



United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2026/13



Framework Convention on
Climate Change

Distr.: General
28 May 2026

English only

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Sixty-fourth session

Bonn, 8–18 June 2026

Item 12(c) of the provisional agenda

Matters relating to technology development and transfer

Host of the Climate Technology Centre

Evaluation of proposals for hosting the Climate Technology Centre

Report by the evaluation panel

Summary

This report contains information on the evaluation of proposals for hosting the Climate Technology Centre and the methodology for evaluating the submissions received against mandated criteria. The report presents a shortlist of two proposals for consideration by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at its sixty-fourth session.



Abbreviations and acronyms

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| AF | Adaptation Fund |
| AFCIA | Adaptation Fund Climate Innovation Accelerator |
| Annex I Party | Party included in Annex I to the Convention |
| CMA | Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement |
| COP | Conference of the Parties |
| CTC | Climate Technology Centre |
| CTCN | Climate Technology Centre and Network |
| GCF | Green Climate Fund |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| MDB | multilateral development bank |
| NDE | national designated entity |
| non-Annex I Party | Party not included in Annex I to the Convention |
| NSI | national system of innovation |
| SBI | Subsidiary Body for Implementation |
| TEC | Technology Executive Committee |
| TNA | technology needs assessment |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| UNIDO | United Nations Industrial Development Organization |
| UNOPS | United Nations Office for Project Services |

I. Introduction

A. Background and mandate

1. In 2010, COP 16 established the Technology Mechanism, comprising the TEC and the CTCN, and set out the functions of each body.¹

2. COP 17 decided that the CTC shall operate for initial terms until 2026, at which time the COP will review its functions and decide whether to extend its term.² COP 29 decided to conduct this review and decide whether to extend the term of the CTC in 2025, at COP 30.³ CMA 6 affirmed this decision and it was decided that CMA 7 would participate in conducting the review and deciding whether to extend the term of the CTC.⁴

3. COP 30 and CMA 7 adopted revised functions of the CTC, which will take effect from 2027.⁵ They also decided to extend the term of the CTC until the end of 2041, with an initial term of agreement of five years, followed by two five-year renewal periods if so decided by the COP subject to the host organization fulfilling the revised functions of the CTC and the roles and responsibilities of the CTC set out in the terms of reference of the CTCN,⁶ to be determined by independent reviews thereof.⁷

4. Further, COP 30 and CMA 7 decided that the process for selecting the new host of the CTC shall be launched upon the conclusion of those respective sessions and conducted in an open, transparent, geographically balanced, fair and neutral manner in accordance with the criteria for evaluating and selecting the host of the CTC⁸ and informed by United Nations practices and standards.⁹

5. COP 30 outlined and CMA 7 affirmed the steps in the process for selecting the new host for the CTC, namely COP 30:¹⁰

(a) Requested the secretariat to prepare and issue a call for proposals to host the CTC secretariat by 16 January 2026, inviting interested organizations to submit proposals by 16 March 2026;

(b) Requested the secretariat to convene an evaluation panel by 1 March 2026;

(c) Invited the CTCN Advisory Board to designate six of its members (two from Annex I Parties, two from non-Annex I Parties and two from UNFCCC observer organizations) and the TEC to designate four of its members (two from Annex I Parties and two from non-Annex I Parties) to serve up until the conclusion of the evaluation process as members of the evaluation panel;

(d) Requested the secretariat to respond to enquiries from interested organizations, in consultation with the evaluation panel, and to make the executive summaries of the submitted proposals available on the UNFCCC website;

(e) Invited the evaluation panel to conduct an evaluation of the proposals submitted for hosting the CTC against the criteria referred to in paragraph 4 above, prepare an evaluation report, including information on whether and how the evaluation criteria have been met in the proposals, and make the report available for consideration at SBI 64;

(f) Requested the secretariat to support the evaluation panel in preparing the evaluation report.

¹ Decision [1/CP.16](#), paras. 117, 121 and 123.

² Decision [2/CP.17](#), annex VII, para. 23.

³ Decision [10/CP.29](#), para. 3.

⁴ Decision [17/CMA.6](#), paras. 3–4.

⁵ Decisions [10/CP.30](#), para. 2, and [17/CMA.7](#), para. 4. The revised functions are contained in annex I to those decisions.

⁶ Decision [2/CP.17](#), annex VII, paras. 4–5.

⁷ Decisions [10/CP.30](#), para. 1, and [17/CMA.7](#), para. 3.

⁸ Set out in annex II to decisions [10/CP.30](#) and [17/CMA.7](#).

⁹ Decisions [10/CP.30](#), para. 6, and [17/CMA.7](#), para. 6.

¹⁰ See decision [10/CP.30](#), paras. 8–10; affirmed in decision [17/CMA.7](#), para. 6.

B. Scope

6. This report presents the process, methodology and results of the evaluation conducted by the evaluation panel of the proposals received in response to the call for proposals to host the CTC secretariat.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

7. The SBI may use the information in this report in preparing and recommending draft decisions on the new host of the CTC, on the basis of this report, for consideration and adoption at COP 31 and CMA 8 respectively.¹¹

II. Call for proposals

A. Issuance

8. The secretariat issued a call for proposals to host the CTC on the UNFCCC website on 16 January 2026, inviting interested organizations, including consortiums of organizations, to submit their proposals to the secretariat via email by 16 March 2026.¹² The call for proposals was announced publicly in a UNFCCC Newsroom article on the same date¹³ and was communicated in official notifications to Parties and observer States and to United Nations system and specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations admitted to the UNFCCC process as observers.¹⁴

9. The call for proposals included the following annexes:

- (a) Annex 1: revised functions of the CTC;
- (b) Annex 2: terms of reference of the CTCN;
- (c) Annex 3: information required to be included in the proposal;
- (d) Annex 4: draft budget and proposal for providing the CTC secretariat with in-kind and financial support;
- (e) Annex 5: template for statements of work of past activities;
- (f) Annex 6: criteria for evaluating and selecting the host of the CTC;
- (g) Annex 7: terms and conditions for submitting a proposal;
- (h) Annex 8: declaration by proponent and disclosure requirement;
- (i) Annex 9: profile form.

10. The call for proposals stated that proposals must include information in sufficient scope and detail to demonstrate that the proponent has the necessary expertise to perform the specified activities in a satisfactory manner, that proposals must include an executive summary and that proposals and any attachments must be submitted in English.

B. Enquiries

11. Potential proponents were informed in the call for proposals that enquiries related thereto should be submitted to the secretariat via email by 20 February 2026. Potential proponents were also informed that all enquiries would be compiled and responded to by no later than 2 March 2026 and that responses would be shared with all proponents.

¹¹ As per decisions [10/CP.30](#), para. 11, and [17/CMA.7](#), para. 7.

¹² See https://unfccc.int/host_ctc.

¹³ See <https://unfccc.int/news/call-for-proposals-to-host-the-climate-technology-centre-secretariat>.

¹⁴ See <https://unfccc.int/documents/655403>.

12. As at 20 February 2026, enquiries had been received from 13 interested entities, to which the secretariat, in accordance with the mandate referred to in paragraph 5(d) above, prepared responses in consultation with the evaluation panel. The compilation of responses was shared with all interested entities and made publicly available on the call for proposals web page on 2 March 2026.

C. Proposals

13. As at 16 March 2026, the deadline for submission of proposals, 22 proposals had been received.¹⁵

14. The executive summaries of the six proposals that met the mandatory information requirements were published on the UNFCCC website¹⁶ on 31 March 2026.

III. Evaluation of proposals

A. Evaluation panel

15. Pursuant to the mandate referred to in paragraph 5(b–c) above, the secretariat convened an evaluation panel, with the CTCN Advisory Board designating six of its members and the TEC designating four of its members to serve as members of the panel (see the table below). Members of the evaluation panel signed a confidentiality agreement and a declaration that they have no conflict of interest in carrying out this function.

Members of the evaluation panel, and the Parties and observers they represent

| <i>Name</i> | <i>Body</i> | <i>Party or observer representation</i> |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Omar Alcock | TEC | Non-Annex I Parties |
| Fred Machulu Onduri | TEC | Non-Annex I Parties |
| Olena Hrypych | TEC | Annex I Parties |
| Stephen Minas | TEC | Annex I Parties |
| Lydia Elewa | CTCN Advisory Board | Non-Annex I Parties |
| Hortense Traoré Kagambèga | CTCN Advisory Board | Non-Annex I Parties |
| Orly Jacob | CTCN Advisory Board | Annex I Parties |
| Jacek Trzosowski | CTCN Advisory Board | Annex I Parties |
| Angela Fey | CTCN Advisory Board | Constituency of business and industry non-governmental organizations |
| Emilly Caroline Costa Silva | CTCN Advisory Board | Constituency of research and independent non-governmental organizations |

¹⁵ From African Centre for Technology Studies; Anant School for Climate Action (Anant National University); BAIF Development Research Foundation; Climate, Nature, Water and Forests-World Life; Centre for Renewable Energy and Sustainability Transitions; Companionships of Work Organization; Confederation of Indian Industry; Egypt the Dream Foundation for Development and Innovation, CRJ Capital Partners, and Petroleum and Green Building Consultancy; Global Asset Trust; Hebatalrahman Initiative; HueHub DigiTech Limited; Nalanda University; Neptune-Vortex; Nigerian Red Cross Society; Somali Youth Development Foundation; Sonali Zol Foundation; Stevenson Holistic Care Foundation; Sukoon; UNEP; UNIDO and UNOPS; Viva Life & Nature Conservative Initiative; and Wijadan Manar.

¹⁶ https://unfccc.int/host_ctc#Executive-Summaries.

B. Evaluation process

16. At the first meeting of the evaluation panel, members agreed on the overall approach to evaluating the proposals to host the CTC, comprising the following modalities:

- (a) Initial examination of proposals by the secretariat against the information requirements;
- (b) Evaluation of proposals by evaluation panel members against the evaluation criteria;
- (c) Consolidation of individual evaluations by the secretariat;
- (d) Preparation of a shortlist of proposals by the evaluation panel.

17. Under the guidance of the evaluation panel, the secretariat examined the 22 proposals received to determine whether they met the information requirements specified in annexes 3–5 and 7–9 to the call for proposals. Documents pertaining to all 22 proposals, that is the 6 that met the information requirements and the 16 that did not, together with a checklist supporting the initial examination, were shared by the secretariat with the panel members for review.

18. The evaluation panel confirmed that 6 of the 22 proposals met the information requirements and evaluated those 6 proposals against the evaluation criteria.

19. At its second meeting, the evaluation panel agreed on the methodology for aggregating the results of the evaluation of proposals by individual panel members and preparing a shortlist of up to three proposals, as per annex 7 to the call for proposals. The panel also agreed on the approach to preparing the evaluation report and on an annotated outline for the report.

20. At its third meeting, the evaluation panel finalized the evaluation report.

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

C. Evaluation methodology

22. The criteria against which the proposals for hosting the CTC were evaluated are grouped in four categories: governance and management, technical capabilities, financial management, and CTCN management plan. Each category contains between three and eight evaluation criteria, with a total of 19 criteria. Because the COP did not ascribe any weight to them, all categories and criteria were considered of equal weight.

23. Each of the six proposals that met the information requirements were independently evaluated by each of the 10 evaluation panel members against the 19 criteria. Panel members determined each criterion as having been met or not met solely on the basis of the information provided by proponents in the respective proposals. In their evaluations, panel members included evidence from the respective proposal to indicate the rationale behind their determination of whether and how each criterion was met.

24. The individual evaluation results were aggregated by the secretariat to obtain percentage scores of “met” for each criterion.

25. Percentage-based scores were then consolidated for each of the four categories using the following scale:

- (a) Fully met: proposal meets all (100 per cent) of the criteria for the category;
- (b) Met: proposal meets most (80–99 per cent) of the criteria for the category;
- (c) Partially met: proposal meets many (50–79 per cent) of the criteria for the category, but indicates potential gaps or weaknesses that may affect delivery capacity or overall performance;
- (d) Not met: proposal meets some (0–49 per cent) of the criteria for the category, but presents significant deficiencies.

26. This aggregation methodology enabled a collective assessment of the evaluation panel to be obtained for each proposal.

IV. Results of the evaluation

27. Of the 22 proposals submitted, the following 6 were found to have met the information requirements specified in the call for proposals:

- (a) African Centre for Technology Studies;
- (b) Confederation of Indian Industry;
- (c) Egypt the Dream Foundation for Development and Innovation, CRJ Capital Partners, and Petroleum and Green Building Consultancy consortium;
- (d) Nalanda University;
- (e) UNEP;
- (f) UNIDO–UNOPS consortium.

28. The six proposals were evaluated by following the process described in chapter III.C above.

29. The evaluation panel reviewed the aggregated evaluation results for each category and agreed to shortlist those proposals that rated “Fully met” or “Met” for each of the four evaluation categories. This resulted in two proposals being shortlisted, namely those submitted by UNEP and by the UNIDO–UNOPS consortium. The other four proposals were found to have “Partially met” or “Not met” some of the evaluation criteria categories. The aggregated evaluation results per category for each of the six proposals are as follows:

- (a) UNEP: rated “Fully met” for the categories technical capabilities and CTCN management plan and “Met” for the categories governance and management, and financial management;
- (b) UNIDO–UNOPS consortium: rated “Met” for all four categories;
- (c) African Centre for Technology Studies: rated “Met” for the categories technical capabilities, financial management and CTCN management plan and “Partially met” for the category governance and management;
- (d) Confederation of Indian Industry: rated “Partially met” for all four categories;
- (e) Nalanda University: rated “Partially met” for the categories technical capabilities, financial management and CTCN management plan and “Not met” for the category governance and management;
- (f) Egypt the Dream Foundation for Development and Innovation, CRJ Capital Partners, and Petroleum and Green Building Consultancy consortium: rated “Partially met” for the category CTCN management plan and “Not met” for the categories governance and management, technical capabilities and financial management.

30. A summary of the findings of the evaluation panel for each evaluation criterion, grouped by category, including evidence from the proposal to indicate the rationale behind the determination, of the proposals from UNEP and the UNIDO–UNOPS consortium is presented in annex II.

31. The evaluation panel agreed to shortlist the proposals submitted by UNEP and the UNIDO–UNOPS consortium and to recommend this shortlist to SBI 64 for consideration.

Annex I**Timeline for the evaluation of proposals for hosting the
Climate Technology Centre**

| <i>Date</i> | <i>Action or event</i> |
|--------------------------|---|
| 16 January 2026 | Call for proposals issued by the secretariat |
| 6 February 2026 | Evaluation panel convened by the secretariat |
| 20 February 2026 | Deadline for the receipt of enquiries from interested organizations |
| 24 February 2026 | First meeting of the evaluation panel |
| 2 March 2026 | Responses to enquiries from interested organizations provided by the secretariat and published on the call for proposals web page |
| 16 March 2026 | Deadline for the submission of proposals |
| 19 March 2026 | Proposals shared with the evaluation panel by the secretariat |
| 19 March to 7 April 2026 | Proposals reviewed by the evaluation panel |
| 28 April 2026 | Second meeting of the evaluation panel |
| 8 May 2026 | Draft evaluation report prepared by the evaluation panel |
| 13 May 2026 | Third meeting of the evaluation panel |
| 14 to 19 May 2026 | Evaluation report, including shortlisted proposals, finalized by the evaluation panel |

Annex II

Summary of the evaluation of the shortlisted proposals for hosting the Climate Technology Centre

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Governance and management | | | | |
| <p>1. Be an organization, or group of organizations, capable of providing an efficient and agile service to the secretariat of the CTC in order for it to provide timely responses to requests from developing countries for technical assistance; in the case of bids from groups of organizations, the bid should clearly identify the organizations’ respective responsibilities and roles with regard to contributing to the hosting of the CTC</p> | Fully met | <p>UNEP is the United Nations’ global authority on the environment, driving transformational change to address the triple planetary crises of climate change; nature, land and biodiversity loss; and pollution and waste. As current host of the CTCN, UNEP has established administrative systems, technical teams, staff resources and network arrangements that support the CTCN technical assistance cycle. These arrangements are already operational at scale, enabling the CTCN to manage about 130 technical assistance activities at different stages and complete about 30 per year. UNEP has broad programme experience relevant to the CTCN mandates and objectives, including its work related to AFCIA, the TNA global project, and GEF mitigation- and transparency-related project portfolios.</p> <p>The proposal puts forward intended actions to enhance the performance of the CTCN.</p> | Fully met | <p>UNIDO is a specialized agency of the United Nations, mandated to promote inclusive and sustainable industrial development. UNOPS is the operational arm of the United Nations, mandated to support partners in peacebuilding, humanitarian and development contexts. UNIDO will take the lead on the technical dimensions of the CTC secretariat’s work and UNOPS the lead on the operational, administrative, procurement, fiduciary and risk management functions, an arrangement that would be formalized in a responsibility matrix.</p> <p>The proposal sets out a structured service delivery model intended to support agility and responsiveness, which includes using pre-defined and ready-to-adapt technical assistance packages for most recurring request sets; proactively engaging upstream with NDEs to scope and frame requests; and using existing country and regional networks to facilitate rapid engagement via either network or consortium capacities. The proposal also envisages the establishment of a digital request management platform, alongside a structured triage and prioritization methodology; and a tiered service model combining rapid advisory support for urgent needs and vulnerabilities with support for</p> |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 2. Have demonstrated ability to engage with and provide support to all developing countries, in all regions | Fully met | UNEP has global coverage, with its organizational structure including a network of offices supporting regional and subregional engagement, and it is headquartered in a developing country (Nairobi, Kenya). In its current CTCN hosting role, it has supported developing countries in all regions, including by providing technical assistance to 115 countries and responding to more than 450 technical assistance requests. Overall, UNEP has implemented projects in more than 160 countries. | Fully met | <p>more complex programmatic technical assistance packages, which could extend to investment structuring and implementation support, where feasible and appropriate.</p> <p>However, while features related to agility and responsiveness are described, the proposal includes limited evidence demonstrating that such responsiveness has been consistently achieved in a context comparable with hosting the CTCN.</p> <p>Both UNIDO and UNOPS have broad presence in multiple regions, including regional and country offices, and ongoing multi-level in-country engagement (e.g. with national, subnational, private sector and civil society organizations). UNIDO maintains 49 subregional and country offices (including specialized offices or centres, such as investment and technology promotion offices and the Global Network of Regional Sustainable Energy Centres), covering 158 countries. UNOPS has a presence in more than 130 countries, including countries in fragile situations.</p> |
| 3. Have an effective governance structure that supports high-quality administration, ensuring the evaluation of operational performance against the following elements: the principles of integrity and transparency; reporting and accountability; the timeliness and appropriateness of responses to developing countries' requests; fiduciary standards; and legal and ethical standards, in a manner that is consistent with the principles of the United Nations | Fully met | UNEP is governed by the United Nations Environment Assembly, which is composed of all 193 United Nations Member States and provides UNEP with strategic direction, transparent decision-making and accountability for results. As a United Nations entity, UNEP operates under United Nations rules and standards on integrity, transparency, financial management, internal control, audit and evaluation, with oversight being reinforced by its independent Evaluation Office and external audits being conducted by the United Nations Board | Fully met | UNIDO and UNOPS operate under established United Nations compliant institutional frameworks, including oversight bodies, audit systems, ethics mechanisms and risk management processes. UNIDO is governed by its 173 member States through the General Conference, the Industrial Development Board and the Programme and Budget Committee. UNOPS operates under the oversight of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the UNOPS Executive Board and is subject to external |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | of Auditors. In 2021, the Multilateral Performance Network rated UNEP “highly satisfactory” for evaluation quality, citing strong governance, accountability systems, and anti-fraud and anti-corruption measures. Specific reporting and accountability arrangements are in place as part of hosting the CTCN, including oversight by the CTCN Advisory Board and the COP and the CMA. | | audit by the United Nations Board of Auditors. Its Internal Audit and Investigation Group, Ethics Office and independent Audit Advisory Committee further support internal accountability and anti-fraud control measures. While the proposal indicates that both organizations’ governance systems would be directly applied to governance of the CTC secretariat, the proposal lacks information on how the simultaneous application of two distinct institutional frameworks would avoid coordination and execution complexity. |
| 4. Have the necessary staff recruitment and management capability | Fully met | UNEP staff recruitment and management processes operate within established United Nations systems and in compliance with the Staff Regulations and Rules of the United Nations, thus supporting transparency, consistency and accountability. The CTCN is positioned in the UNEP Climate Change Division, allowing it access to the technical expertise and internal support of UNEP. The commitment of UNEP to gender and geographical diversity and flexibility in engagement modalities enables it to adapt to changing staffing and operational needs. | Fully met | UNIDO and UNOPS have standard United Nations staff recruitment and management systems and the capacity to conduct flexible recruitment processes and manage large numbers of staff, including specialized experts. UNOPS will take the lead on recruitment and human resources management (with the exception of three positions to be recruited and managed directly by UNIDO), drawing on multiple contractual modalities that allow flexibility and rapid response to staffing needs. UNIDO will complement the work of UNOPS in this regard through its capacity to attract specialized technical experts. |
| 5. Have demonstrated capability to ensure timely, fair and open international tendering for the procurement of services in line with the fiduciary and ethical standards of the United Nations | Fully met | UNEP procurement processes operate in accordance with United Nations standards and are guided by the United Nations Procurement Manual and the principles of fairness, transparency, integrity and international competition. In response to CTCN Advisory Board recommendations to improve the efficiency of the CTCN, UNEP operationalized a dual procurement | Fully met | The procurement procedures of UNIDO and UNOPS align with United Nations fiduciary and ethical standards. UNOPS, as the procurement lead, will operate in compliance with its Financial Regulations and Rules, which emphasize best value for money, fairness, integrity and transparency. UNOPS has procurement systems and processes, including an e-sourcing system, a global supplier network and rigorous |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| 6. Be able to simultaneously manage and administer multiple and complex projects in developing countries | Fully met | <p>approach through UNEP and the United Nations Office at Nairobi and strengthened its monitoring of procurement timelines.</p> <p>UNEP manages multiple projects as part of its large operational portfolio. In 2024, it managed 627 projects with a combined budget of USD 2.79 billion, of which 154 projects, totalling USD 1.09 billion, were under the responsibility of Climate Change Division. The organization has experience in coordinating multi-country and multi-partner initiatives (e.g. AFCIA) and, as host of the CTCN, in managing simultaneously numerous technical assistance activities at different stages of the project cycle. Its project portfolio reflects a high degree of complexity, including interventions spanning policy, regulatory, technological and stakeholder dimensions in developing countries.</p> | Fully met | <p>quality assurance mechanisms, that enable it to manage annual procurement to the value of approximately USD 1.7 billion on behalf of its partners.</p> <p>UNIDO and UNOPS are able to manage multiple country requests and, where appropriate, structure them into scalable programmatic approaches. The project management capacity and certified systems of UNOPS are notable, allowing it to implement more than 1,100 projects totalling USD 3 billion in more than 130 countries each year. UNOPS also has in-country presence and experience managing multi-donor and multi-partner project portfolios. UNIDO has complementary experience in designing and implementing complex, long-term programmes, including in industrial development, clean energy and innovation ecosystems.</p> |
| 7. Be able to guarantee the appropriate monitoring and tracking of the activities undertaken | Fully met | <p>UNEP has established systems for monitoring and tracking activities through its Integrated Planning, Management and Reporting system, which covers the full project life cycle from design through to implementation, evaluation and reporting. The system also supports monitoring under the CTCN through a dedicated monitoring and evaluation framework, which was updated in 2025 to strengthen the assessment of results and of the long-term effectiveness of technical assistance projects, including by systematic tracking of their outcomes and impacts. Monitoring data are linked to the broader institutional reporting arrangements of UNEP, which include quarterly reporting</p> | Fully met | <p>UNOPS applies project management, monitoring and evaluation, and financial oversight systems to support real-time tracking of expenditure, project implementation, contractual performance, risk indicators and delivery of milestones, complemented by processes for the assurance, periodic review, reporting of results and evaluation of projects. UNIDO applies a results-based management framework and related monitoring and evaluation systems to track the outcomes of technical programmes, particularly those related to innovation and industrial transformation. UNIDO and UNOPS envisage building on and unifying their systems to establish a monitoring, evaluation and learning framework for the</p> |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| 8. Have capacity to provide funds for technical and logistical support to NDEs to enable them to fulfil their roles | Met | <p>to the Committee of Permanent Representatives and inclusion in the 2026–2029 impact framework.</p> <p>The statements of work of past activities included in the proposal confirm that UNEP has well-established monitoring and evaluation standards.</p> <p>UNEP, as current host of the CTCN, has systems in place to provide technical and logistical support to NDEs, which it does by, for instance, organizing NDE regional forums, webinars and other capacity-building activities. UNEP administrative systems also enable the channelling of funds dedicated for the logistical support of NDEs, and a modality agreed by the CTCN Advisory Board provides up to USD 5,000 per request for logistical support to NDEs.</p> | Met | <p>CTC that supports the tracking of operational performance, technical effectiveness and systemic impact of the CTC against its revised functions.</p> <p>UNIDO and UNOPS have relevant experience in supporting national entities. The consortium combines the extensive experience of UNIDO in the provision of technical assistance and capacity-building support to national institutions with the large capacity of UNOPS in fund administration and grant management. For example, UNOPS has administered multiple trust funds and acted as a delivery, an implementing or a hosting agency under multiple funding arrangements (e.g. GCF Readiness Programme, Climate Vulnerable Forum and Vulnerable Twenty Group of Finance Ministers partnership).</p> <p>The proposal indicates that UNIDO and UNOPS have demonstrated capacity to support NDEs through both financial and technical means.</p> |
| Technical capabilities | | | | |
| 9. Have a comprehensive understanding of the development and transfer of technologies, including in the context of the Convention and the Paris Agreement, in particular an understanding of the challenges faced by developing countries, of regional, subregional and sectoral constraints and of differences regarding specific technologies, as well as have the capability to support and facilitate the transfer to and diffusion and | Fully met | The work of UNEP, particularly under its Climate Change Division, covers technology development and transfer in the context of the Convention and the Paris Agreement (including current engagement with the COP, the CMA, the TEC, as well as under the Financial Mechanism) across mitigation and adaptation and across the full technology cycle, from identification and prioritization to feasibility analysis, | Met | UNIDO, the consortium’s technical lead, has demonstrated understanding of technology development and transfer, particularly in relation to industrial development and transformation, its core area of expertise. Supporting its capabilities in technology development and transfer are its (1) regional and country presence, including regional platforms that support peer exchange on and coordinated delivery and adaptation of technology solutions |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| dissemination of technology in developing countries, including through regional presence | | policy and regulatory support, piloting, early-stage deployment and financing. UNEP facilitates such engagement under the CTCN, the TNA global project (which is implemented by the UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre and has supported more than 100 developing countries), GEF-supported projects, and flagship initiatives such as the Cool Coalition and the Digital Transformations programme. UNEP has both global presence and country-level engagement, which enables the delivery of technical assistance and the adaptation of solutions across different regional and national contexts. | | across similar markets (e.g. Global Network of Regional Sustainable Energy Centres); and (2) experience in addressing key constraints to the uptake and scale-up of technology solutions at both the systemic and the enterprise level, including through its work on developing technology standards and certifications and quality infrastructure. UNIDO has been a CTCN Consortium member, supports the work of the TEC, and is an implementing or accredited entity for the AF, the GCF and the GEF, all of which indicate its familiarity with objectives under both the Technology Mechanism and the Financial Mechanism. However, the proposal indicates that the expertise and track record of UNIDO is focused on mitigation- and industry-related applications rather than on adaptation, which is confirmed by the UNIDO Climate Change Strategy. |
| 10. Have demonstrated experience and expertise in technology development and transfer that would enable the CTC to perform its revised functions as set out in annex I to decision 10/CP.30 | Fully met | CTCN services under UNEP cover the full technology cycle and, in practice, already respond to the revised functions of the CTC. UNEP has supported: (a) Identifying and prioritizing technology needs (e.g. by supporting TNA and technology action plan processes, which it has done in more than 100 countries); (b) Developing enabling environments (e.g. via GCF and GEF readiness and mitigation projects), NSI and endogenous technologies (e.g. by supporting small and medium-sized enterprises through the UNEP eco-innovation methodology, under the Net-Zero Nature-Positive Accelerator Integrated Program | Fully met | The experience of UNIDO in technology development and transfer relevant to the revised functions of the CTC is reflected in its application of system-level approaches, focus on regional programming and technology dissemination, linking of project preparation and financing, and emphasis on the scale-up of technology solutions. Those strategies are evidenced in its involvement with, for instance: (a) The Global Eco-Industrial Park Programme, which fosters ecosystems for technology diffusion via a policy–park–enterprise model and is a multi-partner (GEF, German Agency for International Cooperation, Swiss State Secretariat for |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 11. Have demonstrated capability to engage in partnerships with a wide range of organizations, bodies, networks and experts across geographical regions in the development and transfer of climate technologies and the facilitation of networks | Fully met | <p>implemented with the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank, and under AFCIA phases I and II);</p> <p>(c) Exchanging information and delivering training and technical assistance across sectors and regions;</p> <p>(d) Preparing projects and improving access to finance, including by engaging with the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism (e.g. UNEP manages GCF and GEF project pipelines that were valued at USD 504 million as at the start of 2026 and USD 1.3 billion in 2025, and which include some projects emerging from CTCN technical assistance);</p> <p>(e) Implementing multi-country and programmatic approaches (e.g. CTCN programmes mobilized with funding from the AF and the European Union);</p> <p>(f) Facilitating partnerships, technology cooperation and financing (e.g. via the AGR13 Fund and the Seed Capital Assistance Facility, and by supporting early-stage low-carbon projects, leveraging USD 313 million across nine renewable energy projects).</p> <p>UNEP engages with a wide range of partners, including public, private, academic and international institutions, under global initiatives such as the Global Adaptation Network, the Climate and Clean Air Coalition and the Global Alliance for Buildings and Construction. As the host of the CTCN it has facilitated</p> | Fully met | <p>Economic Affairs) and multi-country (14 as of March 2026) initiative;</p> <p>(b) The SwitchMed (switching to a circular economy in the Mediterranean) initiative, which focuses on sustainable circular industry demonstration and regional technology dissemination and replication and is a multi-partner (UNEP, MedWaves) and multi-country (countries in the Middle East and North Africa) initiative;</p> <p>(c) The Private Financing Advisory Network and other initiatives, including tools and networks, linking project pipelines with financing mechanisms. The Private Financing Advisory Network was hosted by UNIDO and the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership in 2016–2023, during which its resource mobilization was scaled up: 869 projects received support and USD 2.16 billion was mobilized for 168 projects;</p> <p>(d) The Accelerate-to-Demonstrate Facility, which focuses on the demonstration and scale-up of models in core sectors (critical minerals, clean hydrogen, smart energy, industrial decarbonization) via project grants and which has a funding commitment for USD 80 million from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.</p> <p>The consortium’s experience in fostering implementation- and finance-based partnerships and other engagement modalities with a wide range of stakeholders is reflected in the following work of UNIDO:</p> <p>(1) Technology and investment matchmaking, for example the promotion</p> |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>a Network of approximately 985 members across 116 countries and collaborates with multilateral climate funds, MDBs and United Nations agencies. Its activities include creating and fostering partnerships with private sector and philanthropic organizations (e.g. Seed Capital Assistance Facility, Bloomberg Philanthropies, Ellen MacArthur Foundation); collaborating with research institutions and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; and facilitating North–South, South–South and triangular cooperation through knowledge exchange and joint implementation of activities across countries and regions.</p> | | <p>thereof via its network of 10 investment and technology promotion offices and its hosting of the Climate Club’s Global Matchmaking Platform;</p> <p>(2) Industry partnerships, for example its collaboration with the Global Cement and Concrete Association and coordination of the Industrial Deep Decarbonisation Initiative under the Clean Energy Ministerial;</p> <p>(3) Work on climate finance, including by engaging with the CTCN in the past, providing support to the TEC, and acting as an implementing or accredited entity with the AF, the GCF and the GEF.</p> <p>This experience is complemented by its field presence, which supports sustained in-country engagement with national counterparts and delivery partners, and by the operational and implementation support capacity of UNOPS. The relevant experience of UNOPS is further evidenced in its hosting of the NDC Partnership and its co-hosting of the secretariat of the Santiago network for averting, minimizing and addressing loss and damage associated with the adverse effects of climate change.</p> |
| Financial management | | | | |
| 12. Have financial management, auditing and reporting functions; a robust accountability system; sound financial systems of an international standard; and a fiduciary record that ensures the accurate and impartial administering and disbursement of funds | Fully met | UNEP carries out financial management, auditing and reporting functions in line with international standards. Its financial statements, prepared in accordance with International Public Sector Accounting Standards, are subject to independent external audit by the United Nations Board of Auditors, which expressed a positive opinion in each of the reports provided as part of the UNEP proposal. | Met | UNOPS will assume responsibility for financial management of the CTC, applying its established systems for fund management, financial transactions, accounting, auditing and reporting, as well as operating in accordance with its financial regulations and rules. Oversight arrangements will include internal audit and investigation and external audit by the United Nations Board of Auditors. UNOPS |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 13. Have demonstrated ability to secure significant funding | Met | UNEP mobilizes financial resources through multiple modalities, including core contributions and earmarked contributions, and from multiple sources, including multilateral climate funds, with total income exceeding USD 753 million in 2025. During the first hosting period, UNEP secured USD 117.26 million for CTCN operations and service delivery while the proposed five-year budget exceeds USD 106 million (in the conservative scenario without UNEP | Fully met | <p>has provided trustee and fund management support to the value of almost USD 2 billion on behalf of Governments and multilateral institutions since 2010 and hosts 15 partnerships. The services of UNOPS will be tailored to the needs of the CTC and, in delivering them, UNOPS will be accountable to the CTCN Advisory Board.</p> <p>However, as stated in the proposal, the 2024 audit of UNOPS found “shortcomings in financial management, project management, strategy management and procurement management, the lessons of which could further improve delivery by UNOPS”.</p> <p>The report of the Board of Auditors produced "key findings" related to "uncertain progress of efforts to recover the Sustainable Investments in Infrastructure and Innovation initiative funds, despite significant resource allocations", “management gaps in a significant infrastructure project with ongoing disputes”, “lack of accountability for project losses”, “performance shortfalls in mine action projects” and “excessive use of direct contracting compromised procurement fairness and compliance”.</p> <p>The ability of the consortium to secure funding is demonstrated by (1) the portfolio of technical cooperation projects managed by UNIDO, which reached a value of USD 663.6 million in 2024; and (2) the experience of UNOPS in administering funding received from a wide range of public and private sources, including Governments, multilateral organizations, foundations, corporations and non-traditional donors, a function in which it is supported by its established financial</p> |

| Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7 | UNEP Criterion met | Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation | UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met | Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation |
|--|-----------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| 14. Have a track record in financial stability and sustainability | Fully met | Partnership and Liaison Office continuation), including AFCIA phase II programme funding (up until 2030 with UNEP as implementing partner). The audited financial statements of UNEP for 2022–2024 indicate a stable financial position and a track record of financial sustainability. The figures point to strong liquidity and capacity to meet financial obligations over time. | Fully met | systems and fund administration partnerships. Both UNIDO and UNOPS are well-established organizations with a track record of financial stability and sustainability, underpinned by the self-financing model of UNOPS and the assessed and voluntary contribution financing model of UNIDO. The financial statements of both UNIDO and UNOPS for 2022–2024 confirm their stable financial positions. |
| CTCN management plan | | | | |
| 15. Have an overall vision and approach in terms of how it will support the effective functioning of the CTCN, including through an effective organizational structure | Fully met | The UNEP proposal outlines a forward-looking approach for the CTCN that builds on current operations while introducing additional mechanisms to strengthen delivery, including by enhancing the link between delivery and finance. The stated vision positions the CTCN as a global yet country-driven platform supporting the development, deployment and financing of climate technologies at scale, aligned with the revised functions of the CTC and relevant guidance from the COP and the CMA. Plans for the new hosting period include: (a) Integrating financing considerations into the technical assistance project cycle in a more systematic manner, for example by focusing on the AF, the GCF and the GEF as sources of funding for the UNEP-managed project portfolio and on the UNEP Finance Initiative for funding private-sector-oriented initiatives; | Met | The UNIDO–UNOPS consortium proposal articulates a vision for the CTC that centres on fulfilling its revised functions. Support delivery is framed as a country-driven, implementation-oriented catalyst for stimulating pipelines of bankable projects, concrete investments and on-the-ground technology deployment. The proposed approaches for achieving those outcomes are as follows: (a) Providing proactive upstream advisory support to NDEs for framing requests for technical assistance within country contexts; and implementing a structured technical assistance delivery model linked to implementation, with a complementary systemic focus on enabling environments (e.g. fiscal, financial and intellectual property regulations and standards, and policy direction); (b) Providing strong support for NSIs, including by developing road maps, fostering ecosystems for small and medium- |

Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions [10/CP.30](#) and [17/CMA.7](#)

UNEP
Criterion
met

Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation

UNIDO–UNOPS
Criterion met

Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation

(b) Expanding the matchmaking and partnership functions of the CTCN by enhancing Network member engagement (e.g. via working groups and fairs with Network members and NDEs), enhancing private sector brokerage (e.g. via regional matchmaking events), leveraging the Belém Technology Implementation Programme infrastructure to enhance matchmaking opportunities, and promoting twinning arrangements;

(c) Establishing a coordination platform with funding entities (i.e. multilateral climate funds) and the proposed CTCN Climate Innovation Guarantee Facility to de-risk technology-related projects and enterprises (to be implemented with suitable national partners);

(d) Providing additional support for developing NSI and endogenous technologies, including by preparing innovation road maps and targeted programmatic approaches to innovation, with a focus on women, youth and Indigenous Peoples.

The proposed organizational structure of the CTC remains broadly aligned with that under the current CTCN hosting arrangements, including staffing organized around the following functional areas: technical assistance and NDE support, partnership and Network engagement, governance and accountability, communication and knowledge management, and management and operations.

sized enterprises (e.g. under the Global Cleantech Innovation Programme) and promoting South–South cooperation and endogenous innovation (e.g. under the Climate Vulnerable Forum and Vulnerable Twenty Group of Finance Ministers partnership and the Accelerate-to-Demonstrate Facility);

(c) Delivering structured capacity-building programmes at the individual and institutional level, including those aimed at building capacity in identifying technology solutions and managing technology projects (e.g. under the UNIDO Knowledge Hub and the UNIDO Training Academy);

(d) Providing NDEs with technical support by offering flexible modalities for assistance, in-country facilitation and logistical support for convening meetings, as well as by facilitating links with the United Nations Country Team (via country office presence);

(e) Strengthening project preparation and investment facilitation functions, by, for example, establishing investment facilities with the GCF and the GEF that leverage the status of UNIDO and UNOPS; providing free coaching on matchmaking (e.g. under the Private Financing Advisory Network); and collaborating with MDBs, including on improving access to preparedness support (e.g. under the Building Readiness for Industry Decarbonization in Group B Economies initiative of the Climate Investment Funds);

(f) Applying multi-country and programmatic approaches to delivering in-

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| 16. Have a proposal for providing the secretariat of the CTC with in-kind and financial support | Fully met | UNEP identified both financial and in-kind support to be provided to the CTCN within the proposed budget framework. For the five-year operating period, the total budget is estimated at USD 106.2 million, including 10.5 per cent programme support costs and 3.0 per cent contingency, rising to USD 117.62 million under the scenario in which the CTCN Partnership and Liaison Office extension is confirmed. Within this budget, the contribution of UNEP is estimated at USD 4.81 million, comprising financial contributions of | Fully met | country technical assistance and promoting South–South cooperation; (g) Fostering structured workstream-based partnerships, twinning arrangements and matchmaking, building on the experience of the UNIDO investment and technology promotion offices and its Global Network of Regional Sustainable Energy Centres and on the Climate Club’s Global Matchmaking Platform. However, the proposal lacks explicit reference to the provision of logistical support to NDEs. Regarding organizational structure, the secretariat will comprise a director and seven other professionals with senior experience: a climate finance and investment officer, a partnership and network officer, a technology and innovation officer, an operations manager, a country engagement officer and two administrative support officers. Functions will be well balanced within and across roles. The UNIDO–UNOPS consortium proposes a five-year budget for the CTC secretariat of USD 23 million, including in-kind contributions from UNIDO valued at USD 657,660. UNOPS, as a self-financing entity, does not provide in-kind contributions. The budget proposal does not include technical assistance, communications and outreach, Network engagement, knowledge management and capacity-building. The UNIDO–UNOPS consortium does indicate that the implementation of these activities has been estimated at USD 46 million, without |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 17. Be able to identify the ways in which partners and networks could be engaged in facilitating and catalysing technical assistance | Fully met | <p>USD 3.48 million, including a UNEP contribution of USD 125,000 and secured resources of USD 3.35 million for AFCIA phase II implementation and coordination services, and in-kind contributions of USD 1.33 million, reflecting UNEP personnel time and the prospective provision of office space and common services in UN City Copenhagen.</p> <p>The UNEP proposal outlines a range of approaches to collaboration with partners and networks across the technical assistance project cycle, namely engaging with regional institutions to support the co-creation of multi-country requests and to support South–South and triangular cooperation; with thematic networks and coalitions to share practices and tools (e.g. UNEP tools); and with public, private, academic and civil society entities (via the Network) to provide them with technical expertise and to support the localization and implementation of projects. Private sector actors, innovation hubs, development finance institutions and United Nations partners are positioned to support project testing, scale-up and alignment with investment processes. UNEP approaches to collaboration also include programmatic and catalytic financing modalities (e.g. AFCIA, European Union programmes) complemented by pro-bono and in-kind contributions from partners, as well as continuation of existing</p> | Fully met | <p>including these activities in the budget proposal. The UNOPS programme support cost is indicated at 5.95 per cent (capped at 7.0 per cent) and 5 per cent contingency, with the management fee also applying on top of the activities excluded from the proposed budget. The proposal indicates that the consortium has the institutional capacity and operational flexibility to establish and manage the CTC secretariat effectively in any geographical region, if the COP and the CMA decide to specify in which region the secretariat should be located.</p> <p>The combined experience of UNIDO and UNOPS provides a broad base of expertise and delivery capacity to underpin a comprehensive response to technical assistance requests reflecting diverse national needs. Deep industrial sector- and technology-specific knowledge (gained by the involvement of UNIDO in, e.g., the International Solar Alliance, Global Cement and Concrete Association and Global Programme for Hydrogen in Industry) is complemented by expertise in infrastructure development and regional and local project implementation.</p> |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| 18 Be able to evaluate its operational performance, take measures to enhance its effectiveness, and promote an independent and accountable relationship with the COP, the CMA and the UNFCCC constituted bodies, as delegated | Fully met | <p>collaborations (e.g. with the World Intellectual Property Organization). The Belém Technology Implementation Programme will potentially be leveraged to support the coordination and scale-up support for climate technologies in developing countries.</p> <p>However, while they build on existing practices under the current hosting arrangements, some proposed enhancements remain at a conceptual level and require further detail regarding implementation mechanisms.</p> <p>UNEP has significant experience in working under the UNFCCC process, including as host of the CTCN. It has established systems and practices to evaluate operational performance and support continuous improvement, including its Integrated Planning, Management and Reporting system and the CTCN monitoring and evaluation framework. UNEP has responded to internal and external evaluations and reviews of the CTCN, donor-funded programmes and GEF-implemented projects, including the TNA global project, and has established reporting and accountability mechanisms with the COP, the CMA and relevant UNFCCC bodies, including via the CTCN Advisory Board.</p> <p>However, while the approach builds on existing arrangements, the proposal includes limited detail on how performance evaluation and accountability mechanisms would be adapted to the revised functions of the CTC.</p> | Met | <p>The UNIDO–UNOPS consortium commits to supporting the CTCN Advisory Board and complying with obligations to report annually to the COP and the CMA. Drawing on the robust performance monitoring and results-based management systems of UNIDO and UNOPS, a unified monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning system will be established for the CTCN. The consortium also commits to going beyond procedural compliance by documenting not only activities undertaken and resources deployed, but also technology implementation outcomes.</p> <p>However, the proposal does not include detailed information on the proposed monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning system for the CTCN.</p> |

| <i>Evaluation criteria, by category, as set out in annex II to decisions 10/CP.30 and 17/CMA.7</i> | <i>UNEP Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> | <i>UNIDO–UNOPS Criterion met</i> | <i>Evidence from the proposal and rationale for the evaluation</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| 19 Have a proposal, with established channels, for the mobilization of in-kind and financial support for the CTC from various sources, aligned with the timelines set out in the applicable CTCN programme of work | Fully met | The UNEP proposal outlines a structured approach to mobilizing financial and in-kind support from a diverse range of sources, including bilateral donors, philanthropic organizations, the private sector and MDBs, in line with the resource mobilization strategy contained in the UNEP programme of work and budget for the biennium 2026–2027. The approach is linked to the programme of work for UNEP for 2026–2027 and includes a planned transition phase from February to December 2027, during which, in addition to preparing a new programme of work for the CTCN and related planning documents, UNEP would support the CTC in organizing a donor round table at COP 32 and in engaging potential donors. | Fully met | The UNIDO–UNOPS proposal identifies four main approaches to the mobilization of in-kind and financial support for the CTC: diversifying bilateral donor funding, fostering closer links with the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism, strengthening engagement with philanthropic organizations and the private sector, and creating partnerships with MDBs. The proposal also indicates that a dedicated resource mobilization plan would be prepared and submitted to the CTCN Advisory Board within six months of commencement of hosting, with progress in implementing the plan to be reported to the Board annually. |