**NDC** ­­­
Handover
Checklist

This NDC Handover Checklist[[1]](#footnote-2) can be used by governments to document key aspects of the recent Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) revision process. It is intended as a contribution to any government’s knowledge management and bears no link with official reporting processes. Governments can use the checklist as it is or adapt it to their own context. They decide what information to include in the checklist, where to store it and with whom the information can be shared.

The objective of this checklist is to record essential information about the process, resources, decisions, and actors involved in the NDC updating process to inform any subsequent revision.
In addition, the checklist offers a space to document reflections on the process and recommendations for future NDC revisions.[[2]](#footnote-3) The information in this checklist may also provide useful information for other processes, such as the reporting under the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) or the development of Long-Term Strategies (LTS)[[3]](#footnote-4).

The format of this checklist is flexible: it can and should be tailored to the context of each country. No single actor or organization can fill in this checklist alone. The national government e.g., NDC Focal Point, environmental or climate change authorities can coordinate to fill it in with other ministries and agencies, as well as external partners or consultants that were involved in developing or revising the NDC. Collecting information for this checklist can also be accompanied by a reflection or a closing workshop with key stakeholders involved in the NDC process for collective reflection and learning.

This checklist was developed and further enhanced with the inputs of experts that supported NDC revision/development in more than 30 countries around the globe. It is expected to facilitate effective and efficient future NDC revision and/or development by ensuring better knowledge management at the country level.

|  |
| --- |
| This NDC Handover Checklist was developed based on the following observations gathered from the 2020-2021 NDC revision/development: * In many cases, background information and data on the formulation of the first NDC and relevant climate policies was only partially available. This includes data and methodology, for example, greenhouse gas emissions inventory, models to establish a baseline and targets, as well as information about the decision-making process. This lack of information required additional resources to fill those gaps, caused delays, as well as posed a challenge for discussions around the specific sectors and adjustments to targets of the previous NDC.
* Most countries were supported in their NDC revision by development partners with funding and technical support through external consultants. Each partner worked on different elements of the NDC.
* Many countries face high turnover as staff are shuffled between agencies. Institutional memory of how the previous NDC was formulated can therefore be limited.
 |
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# Contributors to this Checklist

| **Institution** | **Name** | **Contact details (email or phone number)** | **Sections of the Checklist filled in** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Key information

This section provides a basic overview of the revised NDC.

### Country

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### NDC submission date

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### The NDC is:

[ ]  A revised document

[ ]  A new document

### Who was involved in drafting the NDC?

Please list the names and email addresses of the persons that drafted the NDC as well as reviewed the document. If consultants were involved, please indicate the institution that they work for or the entity that hired them to support the government.

| **Institution** | **Name** | **Contact details (email or phone number)** | **Responsibilities for NDC revision process** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### What were the main inputs used in the preparation process for the NDC revision?

For example, national policies or strategies, sectoral strategies and plans, reports, regulations and any other legislation or studies.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Scoping of the NDC

This section aims to document the persons involved in the processes for determining the areas to be included in the revised NDC, and the overall process itself.

###  Which national institution led the NDC revision process and what were its responsibilities?

Please name the institution that led the process and the institution’s main responsibilities in the process. If possible, please add the positions and contact details of the persons involved.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

###  What was identified as part of the enhancement of the revised NDC?

The enhancement could for instance be in mitigation (expansion of scope for sectors as well as greenhouse gases identified by the IPCC, raising ambition in pre-existing targets, or including new programs), in adaptation (new programs), progressing towards economy-wide targets, or the overall quality of the NDC.

### What were the limitations to further enhancing the scope, targets and/or quality of the NDC?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What were the main components of the methodology to revise the NDC?

Please list, from start to submission, the main processes involved in NDC revision, and the time allotted for each component. Examples include stakeholder consultations, policy analysis, financial strategy, and/or implementation plan.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What was the timeline for NDC revision?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Was the allocated time sufficient?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

If the allotted time was inadequate for any component, please state why and list any recommendations to more precisely estimate the timeframe for each component.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What type of technical analysis was carried out to assess the scope for revising the NDC?

For example, updating the energy balance of the greenhouse gas inventory, literature review of fiscal incentives for greater adoption of electric vehicles, or a gender mainstreaming report. Please share URLs, references or location of where relevant data is stored and/or the partner(s) that prepared the analysis. If there are main takeaways from the conclusion, like “this report concluded that targets for x sector should be revised, hence a revision process for x was organized”.

[ ]  Development of a National Communication

[ ]  Vulnerability/risk analysis

[ ]  Stakeholder dialogue

[ ]  Other:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## External Support for NDC Revision

This section primarily documents the external technical and financial support sought by the country for NDC revision activities. It also takes stock of whether the support provided was sufficient and collects recommendations for improvement in the future. Government officials involved in the NDC revision process can primarily fill in this section.

### Was external support requested for NDC revision?

[ ]  No: skip ahead to section 4

[ ]  Yes

### Which channel did the country use to request support?

[ ]  NDC Partnership

[ ]  Approached by an external partner

[ ]  Approached an external partner

[ ]  Other (please specify, this could include other programs like the UNDP Climate Promise):

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What were the requested financial needs, if any?

This can include the budget for activities, or simply the activities for which an external budget was requested.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Who provided the external funding?

This includes funding for hiring external consultants, purchasing software licenses, receiving support on NDC revision activities, or to cover workshop and stakeholder engagement expenses.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Were the allocated financial resources sufficient?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

Suggest improvements, if any:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### In which area(s) did the country receive external support?

[ ]  Mitigation

[ ]  Adaptation

### What type of external support did the country receive for NDC revision?

[ ]  Costing of the NDC

[ ]  Capacity building

[ ]  Financial support

[ ]  Gender equality and social inclusion

[ ]  Implementation plan

[ ]  Technology transfer

[ ]  Emissions mitigation assessment

[ ]  Other (please specify, this could include other type of support received by the country):

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What type of support did each external advisor or institution provide?

List the roles and responsibilities of each external advisor or institution and their corresponding activities. Please add your reflection and recommendations on the roles of the external advisors.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Were there synergies or overlaps in the activities of external partners?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes (please specify how synergies or overlaps were addressed):

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What were the expressed capacity building needs, if any?

Some categories for capacity building are listed below but please add your specific need if it is not included.

[ ]  Training on GHG inventory development and management

[ ]  Training on NDC costing/cost-benefit analysis

[ ]  Improvement in cross-ministerial coordination

[ ]  Other:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Were there sufficient capacity-building activities part of the support offered?

[ ]  No (please suggest improvements, if any)

[ ]  Yes (please list some of the capacity-building support provided)

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Were there sufficient capacities among external partner(s) to adequately deliver on the activities that they supported?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

Suggest improvements, if any:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What are the lessons learned from requesting and receiving external support for this NDC revision process?

Please specify how the external support contributed to the revision of the NDC. If there are any recommendations for improvement, please add them in the box.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Overall Coordination of the NDC Revision

This section documents the coordination mechanism between the external advisors and government officials closely working on revising the NDC. External advisors should first fill in this section, followed by government officials.

### Was there a defined coordination mechanism for the NDC revision process?

[ ]  No: skip ahead to question 4.8 on recommendations

[ ]  Yes

### Which institution was the main coordinator of the NDC revision process?

Please include the name of the entity, person leading the effort, their position, and, if possible, their contact details.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### How did the country and implementing partners maintain regular coordination throughout the NDC revision process?

[ ]  Emails

[ ]  Virtual meetings and workshops

[ ]  In-person meetings and workshops

[ ]  No regular mechanism

[ ]  Other (please specify):

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### How frequently was the above mechanism used for coordination?

Please mention if it was weekly, biweekly, monthly, quarterly, or other time intervals.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What technological, capacity, financial and/or other resources were allocated for coordination?

Examples of resources could include virtual calling platforms like Zoom, a designated government person taking notes at meetings and sending calendar invitations, or financial resources set aside for in-person meetings with partners that were present in-country.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Which organizations were participating in regular coordination?

| **Organization** | **Representative’s name** | **Role in the NDC revision process** | **Contact details (email & phone number)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

### Did the government seek assistance to coordinate the revision activities between the stakeholders?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

If yes, please specify the type of assistance that the government received:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What are the lessons learned from this revision cycle for future NDC coordination processes?

Please write any reflections and suggestions for improvements as a result of your experience.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Stakeholder Engagement

### Who were the key national stakeholders involved in the revision process? What were their roles and responsibilities?

Please provide their name and organization. This can include stakeholders from civil society, private enterprises, government entities, and other relevant persons. An example of a responsibility is the Ministry of Transport participating in monthly update calls and validation workshops and providing transportation-related data.

| **Name** | **Organization** | **Role** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### What key advice would you give the team that organizes the next stakeholder consultation process?

If there was no stakeholder engagement process, please advise on if or how you would ensure stakeholder engagement in the next round of revision.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Mitigation and Modelling of GHG Projections

This section aims to target technical mitigation-related modeling activities for sectors defined under the IPCC 2006 Guidelines. It will take stock of the software used to create models, the input data used for modeling, main assumptions in the mitigation pathways, and takeaways from each model. A more detailed technical handover sheet to gather information on mitigation modeling can be found at the following link: [Data Handover for NDC](https://www.transparency-partnership.net/system/files/document/Data%20Handover%20for%20NDC%20Revision_English.xlsx). Institutions that contributed to the modeling effort should particularly fill this section to the best of their abilities.

### What modeling software was chosen and for which sector(s) was it applied? Why was this model chosen?

If different software was used to model different sectors, then please list each sector and the reasons that the software was chosen.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Who did the modeling (e.g., institution, consultant, or external advisor)?

If there were multiply modelers involved, please list them and their roles.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What were the assumptions that went into creating an emissions baseline in the model(s) for NDC revision?

Please list the base year, and other assumptions including underlying GDP assumptions, transportation sales and use data, cost of electricity, forest cover, etc.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Please list the main socioeconomic assumptions for the mitigation scenarios.

“Socioeconomic” refers to metrics related to population and the economy, for example, population growth rate and GDP per capita.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Was there an emissions baseline inventory before the modeling effort for this NDC revision was undertaken? Please mark any documents that had a greenhouse gas emissions baseline.

[ ]  National Communication; if yes, year of the most recent Communication:

[ ]  Biennial Update Report; if yes, year of the most recent Report:

[ ]  Other emissions related document (please list them below):

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Where did the input data for modeling come from and who retrieved it?

If there were multiple implementing partners or government agencies involved in this step, please list them, and describe what data they collected. If possible, add references like URLs.
If stakeholders shared data that is not publicly available, please mention that in particular.

| **Data retrieved** | **Location of data** | **Institution involved** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Was there sufficient data to generate future mitigation pathways?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

If the answer was “no”, how was this lack of data addressed?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What were the mitigation pathways produced? Which one was chosen for the targets of the NDC under revision? What were the reasons for this choice?

If there were many models for different sectors, please list them in separate paragraphs. Examples of pathways can include a) a business-as-usual scenario without any mitigation measures, b) a scenario with existing mitigation measures, c) a scenario with additional mitigation measures, and d) scenarios experimenting with different target levels of the same mitigation measures.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Please list the assumptions driving the chosen mitigation pathway.

The assumptions include, for example, the necessary increase in capacity in national electricity generation capacity, energy savings by improving building energy efficiency, percentage increase in electric vehicle sales, and/or change in fuel used for cooking.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### How long did the modeling process take?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Where are stored the data compiled for the model(s) and the model(s)?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Who has access to the data and to the model?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What were the main challenges in the modeling process?

Examples of recurring challenges include acquiring the license for the software model, lack of technological equipment, and frequently changing expectations.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Should the same models be used for the 2025 NDC update?

[ ]  No (please specify why):

[ ]  Yes (please specify why):

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### How can modeling challenges from this cycle be addressed in the 2025 NDC revision cycle?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Adaptation

This section documents adaptation-related processes, assessments and models that informed the revised NDC. Persons from institutions that were involved in forming the National Adaptation Plan, conducting climate vulnerability risk assessments or that contributed to the adaptation sections of the revised NDC may be best placed to complete this section.

### Did an existing national adaptation strategy or plan inform the adaptation components included in the revised NDC?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

If “No”, please explain why and suggest improvements, if any:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What are other existing strategies, policies or plans relevant for adaptation that have been incorporated into the revised NDC?

Please mention any adaptation programs taken from a specific national document. If there were none, skip ahead.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What assessments were undertaken to inform the adaptation priorities in the NDC?

An example of an adaptation assessment is a climate vulnerability and risk assessment, or a model that includes hazard and risk mapping of different areas within the country. Please also specify the sectors for which a vulnerability assessment was conducted.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Where is the data compiled for the assessment and the model(s) stored?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Who has access to the data and to the model?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What are the lessons learned for including adaptation programs in the next NDC?

Lessons can include identifying and closing gaps in adaptation, recommendations for relevant processes, and/or undertaking certain assessments.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Linkages with Other Processes

If there were ongoing parallel processes on preparing national or sectoral development strategies, other processes related to climate change, emissions mitigation, adaptation, or any other component of the revised NDC, this section documents how those processes were aligned with the NDC process.

### What were the parallel ongoing processes relevant for NDC formulation?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### How was the NDC revision process aligned to and informed by other processes relevant for climate change?

For example, development of the National Adaptation Plan, Long-term Low Emissions Development Strategy, or a National Energy Development Strategy.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Drafting the Updated NDC

All institutions that drafted the NDC and collected feedback from stakeholders on the draft document should especially fill this section out to the best of their abilities.

### Which resources were used as a reference for the structure of the NDC?

[ ]  Information to facilitate Clarity, Transparency, and Understanding of NDC (ICTU)

[ ]  Country’s own template

[ ]  Other (please specify):

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Was the draft NDC document open to feedback from stakeholders?

[ ]  No

[ ]  Yes

If yes, please note the stakeholders that provided feedback:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What were the languages in which the draft NDC was made available to the public?

☐ Not applicable (draft NDC was not shared with the public for feedback)

☐ National language (if not English)

☐ English

☐ Other local languages

Please list the languages in which the NDC was prepared:

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### If made publicly available, how was the draft NDC revised to incorporate public feedback?

Please included any processes, such as sharing the draft on a government portal, the time period for which the draft NDC was shared with the public for feedback, and any workshops to discuss changes.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

## Approval and Submission of the Revised NDC

The government is best placed to answer the questions in this section pertaining to national validation and approval of the revised NDC.

### What was the national process for validating the revised NDC?

Countries have different processes in place. Some countries only require validation through the appropriate government body, others have a consultation process with indigenous groups and other entities. Please include description of the process and timelines below.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### Which governing body provided national approval for the revised NDC?

|  |
| --- |
|       |

### What went well in the approval process for this NDC and what are the recommendations to improve the approval process in the next cycle?

Please use the space below for reflection and to share recommendations for any subsequent NDC revision cycles. If you encountered any time delays or major changes in the NDC approval process, please list them below, and propose solutions if any.

|  |
| --- |
|       |

This NDC Handover Checklist is a flexible template that can be adapted to the context of each country.

The opinions put forward in this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU).

The NDC Handover Checklist was prepared by Climate Analytics and the Support Project for Implementation of the Paris Agreement (SPA) implemented by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and funded by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU).

1. The Checklist was developed by the GIZ Support Project for Implementation of the Paris Agreement (SPA) and Climate Analytics (CA). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For more information about the process, please see the publication [“Next steps under the Paris Agreement and the Katowice Climate Package”](https://www.transparency-partnership.net/documents-tools/guidance-policy-makers-ndcs-and-etf) by Partnership on Transparency in the Paris Agreement (PATPA). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The preparation of Biennial Transparency Report (BTR) and LTS can benefit from such information as how the baseline was developed and how were the assumptions identified, as well as the process of setting the mitigation and adaptation targets. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)