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**Overview**

1. The Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) was established to demonstrate ways that climate risk and resilience can be integrated into core national development planning. The PPCR provides developing country governments with financial incentives to design strategic programs for climate resilience that build on relevant national plans and strategies, such as National Adaptation Programs of Action.
2. PPCR seeks to integrate climate action with development needs. The PPCR’s mandate includes cross-sectoral planning to address climate change challenges with a view to achieving long-term development goals. Pilot countries are encouraged to scale-up financing[[1]](#footnote-1) and initiate transformational change in the most vulnerable sectors. By emphasizing dynamic adaptation strategies, PPCR encourages broad and strategic planning rather than isolated sector approaches.
3. PPCR places a strong emphasis on country leadership. Countries selected as PPCR pilots identify their own needs and priorities, determine their own timelines, and decide whether grants, optional highly concessional financing[[2]](#footnote-2), or a combination of both are best suited to their particular circumstances.
4. Pilots are eligible to receive $1.5 million in PPCR preparation grants. These grants may be used to identify gaps and vulnerabilities, integrate climate change perspectives into national development plans, and undertake basic capacity building that complements ongoing climate change activities, among other things.
5. The CIF works with five multilateral development banks (MDBs)[[3]](#footnote-3), which implement PPCR-funded activities in partnership with countries and other stakeholders. PPCR’s premise of working through the MDBs contributes to more streamlined and flexible programs and project development. The MDB partnerships are also intended to help ensure coordination with relevant initiatives in a country or region.
6. “Learning-by-doing” is at the heart of the PPCR mission. It includes the piloting of new approaches to climate finance as well as the design and implementation of investments that increase resilient development. Documenting the experiences and lessons emerging from these efforts can inform efforts in other developing countries and support replication at the national, regional, and global levels as the PPCR evolves.
7. This Learning Brief is one of several tools designed to capture the lessons from the overall PPCR experience. Others include regular PPCR pilot country meetings, the annual Partnership Forum, an interactive web-based platform for communications and learning, and PPCR-financed country workshops.
8. The CIF Administrative Unit commissioned an independent consultant to document the experiences and lessons learned during PPCR’s design and early implementation phases in PPCR pilots. The consultant visited five countries[[4]](#footnote-4), interviewed stakeholders and development partners, and reviewed relevant documents. This Brief is distilled from the consultant’s findings.
9. The PPCR Learning Brief is based on four themes—country programming, program and investment financing, stakeholder collaboration, and procedural issues. The Brief is intended to inform the work of developing countries and development partners. It also provides useful information to enhance and strengthen PPCR’s performance during full implementation. Disseminating these early PPCR lessons will also contribute to the robust development of other CIF programs, such as the Forest Investment Program (FIP) and the Scaling up Renewable Energy Program in Low Income Countries (SREP). Both are just beginning the planning process in their respective pilot countries.

**Key PPCR Lessons**

1. *Unique Partnerships:* The PPCR has pioneered a unique partnership model and demonstrated that effective MDB collaboration is possible. The challenge is to make such partnerships an integral part of development planning and not just a one-time engagement.
2. *Leveraging:* PPCR’s cross-sectoral approach to adaptation is appealing to other development partners. However, achieving PPCR’s full potential will depend on the ability of governments and the MDBs to effectively leverage the comparative advantages and technical and financial resources of these development partners.
3. *Transformational Change:* The PPCR can be seen as a catalyst for integrating development needs with climate action. Delivering scaled up resources and initiating transformational change will depend on the sustained commitment and resources of governments and development partners.
4. *Country Leadership:* Expectations about country leadership must be realistic. Scarce resources, capacity limitations, political instability, and environmental and financial crisis can affect a country’s ability to effectively respond to climate challenges.
5. *Private Sector:* The private sector’s critical role in developing successful adaptation strategies is well recognized. However, engagement with the private sector has thus far been limited. Expanding outreach to the private sector through all stages of the PPCR can create practical opportunities for sustained engagement, especially in implementation.

**Country Programming**

1. A government’s recognition that climate change is a development issue can strengthen country leadership and stimulate the broad strategic planning that underpins transformational change. When governments make the establishment of frameworks to manage and implement cross-cutting resilience programs a priority, other climate related programs in the country can also benefit. In cases where governments already have policies and structures to address climate change and variability, the PPCR process provides an opportunity to strengthen coordination and collaboration. The following lessons have been distilled from early country programming experiences.

***Country Leadership***

1. **Expectations about government leadership, particularly in the initial stages of PPCR, must be realistic and take into account a government’s capacity and experience addressing climate change issues.** Even though a PPCR focal point has been identified in each pilot country, realigning institutions and developing leadership capacity can be lengthy endeavors. In Bangladesh, the government demonstrated strong leadership in assessing the country’s climate vulnerabilities and developing strategies to address those challenges. PPCR resources are being used to jump start implementation of targeted initiatives and ensure that the appropriate institutions and administrative frameworks are in place. However, the challenge of gaining widespread acceptance of climate resilience as a development issue may require extended capacity building.
2. In Tajikistan, on the other hand, there was strong government buy-in for the PPCR, but the reassignment of key personnel and the government’s limited experience with climate change issues slowed the momentum. MDBs and development partners worked with the government to design a coordinating structure that would support the full PPCR process. This allowed for the gradual strengthening of climate change strategies, institutional capacity, leadership skills, and management processes.
3. **Government leadership is facilitated when there are adequate financial and personnel resources, a high level of buy-in, and in-country technical expertise.** However, many PPCR pilots have insufficient resources and a limited ability to respond to the impacts of climate variability and change. This is a dilemma for the MDBs, which seek to encourage governments to take charge of the PPCR process, but in some cases have been forced to play stronger leadership roles themselves. Ultimately, government leadership is vital for sustained resource allocation and institutional restructuring.
4. In the Pacific region, small island states face similar climate and development challenges. The Pacific regional program needs to address them in the context of countries’ circumstances. Samoa has moved the most quickly to develop a strategic program, an effort that was bolstered by the availability of dedicated resources and years of experience with adaptation planning. In Papua New Guinea, the government’s ownership of the PPCR process has been facilitated by the dedication of personnel and financial resources, such as assigning a specific government unit to oversee adaptation activities. In Tonga, the motivation is high but there are only a few staff in the Ministry of Environment to support climate change adaptations efforts, which makes it more difficult to mainstream climate resilience.
5. Other countries in the region but currently not supported by the PPCR will also benefit. Through the regional component, regional information and technical assistance will be shared. This inclusive approach will strengthen the entire region’s resiliency by enabling all Pacific island states to better cope with the impacts of climate variability and change.
6. **A government’s ability to lead and coordinate development partners[[5]](#footnote-5) will vary depending on specific country circumstances.** Government collaboration with development partners are affected by the history of engagement and the nature of the relationship. Even supportive partners may create their own agendas in the absence of a strong government push for coordinated assistance. The MDBs have encouraged government focal points to identify the country’s needs and provide clear indications on how development partners can support national priorities.
7. In Niger, the government not only supported the PPCR in the face of challenging political circumstances, but also officially designated a multi-sector body to provide oversight and guidance. This enabled a broad range of stakeholders to participate and provided them with a stake in PPCR’s success. The MDBs stood behind the government’s decision to make basic

needs, such as food security, a priority.

1. In Zambia, bilateral development partners are closely aligned with particular sectors. Recognizing this, the Zambian government has identified targeted interventions in specific sectors that development partners can support. In Yemen, as well, development partners have remained focused on key sectors affected by climate change, such as water. PPCR is expected to expand a pilot country’s focus to include a broader set of climate-relevant issues.

***Transformational Change***

1. **The different interpretations of “transformational change” demonstrate that stakeholders are defining this PPCR goal in the context of their own country’s circumstances.** In Niger, where 12 percent of children under age five are affected by acute malnutrition, enhancing food security is the overriding development challenge. Leaders believe that the PPCR can achieve transformational change and help reduce the country’s vulnerability to food shortages. The government is using PPCR funds to improve rural livelihoods and support sustainable land management, strengthen weather and climate forecasting, and expand early warning systems.
2. In Tajikistan, a major PPCR investment will retrofit an existing large hydropower plant to make it more climate resilient. PPCR will support an analysis of the plant’s vulnerabilities and identify practical measures to manage these risks. Resources will also be used to improve the plant’s resiliency to extreme events, such as flooding and increased sedimentation caused by melting glaciers and soil erosion. Addressing risks to energy production is a high national priority, since the country relies on hydropower for 90 percent of its energy needs. The investment may be a model for other hydro-power dams in the country and the region.
3. Another example of transformational change, albeit on a smaller scale, is the Zambian government’s pioneering use of innovative approaches. Crowd-sourcing—a web-based platform—is being used to identify immediate needs and enhance responsiveness when natural disasters strike. The government plans to use PPCR to expand the crowd sourcing model and enhance public participation in policy and decision-making about specific adaptation issues. Increased use of this new approach combined with web-based technology will facilitate an extensive participatory process that was not possible before.
4. **The scale of PPCR funding and its leveraging potential are incentives for governments to tackle the complex links between sectors and explore the kinds of institutional management that can be considered transformational.** Many governments undertake isolated sector planning without considering the cross-cutting nature of emerging climate change issues. PPCR’s strategic focus on cross-sectoral approaches encourages governments to tackle the inter-related and complex dimensions of climate resilient development. The scale and momentum of PPCR and MDB investments in agriculture, energy, and other sectors can stimulate additional financial support and catalyze the interest of a broad range of stakeholders.

***Mainstreaming***

1. **Countries that are in the process of preparing or revising development plans may be better positioned to align PPCR investments with national priorities.** The process of revising development plans strengthens a government’s ability to play a leadership role on climate change issues and provides a foundation for generating cross-cutting opportunities. National development plans, twenty-year visions, and other development strategies are likely to clarify linkages between sectors and prompt inter-sectoral planning, thus facilitating the mainstreaming process. In countries where the timing of the PPCR coincides with such efforts, mainstreaming is easier. In countries that are not in the process of refining their development plans, mainstreaming may require greater effort and retrofitting.
2. In Zambia, PPCR funding provided the impetus for climate-proofing the national development strategy, thus enabling PPCR investments to be aligned with development objectives and priorities. Yemen is also working to use the PPCR platform to mainstream climate resilience into the country’s five-year national development strategy, which is being finalized.

***Planning and Investment***

1. **PPCR’s flexible structure allows countries to determine the length of time needed to develop comprehensive resiliency strategies.** The PPCR Sub-Committee’s endorsement of the first round of strategic programs has demonstrated that timelines and the use of resources must be based on a country’s specific circumstances. Niger and Bangladesh had enough data and information available about their vulnerabilities to identify priority investments. Thus, an additional and lengthy planning phase was not necessary. Zambia and Yemen, on the other hand, needed more time to integrate climate change considerations into their national development strategies before utilizing PPCR funding for financing priority actions. This dynamic and flexible process highlights the potential to align PPCR with individual country circumstances and is expected to continue to evolve as programs and projects are rolled out.

***Institutional Structures and Capacities***

1. **Since the PPCR does not provide specific guidelines for country-level institutional arrangements, the MDBs may need to provide technical assistance and build capacity when a variety of ministries are included in planning and implementing climate change strategies.** An inter-ministerial approach and leadership by a Ministry or a government planning agency that can leverage cross-sectoral coordination is key to effectively integrating climate resilience in core development planning. Ministries of finance or planning are often best placed to do so. While other ministries may have technical expertise, they are generally not in a position to convene other sectors.
2. In Jamaica, for example, the government planning institute is leading the PPCR process. MDBs are supporting personnel of the institute with capacity development to identify future needs for the agriculture, fishing, infrastructure, water, and tourism sectors and include adaptive practices in the country’s development planning. In Yemen, an agency in the Ministry of Water and Environment serves as the technical secretariat for the PPCR under the auspices of a broader inter-Ministerial committee chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister. The World Bank is supporting the development of a cross-sectoral approach to enhance collaboration between line-ministries who may have limited capacities.

1. **The effectiveness of the lead PPCR ministry depends on its ability to understand and convey the potential impacts of climate variability and change across economic sectors as well as its propensity to convince others to take up climate resilience challenges.** In many cases, the ministries leading the PPCR effort may not have in-depth climate change expertise. This requires the PPCR preparation process to focus on building capacity and expanding the climate change knowledge base. In St. Vincent and the Grenadines, for example, the PPCR preparation grant is being used to develop the capacity of the Ministry of Finance as the lead agency for PPCR implementation. This will help ensure longer-term investments in climate resilience as well as adequate resources and planning across numerous sectors.

**Program and Investment Financing**

1. The two phases of PPCR financing—planning and investment—provide pilots with sufficient support to build an informed strategic program that can lead to transformational change. Resources are available for country governments in the form of grants and optional concessional loans. PPCR grants can be used to complement MDB resources and create a more robust program portfolio. The countries themselves determine whether they will utilize optional loans in addition to grants. Thus far, two countries have opted for concessional loans and will use them to attract private sector investment and supplement MDB funding. Following are the lessons learned from early program and investment financing experience.

***Preparation Funding for Country Engagement***

1. **PPCR resources are available to help countries prepare strategic programs aimed at strengthening the resiliency of national development plans, but the process and costs will vary based on individual country circumstances.**  Pilot countries that have sufficient climate information and advanced strategies may not require a $1.5 million preparatory grant. Those that do not have an in-depth understanding of their vulnerabilities and the potential impact on development may require additional time and resources.
2. Regional programs are more complex because they span numerous countries with different goals and capacity levels. Each country must develop its own national plan as well as buy into an overarching regional strategy. The regional dimension requires more coordination and additional resources.
3. Tajikistan, which has limited experience with adaptation, utilized its preparatory grant to build institutional capacity and undertake focused studies. Bangladesh, with years of climate resiliency experience, did not request a preparatory grant. The government opted instead to use the MDB joint programming process to move into investment planning more quickly. However, the lack of a preparation grant resulted in a funding gap between the planning of the strategic program and the implementation of project investments. In other countries, political circumstances can necessitate broader consultations, additional time for planning, and resources that exceed the average preparation grant.

***Investment***

1. ***Leveraging***  **PPCR has significant leveraging potential because development partners support a cross-sectoral approach to climate challenges.** Thus far, resources leveraged through the MDBs are the most concrete demonstration of commitments to the PPCR. Pilot countries and the MDBs view the PPCR as an opportunity to scale up climate resilient investments in their existing portfolios. For example, Bangladesh expects to use PPCR funds in order to leverage at least $500 million from ADB and World Bank Group investments. Tajikistan and Niger also expect to leverage at least $70 million and $120 million respectively from the MDBs.
2. Other development partners, such as bilateral development agencies, have indicated an interest in supporting efforts to address the impacts of climate change and variability. However, the funds have not yet been forthcoming because the early stages of the PPCR process focuses on capacity development for pilot countries. As projects are approved and implementation begins, pilot countries and the MDBs are expected to make a greater effort to attract development partners interested in providing complementary resources.
3. ***Funding Availability*****The scale of PPCR funding is a strong incentive for governments to initiate transformational change.** The PPCR’s comparative advantages include the amount of funding available and the opportunities to engage other partners who can provide additional resources. Even though Bangladesh and Mozambique receive substantial donor support, the governments of both countries believe that the PPCR will catalyze climate action and deliver scaled up and measurable results. For Tajikistan, on the other hand, PPCR resources represent a substantial investment and are the “largest adaptation game in town,” although additional financing is necessary to achieve long-term progress.

***Grants and Optional Near-zero Interest Credits*****Initially, there was some uncertainty about whether countries would utilize highly concessional financing. However, it now appears that many PPCR pilots see a benefit in requesting the optional financial instruments.**  A country’s decision to take advantage of the availability of highly concessional loans is based on its ideological stance on accepting concessional financing for adaptation as well as restrictions on its borrowing ability[[6]](#footnote-6). As governments realize that even the substantial PPCR grant resources are not sufficient to address adaptation needs, they are looking to highly concessional PPCR financing to provide additional opportunities for supporting their program portfolios, specifically with a view to engaging the private sector.

Originally, the government of Bangladesh did not plan to use optional credits to make coastal communities more climate-resilient. But as the strategic program was extended to all coastal districts, the government opted to use a combination of $21 million in PPCR grants and $50 million in PPCR loans to fortify coastal water supplies, improve sanitation, and make infrastructure more resilient. The government plans to use another $10 million in PPCR credits to support efforts by private companies, farmers, and cooperatives to promote climate resilient agriculture and food security.

In Nepal, national stakeholders are extensively discussing the possibility of using optional PPCR credits to build the country’s climate resilience. The ensuing dialogue, which was fostered by the government, has led to a healthier understanding of how near-zero interest credits can be used for development-oriented investments and the potential benefits to vulnerable communities.

1. ***Disbursements*****Increasing pressure for “quick wins” to justify PPCR investments may require the MDBs to take greater responsibility for the country and regional programs. The trade off is that opportunities to strengthen country capacity and solidify government and stakeholder ownership may be missed in the process.** The disbursement of PPCR funds is slowed when a country does not have the human and institutional capacity to absorb and implement the broad types of investments that the PPCR supports. While building capacity represents a long term commitment to transformational change, the time required to lay such a foundation may not coincide with expectations for rapid disbursement and early results.

**Stakeholder Collaboration**

1. Bilateral and UN agencies, civil society groups, the private sector, and other development partners are vital to the success of PPCR, but the level of involvement varies by country. The lessons learned from stakeholder collaborations highlight the complexity and uncertainties of creating effective partnerships. Specific roles and expectations for different stakeholder groups need to be determined systematically and integrated into the overall development process.

***Stakeholder Participation***

1. **By encouraging better relationships between governments, civil society organizations, the private sector, and other stakeholders, the PPCR has contributed to a participatory process in pilot countries.** PPCR investments aim to benefit all affected stakeholders in a country, especially groups that are most vulnerable to climate change, such as women. Governments and stakeholders must work together to develop mutual expectations and define roles within the PPCR process. Each pilot country has expressed interest in engaging civil society and the private sector, but specific and more targeted strategies are needed to strengthen and expand their participation.
2. In Tajikistan, there is neither a history of civil society participation and gender consideration nor do civil society groups have extensive networks. The PPCR has strengthened the dialogue between the government and civil society groups, resulting in their increased participation in the design process. Ensuring their engagement throughout PPCR implementation will require further effort. In Zambia, a number of civil society groups are not well organized, but the government has invited and encouraged them to participate in PPCR planning and implementation.

***Development Partners***

1. **The status of PPCR programs and the expected roles of various partners must be more clearly communicated.** Governments and MDB focal points actively consult with potential partners during the joint programming process. What is currently missing is systematic follow up. Development partners have expressed the desire for regular updates on PPCR progress and timelines. In some pilot countries, there has been no communication about PPCR for months at a time, a situation which is frustrating to partners. Such inadequate communication may be due, in part, to limited country and MDB staff, the absence of clear lines of responsibility, and the lack of a communications plan. Both governments and the MDBs can provide clearer guidance about communication expectations and follow through.
2. **Some development partners have worked to align country programs with the PPCR. Such efforts are enhanced when contributing countries effectively communicate with their country representatives.** For example, the UK, the largest contributor to the PPCR, has actively followed the PPCR process, especially in those pilot countries in which it has a presence. In Tajikistan, the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID) funded parallel preparatory work for institution building, which has been complementary to the government-led preparatory PPCR activities. By helping to strengthen Tajikistan’s institutions, DFID is not only increasing the chances of PPCR success, but also raising the country’s overall ability to effectively respond to the impacts of climate variability and change.

***Civil Society Engagement***

1. **Interactions with civil society groups through the PPCR process are perceived to be an improvement over business-as-usual in all pilots.** Creating clear and deliberate strategies for engaging different groups can enhance and strengthen the PPCR process. Countries are being encouraged to include action plans for continued dialogue with civil society as part of their strategic programs. Special consideration needs to be given to the most vulnerable groups in society, including women and youth.
2. In Nepal, an active and vocal civil society has been fully engaged throughout the PPCR process, with more than 850 stakeholders consulted about the preparation of the strategic program. In Bangladesh, every planned project includes a process for dealing with vulnerable groups as well as gender issues. The government of Niger has included civil society representatives, among them a representative of women’s groups, on the steering committee charged with PPCR oversight. In Tajikistan, civil society groups advocated for more emphasis on gender issues. A PPCR Secretariat is being established to ensure better coordination, including sustained engagement with civil society, especially women and youth groups.

***The Private Sector***

1. **Broadening private sector engagement in PPCR may take a shift in thinking to attract viable partners.** The public sector approach used in planning PPCR consultations may not be appropriate for outreach to the private sector. Instead, the one-on-one meetings that the IFC has conducted have prompted the most interest. In Zambia, the IFC is building on a successful private sector initiative that has improved dairy and agricultural production. In Nepal, on the other hand, the Federation of Nepali Chambers of Commerce is spearheading a private sector working group’s participation in the PPCR process.

***MDB Collaboration***

1. **Overall, the PPCR is perceived as helping to strengthen MDB collaborations at the country level.** Operationally, inclusiveness and information sharing have fostered positive relations between multiple MDB teams in the pilot countries. Overall, the PPCR has catalyzed extensive MDB cooperation in individual countries. Differing “visions” of the role of PPCR and the appropriate use of PPCR resources in the pilot countries have generally been resolved after discussion. On the other hand, the absence of clear guidelines for funding allocations for regional pilots has affected MDB cooperation in some areas. Although the overall amount of regional financing is clearly defined, there is no formula for dividing the resources among participating countries.

**Procedural Issues**

1. Although the CIF relies on established institutions, such as the Trustee**[[7]](#footnote-7)** and the MDBs, more work is needed to develop a suite of procedures to effectively manage the PPCR. Because the internal procedures of the five MDBs are not designed to meet PPCR needs, resources and time are needed to overcome the administrative hurdles associated with developing relevant and appropriate protocols and procedures. Following are the lessons drawn from those early experiences with procedural issues.
2. ***Communications*  Uneven communication between MDB headquarters and country-based staff has resulted in confusion and mixed messages to partners.** In between the joint missions that are part of the programming process, MDB headquarters-based staff have driven the PPCR process, including preparation of the strategic programs. Country-based staff often see the PPCR as an “add on” to their portfolios, especially if they have limited climate change expertise and face time constraints. In countries where MDB staff at all levels have been regularly briefed and engaged, the response and involvement has been more positive from the perspective of various development partners.
3. ***Fiduciary Procedures* The time needed to formalize agreements between individual MDBs and the Trustee has contributed to** **delays in the transfer of CIF funds and impacted MDB interventions at the country level.** Fiduciary procedures and legal protocols between MDBs and the Trustee need to be established before funds can be transferred. The process takes time and resources. This has affected activities at the country level and contributed to the perception that some MDBs play a stronger role than others. As agreements between the Trustee and all the MDBs are finalized, future delays should be minimized.
4. ***Operational Procedures*** **The MDBs estimated programming costs for helping countries with preparatory activities must be realistic and reflect the complexity of the process.** The MDBs have noted that the cost of the joint programming necessary to develop a country-led strategic program may at times be underestimated. Early experience indicates that additional joint programming and capacity building are necessary when stakeholder consultations need to be enhanced and both national and overall regional frameworks must be developed. For example, the Caribbean regional program has submitted planning proposals for nearly all countries as well as the regional track. Because so many countries are involved, the resources needed were higher than anticipated to expand MDB collaborations, foster continuing dialogue between development partners and other stakeholders, and ensure ongoing government inputs and ownership.
5. ***Administrative Procedures*** **The efficiency and cost effectiveness gained by working within the administrative structure of the World Bank can lead to a perception that interactions with other MDBs are not as extensive.** The CIF Administrative Unit’s physical location at World Bank headquarters allows for convenient interactions with the Trustee, as well as decreased overhead costs and start up delays. The CIF Administrative Unit is working to raise awareness that it represents all five MDBs and that the channels of communication to all MDBs are equal.

**Going Forward**

1. Lessons from the past can serve as a useful guide to the future. At a time when the complexities of global environmental and socio-economic circumstances are increasing, the experiences and lessons learned from PPCR’s first two years of operation can add value to the concerted efforts to make climate resilient development a reality in PPCR pilot countries. Each PPCR program is essentially testing a unique development model and working out large scale solutions that can be embraced by any country struggling to cope with climate change and variability.
2. PPCR itself benefited from the early experiences of the Clean Technology Fund, the CIF’s pioneering initiative. In a similar way, PPCR’s broad-based approach and financial innovations are helping to shape other CIF programs and inform the international discussions on long-term funding to address climate change challenges.

1. Each pilot country may receive up to $40 – 50 million and regional pilots may receive a maximum of up to $60 – 75 million in grants. In addition, 10 – 15 percent of the available highly concessional financing may be programmed for each country and regional pilot. *(Summary of the Co-Chairs, Meeting of the PPCR Subcommittee on Financing, June 23, 2010.)* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. PPCR’s highly concessional loans (or: near-zero interest credits) are comparable to International Development Assistance credits. Both financial instruments do not charge interest on the principal, have a 40-year maturity and 10-year grace period, require repayments of 2 percent of the principal during years 11 – 20 and 4 percent during years 20 – 40, and are subject to a low service charge. PPCR credits have a grant element of 75 percent. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. African Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Inter-American Development Bank, and the World Bank Group, including the International Finance Corporation. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Bangladesh, Niger, Tajikistan, Zambia, and Jamaica, a country participating in the Caribbean regional pilot. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Development partners include sector leaders, civil society organizations, research institutions, the private sector, and UN and bilateral agencies, among others. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The IMF/World Bank Debt Sustainability Analysis, which the PPCR follows, classifies low income countries according to their risk of debt distress (high, moderate, or low). This in turn determines a country’s eligibility for loan financing. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The World Bank is the Trustee of the CIF. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)