



# Tool: Mitigation Action Screening Tool

## Tool Description

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

## General Information of this tool

### Objective/ function:

This tool gives guidance to structure the process of screening and priority setting for potential Mitigation Actions.

### Tool developer & weblink:

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

### Area of application:

- Designing mitigation measures
- Quantified target
- Strategy or plan
- Policy or program
- Project

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

**Level of complexity:** Medium

### Required data/information:

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

**Cost:** free of charge

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

**Equipment needed:** Pinboards or laptop with beamer and flipchart

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

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

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

## Application – in 4 steps to a Mitigation Action short list!

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

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

### Step 2: Define evaluation criteria

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

### Step 4: Define next steps

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

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

#### Step 2: Define evaluation criteria

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

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

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

##### Criterion 2: Likelihood of successful implementation

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

##### Criterion 3: GHG mitigation potential

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

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

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

##### Criterion 5: Economic and financial feasibility

- Abatement cost per tonne of CO<sub>2</sub>-eq
- Relation of costs<sup>1</sup> and expected benefits
- Cost of MRV (complexity in methodology; data availability & need for new data; technical capacity of core stakeholders)
- Feasibility to close funding gaps with public resources (domestic or international)
- Access to finance (domestic and international, public and private)
- Financial risks

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

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

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

Table 1. Guidance on scoring

Criteria	Scores				
	++	+	o	-	--
<b>Paradigm shift potential / Potential for transformational change</b>	very high	high	Middle	Low	very low
<b>Likelihood of successful implementation</b>	High chance of success	Good chance of success for at least the main parts	Medium-good chance for most parts	High barriers for several parts	Very high implementation barriers
<b>GHG mitigation potential (MtCO<sub>2</sub>-eq/yr)</b>	>1	0.5 – 1	0.1 – 0.5	0 – 0.1	only indirect
<b>Co-Benefits</b>	very high	High	Middle	Low	Negative
<b>Economic and financial feasibility</b>	Very good cost-benefit ratio and very good chances to be financed Very high cost of MRV	Good cost-benefit ratio and good chances to be financed High cost of MRV	Moderate cost-benefit ratio and some barriers to be financed Medium cost of MRV	Low cost-benefit ratio and high barriers to be financed Low cost of MRV	Negative cost-benefit ratio and high barriers to be financed Very low cost of MRV

Table 2. Screening Table

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

#### Step 4: Define next steps

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

**Published by:**  
Deutsche Gesellschaft für  
Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Registered offices  
Bonn and Eschborn, Germany

Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5  
65760 Eschborn, Germany  
T +49 61 96 79-0  
F +49 61 96 79-11 15  
E [info@giz.de](mailto:info@giz.de)  
I [www.giz.de](http://www.giz.de)

**Programme/project description:**  
TRANSfer

**Authors:**  
Stefan Bakker (updated by André Eckermann)

**Design/layout, etc.:**  
Jana Stingl, Bonn

**Photo credits/sources:**  
Photo by chuttersnap on Unsplash

**URL links:**  
[www.changing-transport.org](http://www.changing-transport.org)

GIZ is responsible for the content of this publication.

On behalf of  
The Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear  
Safety of the Federal Republic of Germany

Bonn 2020