

# CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS

June 5, 2018

---

Meeting of the SREP Sub-Committee  
Washington D.C.  
Wednesday, June 6, 2018

## **STOCKTAKING REVIEW OF SREP MONITORING AND REPORTING SYSTEM**

Dear Mafalda,

We have a number of questions and remarks on document SREP/SC.19/5 “Stocktaking review of SREP monitoring and reporting system” that we would like to share with the subcommittee members before tomorrow’s SREP subcommittee meeting. Could you please circulate these?

1. The document should note that SREP cooperated with ESMAP (and provided significant financial support for) two analytical tools to improve the monitoring of SREP: the report mentions the multi-tier framework for energy access (MTF), but fails to mention the Readiness for Investment in Sustainable Energy framework (“RISE” <http://rise.esmap.org/>). RISE has been developed to be able to have a uniform tool for measuring improvements in the policy and regulatory framework. RISE should thus be included in the SREP monitoring framework and toolbox, much like the recommendation to apply the MTF.
2. We prefer that “*strengthened regulatory, institutional and policy frameworks*” is presented as core indicator of SREP in view of the transformational ambitions of SREP (instead of as co-benefit).
3. We have objections against the formulation in paragraph 67 that “*the transformative impact cannot be achieved by SREP interventions but requires a truly national effort to move to low carbon development pathways*”. In our view that ambition is what SREP has been designed to contribute to, through a programmatic approach with government ownership, full stakeholder involvement, and transformational investments.
4. The reference in para 93 to six projects that fall under the category of “*enabling environment projects*” does not seem to do justice to enabling environment interventions that are part of an investment plan with multiple interventions.
5. The revised framework is unclear on measures of energy poverty. With the SDG7 tracking framework in place, we think the indicator should make reference to the harmonized SDG7 indicators for energy access of the SDG7 global tracking report and delete current references to ESMAP data, MEPI and other.
6. We asked earlier why the significant energy access results of Lighting Ethiopia have been reported by IFC to the bilateral contribution of the NL, but were not included in the results reporting to SREP. With the proposals in this document, would SREP now be able to report these results, or would further modifications be needed?

We feel these comments (and those of other subcommittee members) need to be addressed before approving the revised results framework. For this, we would prefer to see a final version of the document, for approval by email.

On behalf of Sweden and the Netherlands,

Best regards, Frank

**Frank van der Vleuten**

