



## SREP Investment Plan for Nicaragua

### Questions (Q) and comments (C)

1. Co-financing: It is noted that the SREP investment plan for Nicaragua relies to a significant extent on contributions from the GCF, already in phase I.
  - i) (Q) What efforts are planned or under way by the Government of Nicaragua to tap GCF resources for the programs proposed in the SREP investment plan?
  - ii) (Q) To what extent are the executing agencies foreseen for the implementation of these programs already in the accreditation process with the GCF?
2. Private sector contribution: The projected private sector contribution for the geothermal component seems rather high in particular the expected readiness of private sector investors to share in the risk of resource confirmation.
  - i) (Q) How realistic do the MDBs consider this projection?
  - ii) (Q) Have interested private sector operators who are ready to take these risks been identified?
3. Results:
  - i) (C) The results listed under “transformative impact” seem far more ambitious than what may be reasonably expected from the SREP intervention.
  - ii) (Q) What is the expected additional installed capacity of geothermal power until 2022?
  - iii) (Q) What are the expectations or targets regarding reduced or avoided CO<sub>2</sub> emissions until 2022?
4. Component II: The proposed split of a \$7.5 million SREP all grant contribution on 4 subcomponents and (at least) 13 individual measures/activities seems very fragmented:
  - i) (C) We recommend to concentrate the SREP contribution under component II on subcomponent II C (renewable energy for productive uses).

SECO/WEIN/mnd  
8 May 2015