

February 14, 2014

**Comments from Switzerland—Proposed Criteria and Process for Selecting New Pilot Countries under the SREP**

Dear Patricia,

Thank you for circulating the proposed criteria and list of eligible countries for the selection of additional SREP pilot countries.

We have the feeling that the proposed selection criteria are very far away from the original criteria used to select pilot countries.

In particular, we see a problem in the lack of consideration of the size (in terms of population) of the pilot countries, which were reflected in earlier selections.

Also the poverty level seems to be insufficiently addressed with just 10%.

Energy access (or more specifically the lack of energy access) could also be given a higher weight, in line with the decision of the Subcommittee to favor countries with low energy access such as still numerous in Africa.

We welcome the more detailed criteria reflecting readiness, willingness and capacity to implement renewable energy strategies, however we feel that with a total of 70%, these criteria are overweighted.

We would favor a total of 50% for criteria a,b,c,d,e

Regarding the list of eligible countries, we would like to note that certain of the countries have already applied for SREP and received a certain support (e.g. some Pacific Islands) and that we do not see why a second application should lead to different considerations than an earlier decision by the Subcommittee (i.e. to concentrate the Pacific Islands program on the two most important countries).

We would welcome an exchange or discussion about these criteria with other subcommittee members and wonder whether a teleconference could be organized. In any case we would like to see other Subcommittee member's comments prior to consider the criteria approved as proposed.

Thank you and best regards

**Daniel Menebhi**  
Program Manager

Federal Department of Economic Affairs, Education and Research EAER  
State Secretariat for Economic Affairs SECO  
Infrastructure Financing

Holzikofenweg 36, 3003 Berne  
Tel. +41 31 322 22 07  
Fax +41 31 324 09 65  
daniel.menebhi@seco.admin.ch  
[www.seco.admin.ch](http://www.seco.admin.ch)

February 14, 2014

**Comments from the United Kingdom—Proposed Criteria and Process for  
Selecting New Pilot Countries under the SREP**

Dear Patricia,

Many thanks for circulating the proposed criteria and process for selecting new pilot countries in follow up to the discussions and decision from October.

As Daniel says in his email below, he would like to hear comments from other committee members. Here are ours:

We are broadly happy with the range of issues covered in para 5 a)-g), in responding to countries willingness to achieve the objectives of SREP and a countries capacity and potential to implement SREP programmes – as expressed through the enabling environment criteria (a)-e).

However, we do agree with Daniel that there is an important issue to resolve in the weighting of the criteria. Broadly criteria a)-e) are enabling environment criteria – representing 70%. Not all of these are mutually exclusive, so a weak score in one area would lead to a low score in another. Similarly the final two criteria – representing 30% - f) and g) are also interlinked (low energy access is more likely in poorer countries).

There is then a potential contradiction between the enabling environment/energy access split and trying to identify 8 countries in Africa. These countries are more likely to score higher on f) and g) and less well on a)-e). This broadly supports Daniel's poverty point.

We would propose some suggestions for the way forward:

1. Could the CIF AU look at how to score new pilot country bids to address the above. This could be by changing the balance between the two sets of criteria (a-e and f&g) as Daniel suggests or could be by sequencing the decision i.e. first consider energy access/poverty, then enabling environment, then providing a balance of countries.
2. However, we also recognise that you have set a tight timeline, so unless there is any objections we would suggest that you go ahead with sending out letters soliciting expressions of interest as planned – while the above details are resolved in time for the expert group to review bids.
3. We would be happy to be part of a teleconference as proposed by Daniel – however, if it saves time we would be happy to review an updated version of the paper electronically if this can be updated quickly, so you can keep to your intended timeline.

Regards,

**Ben**

February 19, 2014

**Comments from the United States—Approval by mail: Proposed Criteria and Process for  
Selecting New Pilot Countries under the SREP**

Dear CIF colleagues,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the proposed criteria.

We have a few comments about the weighting criteria as it stands in the proposal. From our perspective, it is important that future SREP programs target energy access in countries where the program will be most transformational. We think the best way to do that is to put more weight on energy access and implementation capacity. Therefore, we prefer to see more emphasis placed on those criteria. We're comfortable with 30% on energy access and relative poverty, but we would suggest shifting more toward energy access and away from relative poverty. The eligibility requirement that a country is IDA-only or a regional MDB equivalent is satisfactory for us.

Below is a table showing how we recommend the weightings be distributed amongst the criteria, though we are open to a discussion about paring down the number of criteria. Specifically, we think the differences between the "supportive regulatory structures" and the "enabling regulatory environment" may not be sufficient enough to warrant separate criteria, so we would be fine with combining them.

	Original proposal	US Suggested Weights
Supportive reg structures	15%	5%
Enabling regs for private partic	20%	25%
Sector-wide dev strategies	10%	10%
Implementation capacity	15%	20%
Good governance	10%	10%
Energy access	20%	25%
Relative poverty	10%	5%

On the issue of regional balance, we think the list of eligible countries in the proposal provides a natural distribution for invitations: 3/5s can go to Africa, 2/5 can go to the other regions. Australia notes the valuable experience of Small Island Developing States with regards to energy access, so we'd like to ensure the SIDS and others get a fair opportunity to apply. Additionally, we would like SREP to leverage the expertise and project implementation capacity of all the MDBs. This topic may require a more in-depth dialogue among committee members.

We welcome questions and look forward to any opportunities to discuss these issues further. Cheers.

Daniel F. Morris  
Office of Environment and Energy  
US Department of the Treasury  
[Daniel.Morris2@treasury.gov](mailto:Daniel.Morris2@treasury.gov)  
202.622.9352 (o)

February 24, 2014

**Comments from the United States—Approval by mail: Proposed Criteria and Process for Selecting New Pilot Countries under the SREP**

I have your reviewed your language about country allocation . My preference would be to give the expert group the space to make recommendations based on the technical criteria that we have established when they review the subset of countries that express interest. I don't think that it is appropriate to propose how the SC conclude before the expert panel has even been convened and without knowing which countries will opt to prepare an expression of interest. Here is some suggested language.

“While the subcommittee expects that many of the 12 identified countries should come from Africa (e.g., at least 8 out of 12), it will base its formal decisions on the expert group’s ranking of countries against the eligibility criteria and will give due consideration to all countries recommended by the expert group as meeting those criteria.”

We agree with the UK that some of the categories are redundant or might be more appropriate as sub-categories, so we recommend combining the aspects that address regulatory frameworks with the one that addresses sector-wide development strategies. With this combination, we're also willing to apply 10% more weight to energy access and relative poverty which should accomplish what you are seeking.

	Original proposal	US Suggested Weights
Supportive reg structures	15%	30%
Enabling regs for private partic	20%	
Sector-wide dev strategies	10%	
Implementation capacity	15%	20%
Good governance	10%	10%
Energy access	20%	30%
Relative poverty	10%	10%

Best,

Abby