

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
202.622.9352 (o)