

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**