the CTC. Decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, gives the substantive evaluation criteria, the weight associated with each of the criteria and the minimum points to be scored overall and under each criterion (hereinafter referred to as the minimum thresholds). Decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 10, defines how value for money is to be calculated, and requests that the value for money ratio be used as an input for the selection process, where the higher the ratio, the more favourable the proposal will be considered. Furthermore, decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 11, states that, all other factors being equal, preference shall be given to host organizations located in developing countries.

23. Paragraphs 24–34 below describe the approach for assessing the proposals against the evaluation criteria and the approach chosen by the evaluation panel on how to consider value for money in relation to the final ranking of proposals.

2. Scoring methodology

24. The evaluation criteria listed in decision 2/CP.17 are grouped into seven major categories, each containing between three and six subcriteria (a total of 30 subcriteria). The weights ascribed to each major category are also defined, ranging from 10 per cent to 20 per cent of the total, with all subcriteria within a category being of equal weight.

25. The major categories of evaluation criteria, and the evaluation weights used to evaluate and select the host of the CTC, are given in table 1.

Table 1
Major categories of evaluation criteria and associated weights used to evaluate and rank the proposals

Major category	*Weight*
Technical capabilities	20
Technical approach	20
Existing governance and management structures	13
Climate Technology Centre and Network management plan	15

Major category	*Weight*
Past performance	10
Budget proposal for the Climate Technology Centre and Network	10
Examples	12

26. The criteria, and their organization into subcriteria, are described in detail in decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, and in annex 3 to the CFP.

27. The proposals were expected to be structured along these categories and subcriteria, to respond to the requirements of the terms of reference (decision 2/CP.17, annex VII, and annex 1 of the CFP) and to provide the information required (decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 12, and annex 2 to the CFP).

28. The evaluation panel's task was to assess the responsiveness of all proposals by rating their level of responsiveness to each of the subcriteria on a rating scale from 0 to 5, whereby:

0 = no information is provided;

1 = information provided for the subcriterion is largely irrelevant and/or very poor;

2 = information provided for the subcriterion is marginally relevant and/or poor;

3 = information provided for the subcriterion covers the basic requirements and/or satisfactory;

4 = information provided for the subcriterion fully meets the requirements and/or good;

5 = information provided for the subcriterion exceeds the requirements and/or excellent.

29. The total points scored against the evaluation criteria were calculated accordingly based on the rating for each subcriterion and the associated weights. The figure below shows a sample with dummy ratings to illustrate the scoring matrix used to rate and calculate the score for each criterion and the total score. In this report, 'rating' refers to the rating given to each subcriterion on a scale of 0 to 5, whereas the 'score' refers to the percentage points scored against the evaluation criteria calculated on the basis of the rating for each subcriterion and the associated weights.

Illustrative sample of scoring matrix

CFP: Host of the Climate Technology Centre	weight (%)			Proposals			
Evaluation sheet				**proposal X (from XXXX)**			
Major categories and detailed selection criteria		**max attainable score (100% of points)**	**min necessary score (50% of points)**	**rating (0-5 pts)**	% of maximum attainable	**weighted score (= weight x % of maximum attainable)**	**explanation/rationale for rating**
I. Technical Capabilities	**20%**	**20**	**10**	**14**	70%	**14%**	
(a) The proponent's comprehensive understanding of development and transfer of technologies including in the context of the Convention, in particular the challenges and opportunities within developing countries as well as the understanding of regional, sub-regional and sectoral issues and differences regarding specific technologies;	5.0%			5			
(b) The breadth and depth of expertise as it relates to the subject areas, activities and the roles and responsibilities of the CTC as referred to in the terms of reference of the CTCN contained in annex I of this decision and the functions of the CTCN contained in decision 1/CP.16 paragraph 123;	5.0%			4			
(c) Demonstrated capability to build capacity and facilitate the transfer of technology and technology diffusion in developing countries;	5.0%			3			
(d) Demonstrated capability in international multi-stakeholder cooperation, including the capability to involve the private sector (e.g. industry enterprises) in order to maximize their contributions to the Network activities in development and transfer of environmentally sound technologies for adaptation and mitigation and the facilitation of networks;	5.0%			2			
II. Technical Approach	**20%**	**25**	**13**	**15**	60%	**12%**	
(a) The overall vision, organizational and administrative structure for the CTC and its ability to prioritize and to respond to high volume of requests from Parties having potentially broad content in an effective and efficient manner;	4.0%			5			
(b) Demonstrated long-term commitment to host the CTC;	4.0%			4			
(c) Feasibility of the proposed approach and methodology for establishing and structuring the Network to accommodate regional and sub-regional issues, also including the involvement of a wide range of relevant organizations, centres, networks, initiatives and private sector entities;	4.0%			3			
(d) Feasibility of how the CTC will engage with the Network to create and maintain relationships with developing countries to ensure effective and efficient lines of communication, and coordinate with relevant organizations to minimize redundancy; and	4.0%			2			
(e) Extent to which the approach focuses on the objective of building capacity in requesting developing countries over the life of a programme;	4.0%			1			

Note: Sample ratings and scores for two criteria are presented in the scoring matrix. Ratings of 0 to 5 were given by the evaluation panel. This rating was then converted into a score (or percentile) after applying the weighting, so that the maximum score under each criterion equals the respective weights indicated in table 1. The total maximum score is 100.

30. The evaluation panel agreed that each member could provide a brief narrative on the rationale for the individual rating. The narrative substantiates the basis of the rating for each subcriterion, indicating the strengths and weaknesses identified.

31. In accordance with decision 2/CP.17, the minimum thresholds for proposals to be considered technically compliant were the following:

(a) Scoring 60 per cent overall, and, at the same time;

(b) Scoring 50 per cent for each of the seven major categories of evaluation criteria.

3. Value for money and final ranking methodology

32. Decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 10, provides a formula to assess value for money, namely the total number of points scored in the evaluation divided by the overall budget figure proposed under the evaluation criteria contained in decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 7(a), which is the 'budget proposal for the CTCN', and decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 10, which explicitly refers to the "overall budget proposal" for use in the calculation of the value for money ratio.

33. The ratio of value for money of a proposal, *i* (Vr_i), would hence be calculated as follows:

$$Vr_i = \frac{Pt_i}{Bo_i}$$

Where:

Pt_i is the total number of points scored by proposal *i* against all categories of evaluation criteria;

Bo_i is the overall budget proposal of proposal *i* (see decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, para. 7(a)).

34. Decision 2/CP.17 indicates that the value for money ratio will be used as an input for the selection process, where the higher the ratio, the more favourable the proposal will be considered.

IV. Evaluation results

A. Scores and ranking of the proponents

1. Scores based on the evaluation criteria

35. The eight proposals that met the information requirements were reviewed and assessed following the process and scoring methodology outlined in chapters III.B and III.C. The rating was based solely on information provided in the proposals. The members jointly reviewed the average rates for each subcriterion and agreed on the final rating for each subcriterion, yielding the score for each criterion and the total technical score for each proposal.

36. Of the eight evaluated proposals, three passed all the minimum thresholds referred to in paragraph 31 above. The other five proposals did not pass the minimum thresholds, for the total score and for some of the criteria. The fourth-ranked proposal received a total score of 46.61. The total scores and scores under each criterion of the top three proposals are presented in table 2.

Table 2
Scores of the top three proposals

		Points scored							
Rank	*Name*	*Total points scored (max.: 100)*	*Technical capabilities (max.: 20)*	*Technical approach (max.: 20)*	*Existing governance and management structures (max.: 13)*	*CTCN management plan (max.: 15)*	*Past performance (max.: 10)*	*Budget proposal for CTCN (max.: 10)*	*Examples (max.: 12)*
1	UNEP-led consortium	81.28	18.00	16.13	10.73	11.70	7.72	7.67	9.33
2	Global Environment Facility	77.19	15.67	14.67	11.16	11.40	7.72	7.78	8.80
3	Det Norske Veritas AS	71.16	15.33	14.00	9.43	11.40	6.89	6.11	8.00

Abbreviations: UNEP = United Nations Environment Programme, CTCN= Climate Technology Centre and Network.

2. Value for money

37. The value for money ratio was calculated in accordance with the methodology outlined in decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 10, whereby for proposals scoring at, or above, the minimum levels defined in the same paragraph, the total number of points scored was divided by the overall budget proposal from the proponent submitted in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 7(a). Three proponents passed the required minimum scores. The calculation resulted in the values shown in table 3.

Table 3
Ratio of value for money calculated based on the methodology set out in decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, paragraph 10

Value for money		
Proponents	*Annual budget USD million*	*Ratio of value for money*
UNEP-led consortium[a]	10–30	8.13–2.71
Det Norske Veritas AS[b]	10	7.12
Global Environment Facility[c]	19	4.06

Abbreviation: UNEP = United Nations Environment Programme.

[a] The proposed budget is USD 10 million in the first year of operation and will gradually increase to USD 30 million in the fifth year.

[b] The proposed budget is for the first year of operation.

[c] The proposed budget is USD 50 million for the first 2.5 years, which is equal to USD 19 million annually as clarified in the proposal by the Global Environment Facility.

38. As a result of insufficient guidance in decision 2/CP.17 on the budget proposal criterion, in particular on the number and nature of expected requests from Parties, proponents assumed the provision of different CTCN service levels in their budget proposal. The evaluation panel reviewed the budget figures used for calculating the value for money ratio, and the associated output projections provided by the proponents, and found that they are generally not comparable. In addition, some proponents provided a budget for the first year, while others presented an annually increasing multi-year budget.

39. In accordance with decision 2/CP.17, annex VIII, the evaluation panel considered the value for money ratio calculated by using the budget information that was requested and provided. The evaluation panel, however, after intense deliberation, concluded that the ratio does not provide sufficient information to affect the final ranking of the proponents.

B. Assessments findings and shortlist ranking three proponents

40. The evaluation panel found that all the evaluated proposals had strengths and weaknesses. For example, common strengths of the three proposals contained in table 2 that received scores above the threshold are their broad regional and thematic coverage and strong capability to provide expert advice and technical support on mitigation. However, the three proponents present limited information on their expertise and capability in adaptation, which could be seen as a common weakness. With respect to the proposals that did not meet the threshold, in most cases their major weaknesses are geographical limitation, proposed management structure and limited experience in the technology transfer cycle. However, the evaluation panel also recognized that they have technical strengths within particular sectors and geographical areas.

41. Based on the information provided in the proposals, the evaluation panel is of the view that only those three proponents that scored above the threshold fully meet the requirements for hosting the CTC as defined by decision 2/CP.17. The evaluation panel, based on the overall technical score of the proposals contained in table 2, and taking into account the value for money ratio, presents a shortlist ranking three proponents in table 4 for consideration by the SBI at its thirty-sixth session.

42. As shown in table 2, the first-ranked proponent, the consortium led by UNEP, received an overall score of 81.28, closely followed by the second-ranked proponent, the Global Environment Facility (77.19), and the third-ranked proponent, Det Norske Veritas AS (71.16). The scores of each criterion as contained in table 2 also reflect the strengths of the proposals in different areas.

Table 4
Shortlist with ranking of proponents

Ranking	*Proponent*
1	Consortium led by the United Nations Environment Programme
2	Global Environment Facility
3	Det Norske Veritas AS

1. Proponents included in the shortlist

43. The first-ranked proponent, a consortium of 13 organizations led by UNEP, demonstrates its relevant technical capabilities and has a proposed technical approach that is comprehensive and responsive to performing the functions of the CTC as decided in decision 2/CP.17. The consortium documented a broad spectrum of professional expertise across sectors and the technology cycle, a good technical reach and a balanced regional representation. It has a long experience in fostering cooperation and partnerships across a wide range of stakeholders, and the proponent's activities show correlation with the CTC functions. The second-ranked proponent, the Global Environment Facility, also has broad experience in technology transfer and diffusion to address climate change and in multi-stakeholder cooperation, has a clearly laid out CTCN management plan and presents a solid record of financial and performance management. The third-ranked proponent, Det Norske Veritas AS, has a large number of technical experts, engages heavily with other technology

stakeholders, in particular technology developers and consumers, and presents an innovative model for the CTC that incorporates capacity-building within the proponent's training academies, an exceptional knowledge management component and a focus on fast-execution strategies. However, it lacks adaptation expertise.

44. A summary of the evaluation panel's consolidated assessment, providing a rationale for the scores of the shortlisted proposals against each criterion, and highlighting their strengths and weaknesses, is contained in annex II.

2. Proponents not included in the shortlist

45. An important factor for the lower scores of the proposals not included in the shortlist compared with the shortlisted proposals is insufficient detail regarding specifically requested information related to the subcriteria. Many issues under the subcriteria were not addressed, or were not sufficiently detailed to allow an assessment. This includes the lack of, or limited, information provided on consistency with United Nations standards and principles of the organizational and operational systems of those proponents, which was a requirement under a number of agreed subcriteria. Another common weakness was the limited scope of activities and/or thematic focus, and/or limited geographical reach of the proponents. In general, the proponents that were not shortlisted did not clearly demonstrate in their proposals the broad regional coverage required for the CTC. Furthermore, the capabilities of those proponents did not match sufficiently with the functions of the CTC identified in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 123.

46. Nonetheless, many of the proposals that were not shortlisted have important attributes, for example strengths within particular sectors and particular geographic areas. The proponents often indicated unique and deep knowledge or technical capabilities, and/or a particularly strong local understanding. Their depth of technical knowledge in certain areas and specialized capabilities could be highly valuable for the Network, and, as appropriate, the evaluation panel would encourage the eventual CTC host to collaborate with those proponents and/or to consider inviting them to join the Network.

47. The technical capabilities and specialized knowledge of those proponents are manifold, and the examples provided here are just a sample to illustrate their often unique attributes. Examples are: the unique capabilities in marine technologies, including ocean climate warning systems and wave energy of BPPT; the expertise of TIFAC in assessing, forecasting and transferring technologies; the experience of South–South GATE in networking experts from developed and developing countries combined with its technical capabilities in areas such as agriculture, renewable energy and energy efficiency; the forestry and agricultural engineering knowledge of ITCR; and the expertise of RIPI in oil and gas exploration and petroleum refining technologies.

C. Acknowledgement

48. The evaluation panel noted with appreciation the commitment and participation in the selection process of all proponents and their response to the demanding requirements of the CFP. All proposals were prepared and submitted to the secretariat in a timely manner within a very tight timeline. All proponents demonstrated their seriousness in providing support and contributing to enhance technology development and transfer to developing countries at the scale required to address the challenges posed by climate change. The evaluation panel would also like to reiterate that it conducted the evaluation in an open, transparent, fair and neutral manner in accordance with the process outlined in decision 2/CP.17, and informed by United Nations practices.

Annex I

Process and timetable followed for the evaluation

Table 5
Process and timetable followed for the evaluation

Date	*Process step*
17 February 2012	Evaluation panel is constituted at the 2nd meeting of the Technology Executive Committee
2 March and 15 March 2012	Teleconference meetings of the evaluation panel to discuss and agree on the modalities, process and timetable for evaluating the proposals and preparing the evaluation report. Evaluation panel members agree on how to evaluate the proposals, including the rating and scoring system
16 March 2012	Receipt, opening and preliminary examination of the proposals
19 March 2012	List of proponents and executive summaries of proposals are posted on the UNFCCC website. Evaluation panel members receive proposals
19–21 March 2012	Secretariat compiles proposals and prepares tables identifying sections and annexes in which relevant information related to the subcriteria can be found in the proposals, and highlights key information related to each subcriterion as a tool to facilitating the evaluation panel's task of evaluating the proposals
26 March 2012	Teleconference meeting of the evaluation panel to discuss the timeline for the evaluation process and the outline of the evaluation report
22–31 March 2012	Individual reading, assessment and scoring of the proposals by evaluation panel members
31 March to 2 April 2012	Secretariat collects and compiles individual scores and the narratives providing the reasons for the scores for each subcriterion by the evaluation panel members. Secretariat also calculates average ratings for each subcriterion
2 April 2012	Meeting of the evaluation panel for the joint evaluation of the proposals. Evaluation panel members review the average scores and reasons for the ratings for each subcriterion for each proposal and agree on the final rating for each subcriterion, the resulting ranking of the proposals and a consolidated evaluation
2–20 April 2012	Preparation of the evaluation report

Annex II

Consolidated assessments for the shortlisted proposals

Table 6
Consolidated assessments for the shortlisted proposals

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
1. A consortium of 13 organizations, led by the United Nations Environment Programme			
Technical capabilities	18/20	The proponent presents a clear narrative spanning a full range of technology development and transfer issues, including regional and subregional considerations. The consortium represents a broad spectrum of demonstrated expertise across sectors and the technology cycle, has a deep technical reach and is balanced in terms of regional representation. The consortium has extensive experience in implementing collaborative projects in developing countries and the proponent's activities and project management experience show a good correspondence with the Climate Technology Centre (CTC) functions. The consortium also outlines its long history and record of capacity-building activities, including that of its role as an implementing agency of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol. Furthermore, the consortium illustrates its long experience in fostering cooperation and partnerships across stakeholders, including the private sector, and provides a number of examples, such as the Seed Capital Assistance Facility and the Climate Finance Innovation Facility	The consortium appears to have stronger competencies in mitigation than in adaptation
Technical approach	16.1/20	The proponent presents a comprehensive vision for the CTC that is ambitious yet practical and realistic. The framing based on local ownership and strong regional partners is convincing. Ample evidence is provided of long-term commitment to hosting the CTC. The proposed approach for establishing and structuring the Network addresses various levels of necessary engagement and convincingly demonstrates how such engagement will be	More clarity is needed on how the prioritization of requests will be managed and how requests will be allocated to core members of the Network. The efficiency of the co-management of the CTC by the two co-leads, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), is a potential concern. The difference between the roles of those within the

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
		accomplished. Also, the plans for linking to, learning from, and building on existing networks adds a lot of value. The consortium shows it can incorporate different kinds of institutions covering a number of sectors and regions. With regard to the extent to which the approach focuses on the objective of capacity-building, evidence of extensive expertise and experience is presented	consortium versus those within the Network could have been addressed with more clarity
Existing governance and management structures	10.7/13	The proponent presents solid evidence related to its ability to ensure the evaluation of operational performance against a number of elements, including fiduciary and ethical standards, consistent with the principles of the United Nations, and related to reporting and accountability. The proponent provides information related to its procedures for international tendering in line with the fiduciary and ethical standards of the United Nations, on which the CTC will rely. Information is presented on the effectiveness of the management structure of the co-lead proponents, UNEP and UNIDO, to ensure financial management, auditing and reporting functions. Experience with simultaneously managing multiple complex projects is in evidence from the co-leads	There is a lack of clarity on which of the two co-leads, UNEP and UNIDO, will take the lead in terms of the management and governance of the consortium. The proposal does not include explicit information regarding the proponent's ability to provide logistical arrangements and accessibility for developing countries and the least developed countries (LDCs). More information about the capability of the consortium to manage multiple complex projects as a whole is needed
Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) management plan	11.7/15	The proponent's plan is concrete and feasible, operationally nimble and clearly laid out. Systems are in place to ensure operational performance evaluation. The personnel identified for the CTC have the necessary experience and proven track records of performance. The proven accomplishments and extensive networks represented in the proposal note the proponent's potential ability to coordinate a more extensive network of actors	Further elaboration regarding the hierarchy within the consortium, and who will take the lead, would be useful
Past performance	7.7/10	The proponent provides information on the systems in place for cost and financial performance control. Evidence is provided on the proponent's track record with regard to meeting targets and goals, including on awards received for excellence. The proponent has a strong record of providing technical assistance and assembling and	Information appears to be missing on some of the key criteria, such as timeliness of implementation, addressing and learning from problems, and the effectiveness of the management in making prompt decisions and ensuring efficient operations of tasks. The proposal is not clear regarding its record on cost

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
		dispatching technical assistance teams. The consortium provides good geographical representation, incorporating strong regional partners as well as extensive United Nations networks. It offers experience consistent with the functions and mandate of the CTCN as identified in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 123. The formation of the consortium for the proposal is a good signal and example of the co-leads' capacity and ability in setting up and managing multiple partnerships with diverse skills and varied geographical presences. Solid examples of the proponent's experience in setting up, organizing and managing a network are provided	forecasting. The consortium's capability to address local needs in relation to capacity-building for local governments and institutions could be more clearly demonstrated
Budget proposal	7.7/10	The proposed budget is balanced between programme and administrative functions. The in-kind and cash contributions to the CTC are substantial and indicate a commitment to the CTC. The business model appears to be reasonable, practical and effective	The reliance on estimated in-kind contributions from donor countries seems risky. Further elaboration on the mobilization of private financing would be useful
Examples	9.3/12	The approach to the hypothetical budget requests is well thought out and pragmatic, and both budget scenarios (the USD 10 million and USD 30 million scenarios) are satisfactory. The 16 per cent and 10 per cent administrative costs for the USD 10 million and USD 30 million example budget scenarios, respectively, are reasonable. With regard to the proponent's approach to the two sample requests, the proposal responds to the need for cost-efficiency, and all elements are addressed. Both the amount and distribution of the costs seem very much in line with what is required	More detailed information in the example budget scenarios for the CTCN is needed on the budget allocation to hire consultants. With regard to the budget in the two sample requests, the reliance on immediate in-kind contributions from countries may be unrealistic
2. Global Environment Facility			
Technical capabilities	15.7/20	The proponent demonstrates a strong climate expertise and knowledge base, including on technology transfer, and has a broad portfolio of climate-friendly technologies for mitigation and adaptation. Its broad experience in terms of multi-stakeholder cooperation is well explained, including its capability to involve the private sector, for	The proponent's substantive breadth and depth has some limitation as it is not an implementing entity but a financing institution, and the specific relevance of its experience for the CTC functions is not sufficiently clear. The proponent also provides little information regarding its understanding of technology and experience at the

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
		example through partnerships with multilateral development banks	regional and subregional levels
Technical approach	14.7/20	The proponent has provided a clear and budgeted long-term commitment to the CTC. Furthermore, the proponent has provided a realistic and practical approach to long-term capacity-building	Although the proponent's vision is adequate to the task, it may be constrained by its existing institutional construct and operations, and may lack the operational creativity and programmatic innovation commensurate with the climate technology transfer challenge. In terms of establishing and structuring the Network, the proponent has not adequately demonstrated how it would establish the requisite broader network that will be central to a successful CTCN. The proposal focuses almost exclusively on the CTC, with minimal attention to the Network. The process for the CTC to engage the Network is weakened by the lack of detail about the nature of the Network itself and it is unclear how the Network would extend beyond traditional Global Environment Facility (GEF) partners
Existing governance and management structures	11.2/13	The proponent's existing structures of performance evaluation provide the necessary foundation for this extended task, and it has a proven and solid record in this regard. The proponent's fiduciary and ethical standards are consistent with those of the United Nations. The management structures of the proponent appear to be sufficient for ongoing oversight and flexibility in those areas key to the execution of a successful programme. With regard to financial management, reporting and auditing functions, the proponent presents its high standards and accumulated trust	The proposal does not appear to provide explicit information on the proponent's ability to provide infrastructural and logistical arrangements for the CTC. While the organization presents its record of the management and administration of numerous projects, the evidence provided on the multiplicity and diversity of clientele objectives is not as substantive
CTCN management plan	11.4/15	The plan is feasible and clearly laid out. The proponent is equipped to evaluate performance	The proposal is not particularly clear on how the programme would quickly ramp up, and the regional and national structure of the CTCN could be potentially slow to emerge relative to proposals with a stronger emphasis on agile networks. The proposal does not sufficiently address how it would ensure the responsiveness and flexibility required within its current structure. The proposed staff, while accomplished in their existing

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
			positions, have limited operational skill sets and experience and the technology expertise required for the CTC
Past performance	7.7/10	The proposal provides a solid case of past performance regarding meeting goals and adherence to schedules. It also presents solid evidence of tracking costs, reducing its administrative costs and improving performance over time. The proponent has experience at the national and local levels across broad regions and has a demonstrated commitment to improving response times. As the financial mechanism of the Convention, the proponent has a rich experience in relation to technology transfer and diffusion	The proponent insufficiently demonstrates its experience with assembling and dispatching technical assistance teams. The information on how the proponent has responded to regional and local technological needs is limited. The information regarding its experience as it relates to the functions of the CTCN is weak. The proponent has some experience in managing a network but the proposal provides limited evidence of experience in establishing a network of the magnitude of the CTCN. Its experience is more geared towards funding, rather than setting up and managing, networks
Budget proposal	7.8/10	The budget is clearly laid out. The proponent allocates USD 50 million of its own resources. The business model is appropriate for and commensurate with the proposed funding and tasks required	Depending on the level of staffing for regional centres, the staffing of the CTC seems light, with only a director, one programme manager and five per cent of existing staff time for 10 other GEF secretariat staff
Examples	8.8/12	The example budget scenarios are reasonable. With regard to the proponent's response to the two sample requests, the approach is clear and detailed, in particular on managing the scope of the work	The administrative costs are difficult to assess owing to the lack of information on the administrative costs of the regional centres. Further clarification of the administrative costs in the budget scenario details would be useful. No budget information is provided for the sample requests
3. Det Norske Veritas AS			
Technical capabilities	15.3/20	The proponent demonstrates substantial capabilities in technology transfer. It has a large number of technical experts in a wide range of technologies, including those encompassed by the clean development mechanism. In terms of capacity-building capabilities, the proponent refers to its training academies, and its experts involved in different capacity-building programmes and training courses. The proponent's regional centres within its business structure demonstrate its ability to respond to	There is limited reference to adaptation in the proponent's expertise. The proponent does not spell out how its expertise relates to the CTC functions and terms of reference. The proponent's experience is strong with the private sector, but appears less extensive with other key stakeholders

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
		region-specific needs. The proponent outlines its core competencies, in particular specialized knowledge management services and technology qualification services, and its technical expertise in a number of sectors. The proponent engages heavily with other technology stakeholders, in particular technology developers and consumers, through joint industry projects, for example in liquefied natural gas and natural gas, pipelines, carbon dioxide capture and storage, and wind energy	
Technical approach	14.0/20	The proponent presents an innovative vision and model for the CTC, including an exceptional knowledge management component and concrete suggestions on how to respond to a high volume of request at its inception, and a focus on fast-execution strategies. The proponent presents some innovative ideas for capacity-building	The proposed model is less convincing with regard to its ability to match the needs of developing country Parties with appropriate service providers, in particular given the proponent's private-sector orientation. No explicit reference is made in the proposal to the long-term commitment to hosting the CTC. The approach for establishing and structuring the Network is not clearly described, and although adequate geographically, it is weaker thematically, and it is structured around Det Norske Veritas' (DNV's) own networks. Although the centre would be supported by existing regional centres and would have the ability to maintain relationships with developing countries, the proposal lacks a clear articulation of how the CTC would engage with broader networks. With regard to capacity-building, the emphasis is on the proponent's own tools and skills
Existing governance and management structures	9.4/13	The proponent provides an outline of the components of its management system, which will be used as a basis when establishing a management system for the CTCN, and which ensures the evaluation of its operational performance. With regard to its capability to manage and administer multiple and complex projects in developing countries, the proponent states that it manages around 20,000 project globally, varying in size from the very small to more than USD 20 million, and that it uses a common approach for project management based on best	The proposal does not explicitly state to what extent the proponent's management system and its international tendering processes are consistent with the principles of the United Nations. The proponent provides limited information related to its international tendering processes other than referring to its role of supporting major tendering processes on behalf of client organizations and government ministries, and that contractors have to comply with DNV's personal code of conduct. The proponent's description of its

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
		practice project management standards	governance and management system is not very detailed. The proposal does not include a specific reference to its ability to provide accessibility to developing country Parties, including the LDCs
CTCN management plan	11.4/15	The proposal presents a clear and feasible management plan and schedule with four phases. The proponent provides evidence that the management structure would ensure legal capacity and the identification and management of risks. The proposal demonstrates the proponent's capacity to evaluate performance at a number of different levels across a wide variety of projects. The key personnel identified have the expertise and experience that reflects the needs of the CTCN operations	Strategies to ensure accountability to the Conference of the Parties are not covered extensively under the proposal
Past performance	6.9/10	The proponent is a successful company working in a commercial environment, in which meeting contract schedules is a prerequisite for maintaining a growing customer base. Similarly, regarding cost control, the proponent follows corporate reporting guidelines in 100 countries, and there is an annual budget planning process to forecast costs and revenues. The proposal demonstrates that much of the proponent's work entails putting together teams and managing the implementation of projects, and that is has a proven track record. The proponent's 300 offices within 100 countries around the globe is a good indicator of its broad regional coverage. The proponent's network formation and management experience is demonstrated in various examples, and it appears to have a solid record in this regard	Although the general information provided within the proposal looks impressive, concrete examples to show its high level of performance are limited. The proposal provides little information on how it would build teams with other organizations, and on ways to involve other private-sector entities in projects. The proposal is not sufficiently explicit on the extent to which the proponent's experience corresponds with some of the functions central to the CTC, in particular related to adaptation
Budget proposal	6.1/10	The budget appears to be easily scalable, with sufficient standards and safeguards, both legal and ethical, in place. For the first year of operation, administrative costs would be covered by in-kind contributions by the proponent. The business model appears to be practical and efficient	The level of resource contribution is quite low
Examples	8.0/12	The proponent's approach to the two sample requests is clear, technically competent and illustrates a fast-	The two example budget scenarios for the CTCN require more clarity and detail, in particular on the nature and

Criteria	*Score*	*Strengths*	*Weaknesses*
		turnaround capability, as well as the ability to leverage the Network	quantity of services. In terms of the percentage of the overall operating budget used for administrative costs in the USD 10 million example budget scenario, 26.8 per cent seems rather high