

April 13, 2011

Comments from Australia on Quality Review of SCF Investment Plans and Strategies

Dear colleagues

Thanks to the CIF Admin Unit and the MDB Committee for preparing this proposal on the SCF quality review process. Australia is pleased to support the proposal, which presents a sound process to ensure high quality investment strategies and assist committee deliberations during endorsement under each of the SCF programs. It appears to represent good value for money and we are pleased to see that the process is integrated well with the existing arrangements established for the preparation of investment strategies under the SCF sub-programs. We have some comments on the proposal and we would be grateful if these could be incorporated in the final design document for the quality review process.

·The respective SCF Sub-Committees should be included in the process to select experts for the PPCR and SREP programs, noting that the initial FIP roster is already settled. We request that the relevant Sub-Committees be incorporated beneath Paragraph 9 (b) to review proposed experts following MDB Committee endorsement. We understand that an open online call for experts will be maintained and it might be onerous to retain a requirement for Sub-Committee approval for each additional expert following the establishment of the initial roster – we would be grateful for advice from the CIF Admin Unit and the MDB Committee of an acceptable process to manage this, perhaps by providing the relevant Sub-Committee with a notification and CV when a new expert is added.

·The specific criteria for each SCF sub-program included in Annex A appear to include a number of criteria that could be included under the general criteria (eg. transformative impact, institutions/co-ordination, stakeholder engagement/participation, cost effectiveness, co-benefits). We note that these are drawn from the programming modalities of each SCF sub-fund, however, we would be grateful for advice from the CIF Admin Unit on whether it would be possible to incorporate some of these specific criteria under the general criteria. We also note that poverty reduction is not explicitly included, except under co-benefits in the FIP.

·We would be grateful for a clarification on the process for the reviewer to prepare a review of an investment strategy. Paragraph 14 suggests that the reviewer has up to ten working days to complete a review, but must provide a draft review to the pilot country and relevant MDBs within seven days. There is no provision for the use of the remaining three days and it appears in Paragraph 20 that the pilot country and relevant MDBs are required to respond to the draft review. We would be grateful if the CIF Admin Unit and MDB Committee could clarify whether the reviewer is required to prepare a final review based on this draft and the role of the pilot country and relevant MDBs in this process.

We also support the interim measures set out in the email below to manage investment strategies that are submitted before the roster of experts is established. We note that these arrangements are already in place for the proposed investment plan for Mali under SREP, circulated on 8 April.

Regards

Jean-Bernard Carrasco

A/g First Assistant Director General | International Programs and Partnerships Division | AusAID