

April 12, 2011

Comments from United Kingdom on Quality Review of SCF Investment Plans and Strategies

Dear Patricia

The UK welcomes the proposal for and we are generally happy with the content. There are a few points that we would, however, like to see reflected in the final proposal:

Roster of experts: The relevant committee should have a role in establishing the roster of experts - we suggest that the roster is sent to the relevant committee for approval.

Terms of reference for reviews: The relevant committee should approve the generic terms of reference once these are developed by the CIF Admin Unit and the MDB Committee.

Criteria for reviews: The criteria in Annex A should be revised to reflect the fact that many of the points under 'specific to each programme' apply across the board. For example, stakeholder engagement/participation should be considered in all programmes, not just the PPCR. The same is true of implementation capacity, transformative impact, institutions/co-ordination etc. These should be reflected in every review. We would also ask that the poverty is included alongside social and environmental issues in the 'general' criteria for review.

A point of clarification: We are unsure about the point in para 14b that states a draft review should be submitted to the pilot country and relevant MDBs seven working days after receipt of the draft investment plan. This seems overly specific in terms of the timing. Also, there is no clear rationale as to why a draft review is needed at all, and it may reduce the independence of the review.

We would encourage that this quality review system should be set up quickly, and would like clarification on whether this could be done before the end of the financial year. Also in the interim we would like clarification over what ToRs the reviewers would be working to.

best wishes,

Kate

Kate Binns
Deputy Team Leader, Adaptation Team /
Climate Investment Funds, Low Carbon Development Team
Climate and Environment Department, DFID