

UK comments on the first annual report on the CIFs

- Welcome the document – very useful, the detail is good for sharing with stakeholders, we are glad to see lesson learning as a focus.

Self-critical approach

- We are anxious to ensure it is balanced so that it is as useful and as credible as possible. Currently it does not really draw out lessons or take a self-critical approach, but rather describes how the design of the CIFs was new and innovative – with the risk of reading like a promotional piece. Understand the sensitivities, but it is very important to acknowledge mistakes frankly in order to gain credibility for the successes as well.
- Learning lessons in an open manner is a challenge to any institution, but this is a way the CIFs can be pioneering.
- Pp.13-14 provide examples where we're not really taking a critical view of experience to date (e.g. innovative design, country-led process, targeting transformational technologies and practices, engaging the full range of stakeholders) and this is likely to be picked up on by civil society. Very positive about the country-led process and the engagement of stakeholders, but this has not been an unmitigated success e.g. broad agreement that the first Partnership Forum could be improved upon, and the Admin Unit and TFC have taken this on board in their planning for the second one. Could also usefully cover discussions with civil society on FIP design and degree to which principles of country ownership have been systematically applied.
- We welcome the openness of the comments on MDB collaboration.

Analysis and reflection

- The description and detail is very useful, but there is scope for more analysis, which sets out what exactly has been learned and how things could be done in the future by the Climate Investment Funds and other institutions
- It would be helpful for it to be more analytical about why particular features were successful or not, and how they could be altered as a result. In the last two paras of p.37, and the third and fourth paras on p. 47, can we explain what these observations *mean*, and as a result what we'll do next? P.48 is good – but can we explain *why* we've put these things in place and what that means for improving the CIFs and for learning lessons for other fora? Also on p.48, what did we learn from the first PF, and how will we do it differently next time?
- Welcome Kathy Sierra's suggestion of including a box on the emerging areas for lesson learning identified in Jamie Radner's initial report.

Additional areas to cover

- We suggest there are lessons to be learned about how missions are conducted, given this is a critical design feature.
- More should be said about the role of allocation criteria and expert groups, and lessons learned about their utility.

- P.14 there's a reference to countries applying for funding under the PPCR – this needs to be adjusted to reflect the expert group process.
- The 'at a glance' boxes are very useful, but do not all include active observers, GEF, AF, UNFCCC etc as appropriate.
- More could be said about the leveraging of private finance for national plans, which is one of the most innovative features.
- Some reflection on what the term "transformational" means in practice would be useful.

Informing climate finance discussions

- Pleased to see the final reference that lessons need to be learned ahead of a new climate change agreement, but this could be made more explicit at the beginning.
- Some concern that lessons learnt are seen as relevant to internal lesson learning to "inform further implementation of the Climate Investment Funds" rather than the broader response to the challenge of climate change, which is a key objective of the Climate Investment Funds as a whole. This needs to be addressed explicitly, while ensuring we're not seen as 'lobbying' the negotiators.

Specific terminology

- Would be helpful to use 'transformational' throughout rather than 'transformative', and to ensure we're talking about 'low carbon, climate resilient' development throughout, not just 'low carbon'.
- The end of the first para on p.29 seems to conflate development spending with climate spending – we have some concerns around this language as it may raise concerns about the TFC's views on additionality.
- The second para of p.38 should also mention indigenous peoples.