**Annex 3. Project Screening Report**

*Step 3 – To be completed by JNAP Task Force*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concept/Project Title** |  |
| Criteria | Guiding Questions |
| 1. Project Rationale
 | * 1. Does the idea/concept have a compelling rationale and clearly link to reducing climate variability or vulnerability?
	2. Has the primary need for the project been identified and justified?
	3. Is there sufficient evidence to support this, e.g. a study or a survey report?
 |
| * 1. **Yes or No**
	2. **Yes or No**
	3. **Yes or No**
 | **Comments:** |
| 1. Project objective versus baseline
 | * 1. Has the objective of the project/concept been clearly defined?
	2. Has a baseline been identified and clearly explained? For example, an emissions/vulnerability scenario discussed?
	3. Has the concept been explained clearly and how the baseline scenario will be improved?
 |
| **2.1 Yes or No****2.2 Yes or No****2.3 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Policy coherence and alignment to national priorities, country ownership and national support
 | * 1. Does the objective align with the national climate change priorities, strategies, and/or policy targets, i.e. the TSDF, JNAP2, NDC, National Climate Change Policy, Sector and/or Community Resilient or Development Plans?
	2. Does the concept assist with meeting targets for mitigation, adaptation and/or disaster risk management?
	3. Is national, sector or community support sufficiently evidenced, e.g. a letter of support from national counterpart(s) (i.e. line ministry and/or department, provincial counterpart, and/or other community-based institutions)?
 |
| * 1. **Yes or No**
	2. **Yes or No**
	3. **Yes or No**
 | **Comments:** |
| 1. Implementing and executing entity background and capacity
 | * 1. Do the implementing and executing entity(ies) have sufficient/suitable capacity and technical expertise in relation to the concept scope and its components?
	2. Do they have a track record/previous experience/credibility in similar work? Have they sufficiently justified this?
 |
| * 1. **Yes or No**
	2. **Yes or No**
 | **Comments:** |
| 1. Risk management strategies
 | * 1. Have the risks and methods to address these been identified and justified? For example, financial or technical and operational, environmental and social or political, and other risks, etc.
 |
| **Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Consultation and multi-stakeholder engagement
 | * 1. Has sufficient consultation with all relevant stakeholders been undertaken and views considered? (Including donors, private sector, local communities and civil society).
	2. Is there evidence of the consultation provided? i.e. a consultation report
 |
| **6.1 Yes or No****6.2 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Potential overlaps or duplication with other existing activities or expected projects, including strategies to resolve (suitability of location)
 | * 1. Is the concept/project idea duplicating existing work?
	2. Is it proposed that the project be implemented in an area that has already been supported by another project with similar activities?
	3. How are these issues to be addressed if there is a likelihood of duplication? Comment below.
 |
| **7.1 Yes or No****7.2 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Technical feasibility/evaluation
 | * 1. Is the project considered technically feasible?
	2. Are the inputs (e.g. labour, materials, transport, etc.) to the project activities likely to produce the project outputs?
	3. If the project involves a technological solution, has it been justified and why it is most appropriate for the project? Comment below.
 |
| **8.1 Yes or No****8.2 Yes or No****8.3 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Reducing vulnerability and managing or minimising impacts
 | * 1. Does the project reduce the level of exposure to climate risks and the degree of vulnerability, and address the needs and vulnerability of the beneficiary population/sector?
	2. Has a vulnerability assessment been conducted and what evidence is there? Comment below.
 |
| **9.1 Yes or No****9.2 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Economic and financial viability
 | * 1. Is the project considered to be economically and financially feasible?
	2. Has an economic and/or financial feasibility/analysis been undertaken? If not yet, at what stage of the project preparation would these be carried out? Comment below.
 |
| **10.1 Yes or No****10.2 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Environmental and social considerations
 | * 1. Have potential environmental and social risks been considered?
	2. Will there be sufficient environmental and social safeguards?
 |
| **11.1 Yes or No****11.2 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) considerations
 | * 1. Has gender, disability and vulnerable groups been adequately considered in the project?
	2. Evidence of analysis? i.e. Gender Equality Analysis
 |
| **12.1 Yes or No****12.2 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 1. Monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL)
 | * 1. Is the monitoring, reporting, evaluation and learning process sufficiently outlined?
	2. Is there a satisfactory logical framework/theory of change (ToC)?
 |
| * 1. **Yes or No**
	2. **Yes or No**
 | **Comments:** |
| 14. Sustainability measures and co-benefits | 14.1 Is there an exit strategy and evidence that the project activities can be maintained after project funding?14.2 Have the maintenance and cost implications for the government/community/private sector been sufficiently outlined?14.3 Does the project clearly explain co-benefits? i.e. specific economic, social, environmental and gender-sensitive development impacts? (Examples include improved access, standard of living, public health, energy security or ecosystem health, etc.). Comment below. |
| **14.1 Yes or No****14.2 Yes or No****14.3 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 15. Impact potential | * 1. Mitigation: Does the project contribute to a shift to low-emission sustainable development pathways? e.g. carbon emissions reduced and/or cost-effectiveness, i.e. total project cost compared to carbon emissions reduced.
	2. Adaptation: Does the project contribute to increased climate-resilient sustainable development? e.g. number of direct/indirect beneficiaries relative to total population.
 |
| **15.1 Yes or No****15.2 Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 16. Paradigm shift potential | 16.1 Does the project have the potential to catalyse impact in the long-term and beyond the scope of the proposed project (potential for scaling-up and replication of the project, knowledge and learning, contribution to regulatory frameworks, policies and public planning, mobilization of other actors, market development and transformation)? |
| **Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| 17. Efficiency and effectiveness | 17.1 Is the project economically and financially sound, taking into consideration the total funding requested, financing already or expected to be secured, any potential revenues and in-kind contributions? |
| **Yes or No** | **Comments:** |
| **Conclusion** |  |
| **JNAP Task Force Member** | **Recommended** **Not Recommended** **Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |