

CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

SCF/TFC.9/4
April 17, 2012

Meeting of the SCF Trust Fund Committee
Washington, D.C.
May 1, 2012

Agenda Item 6

STATUS REPORT ON ROSTER OF EXPERTS FOR SCF TECHNICAL REVIEWS

Proposed Decision by the SCF Trust Fund Committee

The Trust Fund Committee reviewed document SCF/TFC.9/4, *Status Report on Roster of Experts for SCF Technical Reviews*, and welcomes the progress that has been made in conducting the independent technical reviews in accordance with the approved procedures.

The Committee takes note of the information provided and requests the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDB Committee, to prepare for its meeting in November 2012 an overview of the expert reviews and the procedures for their preparation with a view to providing information to assist the Sub-Committee to determine the usefulness of the review process and/or revising the procedures, if necessary.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. During its meeting in November 2010, the SCF Trust Fund Committee reviewed document SCF/TFC.6/8, *Options for a Quality Review of Investment Plans and Strategies under the SCF*, and agreed that a focused independent technical review could contribute to enhancing the quality of the plans and strategies.
2. To this end, the SCF Trust Fund Committee agreed that the review should be independent and part of the development process of the investment plans and strategies and should:
 - a) add value to the design process of the investment plan or strategy and be seen as a useful tool for countries, MDBs and the Sub-Committee;
 - b) be part of the country-led preparation process of an investment strategy or plan;
 - c) reflect the objectives and investment criteria of the targeted program; and
 - d) provide knowledge and experience for interested stakeholders, including the members and observers to the SCF governing bodies.

II. PROCEDURES

3. In 2011, the SCF Sub-Committees approved procedures to be followed in preparing the independent technical reviews. One set of procedures apply to the PPCR and SREP¹ while separate procedures with some variations to those for the PPCR and SREP were approved for the FIP².
4. Twenty-four investment plans under the three programs have been reviewed by independent experts in accordance with the approved procedures. The review(s) of the expert(s) and the response prepared by the Government and the MDBs are submitted to the Sub-Committee when the proposed investment plan is submitted for endorsement. This information is also posted on the CIF website.

Selection of Experts

5. For the FIP, it was agreed that experts would be selected from the roster of experts eligible to serve as members of the Technical Advisory Panel established by the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility³. The review is prepared by two reviewers selected from the roster. Terms of reference for the review are developed by the country and the MDBs, and the CIF Administrative Unit selects the proposed reviewers for approval by the country and the MDB

¹

http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/Revised_PPCR_SREP_technical_reviews_of_investment_plans_101111_0.pdf (October 15, 2011)

²

http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/sites/climateinvestmentfunds.org/files/FINAL_Procedures_for_the_Preparation_of_Independent_Technical_Reviews_of_FIP_IPs_November2011.pdf (November 28, 2011)

³ <http://www.forestcarbonpartnership.org/fcp/node/23>

Committee. The Sub-Committee is invited to review the terms of reference and the resumes of the two selected experts and to express any objections.

6. For PPCR and SREP, the CIF Administrative Unit and the MDBs were requested to develop a roster of experts from which experts could be selected by the pilot country and the MDBs. A roster of experts was established for SREP and approved by the SREP Sub-Committee in October 2011. The PPCR Sub-Committee has not yet approved its roster, and a PPCR roster of experts with improved gender balance from the initially proposed roster has been submitted to the PPCR Sub-Committee for its review and approval at its meeting on April 30, 2012.

7. The procedures provide that pending the approval of a roster, the country and the MDBs are to agree upon a qualified expert to undertake the review. The CIF Administrative Unit is to submit the expert's resume and proposed terms of reference to the MDB Committee for its agreement. Thereafter, the resume and terms of reference for the review are submitted to the Sub-Committee for approval on a no objection basis.

III. SELECTED REVIEWERS

Forest Investment Program

8. Table 1 lists the experts that prepared technical reviews of seven FIP investment plans:

Table 1: FIP Independent Expert Reviews

Pilot Country	Name	FIP Sub-Committee Approval Date
Brazil	Bernadus de Jong	
	Hector Ginzo	
Burkina Faso ⁴	Juergen Blaser	4/22/2011
DRC ⁵	Juergen Blaser	5/06/2011
Ghana	John Mason	1/04/2012
	Harrison Ochieng Kojwang	1/04/2012
Indonesia	Ana Doris Capistrano ⁶	
	Dodik Nurrochmat	
Lao PDR	Kham Phet Sengchanh Oudom	9/29/2011
	John Howard Dick	9/29/2011

⁴ Burkina Faso and DRC were the first investment plans reviewed. At that time, the procedures suggested the use of one reviewer from the FCPF roster of experts.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ The second reviewer for Indonesia was contacted, but the reviewer has not signed yet the contract. A new reviewer might need to be contracted.

Mexico	Alejandro Eduardo Guevara Sanginés	8/26/2011
	Leticia Merino	8/26/2011

9. For the seven FIP investment plans that have been reviewed, the average number of days for each review, using two reviewers, was 8.3 days and the average cost for a review was USD 5,840 per plan.

10. The investment plan for Peru is still to be reviewed. The plan is expected to be submitted for review and endorsement at the November meeting of the FIP Sub-Committee.

Pilot Program for Climate Resilience

11. The *Procedures for the Preparation of Independent Technical Review of PPCR and SREP Investment Plans* were approved after the PPCR Sub-Committee had endorsed the PPCR investment plans for the following six pilot countries: Bangladesh, Grenada, Niger, St Vincent and Grenadines, Tajikistan and Zambia. Hence, these investment plans were not reviewed by an independent expert.

12. Table 2 lists the experts that prepared technical reviews of eleven PPCR Strategic Programs:

Table 2: PPCR Independent Expert Reviews

Country	Name	PPCR SC Approval Date
Bolivia	Lykke Andersen	9/29/2011
Cambodia	Arivudai Nambi Appadurai	5/17/2011
Caribbean Regional Track	Roger Pulwarty	10/20/2011
Jamaica	Leonard Nurse	9/21/2011
Mozambique	Camille Bann	6/1/2011
Nepal	Ajaya Mani Dixit	
Pacific Regional Track	Catherine Bennett (first review)	5/19/2011
	Catherine Bennett (second review)	
Papua New Guinea	Maarten van Aalst	
St Lucia	Scott Cunliffe	5/10/2011
Tonga	Ulrich Trotz	02/10/12
Yemen	Casey Brown	9/27/2011

13. For the eleven PPCR strategic programs that have been reviewed, the average number of days for each review was 8.5 and the average cost for a review (using two experts) was USD 5,623 per plan.

14. Haiti is the only pilot country which has not requested the review of its draft SPCR by an expert from the PPCR roster of experts.

Scaling-up Renewable Energy Program in Low-Income Countries

15. Table 3 lists the experts that prepared technical reviews of six SREP investment plans.

Table 3: SREP Independent Expert Reviews

Country	Name	SREP SC Approval Date
Ethiopia	Steve Thorne	12/16/2011
Honduras	Oscar Coto	09/2011
Kenya	Lennart Bangens	5/19/11
Maldives	Mike Allen	12/9/2011
Mali	Nacer Hammami	4/12/2011
Nepal	Drona Upadhyay	09/2011

16. For the six SREP investment plans that have been reviewed, the average number of days for each review was 7 and the average cost for a review (using two experts) was USD 5,177 per plan.

17. At its meeting in November 2011, the Sub-Committee agreed that work could be initiated on the preparation of six additional investment plans (Armenia, Liberia, Mongolia, Pacific Regional Program, Tanzania and Yemen). These investment plans will be reviewed by an expert from the approved SREP roster of experts.

IV. CONCLUSION

18. Document SCF/TFC.9/4, *Status Report on Roster of Experts for SCF Technical Reviews* provides an update on the reviews of draft investment plans that have been undertaken under the SCF targeted programs. It does not, however, provide an analytical overview of the content nor value added of the reviews and the procedures that were followed.

19. As requested by the SCF Trust Fund Committee in November 2010, the CIF Administrative Unit, in collaboration with the MDB Committee, is planning to prepare for the Trust Fund Committee meeting in November 2012, an overview of the expert reviews and the procedures for their preparation with a view to providing information to assist the Sub-Committee to determine the usefulness of the review process and/or revising the procedures, if necessary.