

December 19, 2013

Comments from the UK: Approval by mail: Revised Procedures, Criteria, and Template for PPCR set aside

Dear colleagues,

The revised procedures have taken the Sub-Committee's feedback into account well; the UK is content to endorse them.

There are three outstanding points we'd like to suggest the procedures could still better address with additional information:

- The criteria on 'level of innovation proposed' could be supplemented further with more specific guidance on how this is defined, as it is a highly subjective term and with a 25% weighting will have a significant impact on the proposal's final score.
- The proposal template (annex 1) is clear and a welcome addition. The only important area that doesn't come through clearly as a requirement is explaining how the project links to the SPCR for that country, especially as it is one of the criterion for scoring (15%). Point IV 'Rationale for PPCR funding' could perhaps be stronger on this.
- In our previous feedback we had asked about the EG recommendation to have a split pot whereby half the funding goes to domestic financial institutions, to leverage more commercial co-financing, and how it is planned to explore this option further. Can the CIF AU confirm on this?

Kind regards,

Anna

Anna Bobin | Policy Analyst, Low Carbon Development and Adaptation Teams | Climate and Environment Department
Department for International Development | 22 Whitehall, London, SW1A 2EG
(: +44 (0)20 7023 1148
*: a-bobin@dfid.gov.uk | : url: www.dfid.gov.uk

December 26, 2013

Comments from United States on the Approval by mail: Revised Procedures, Criteria, and Template for PPCR and SREP set aside

Dear Patricia,

We are pleased to see these revised criteria and the plans to increase resources for awareness raising. We have a few comments on the revised set aside criteria for SREP and PPCR. We would be happy to discuss these comments with you or other members of the CIF team.

SREP:

Commercial sustainability: We would prefer a heavier weighting on commercial sustainability than just 10% as it is important to send a signal that applicants need to have well thought through business plans with a long-term plan for sustainability. We are open to discuss how much this weighting should and where it should come from. (The logical places may be innovation and/or readiness). We would also be open to considering whether this criteria should be a should be a yes/no or “high/medium/low” metric.

Readiness: It is not clear whether a percentage weighting for readiness is the best metric if the objective is to have approval by the MDBs within 12 months of sub-committee approval. Perhaps this should be a yes/no or “high/medium/low” metric

PPCR:

Paragraph 11 b: We suggest local financial institutions also be included in outreach efforts.

Criteria:

Readiness: Similar to SREP, it is not clear to us whether a percentage weighting for readiness is the best metric if the objective is to have approval by the MDBs within 9-18 months of sub-committee approval. Perhaps this should be a yes/no or “high/medium/low” metric.

Commercial sustainability: It is important to send a signal that applicants need to have well thought through business plans with a long-term plan for sustainability. It is not clear to us whether this criteria should be weighted with other factors or be more of a yes/no or “high/medium/low” metric

Abigail Demopoulos
Office of Environment & Energy
U.S. Treasury