

Dear all,

Thank you for sending the "Guidance Note on Regional Programmes". Our comments are as follows (NB only point 2 recommends a small change in the text)

1) We think this paper sets out clearly and well the role and operation of regional programmes - especially paragraphs 20 to 22. We are pleased that the inclusion of and partnership with existing regional institutions has been highlighted (paras 11 and 15).

2) Although we agree that the PPCR needs to take into account the additional transaction costs of regional pilots, we are not sure that the 30% additional funding above single country allocations makes sense. Firstly, discussion on the programming paper has yet to agree an allocation methodology - so it is not yet agreed that there will be a set maximum for either phase 1 or phase 2 that will be common across pilots. Secondly, some single country pilots may turn out to be very large and complicated, and warrant as much funding (in either phase 1 or phase 2) as a regional pilot. We would therefore prefer that the 30% reference be removed, and that paras 17 and 19 be simplified just to say that finance will need to be adequate to cover the additional transaction costs of regional operations.

3) In terms of the use of this document by the Expert Group in fulfilling their terms of reference, it should be made clear to them that just because countries were previously proposed and not immediately accepted by the PPCR-SC, this does **not** mean that there is an implicit or explicit instruction not to include them in proposed regional pilots. The EG should be free to choose any group of countries on the basis of the extra guidance given here, alongside the primary instructions of their initial TORs.

Very happy to discuss.

Many thanks and best wishes,

Judith

Judith Whiteley | Climate Change Adaptation | Policy and Research Division | UK Department for International Development (DFID)