

# CLIMATE INVESTMENT FUNDS



**REVISED PPCR Results Framework**  
**Guido Geissler**  
**CIF Administrative Unit**



# SREP results framework - Simplification

CIF

## **SREP results framework**

– approved Nov 10 -  
National level indicators: 13  
Project/program indicators: 9  
Total: **21**



## **Investment Plans**

Ethiopia  
Honduras  
Kenya  
Maldives  
Mali  
Nepal



**Living document**

**Learning-by-doing**




## **REVISED SREP results framework**

– DRAFT for discussion March 12 -  
National level indicators: 5  
Project/program indicators: 0  
Total: **5**



# Scaling Up Renewable Energy Program in Low Income Countries (SREP) – Logic model



**Project/Program** – SREP Indicative Outputs & Outcomes  
**Project / Program** – SREP Indicative Activities

Increased access to clean energy      Increased supply of renewable energy (RE)      New & additional resources for renewable energy projects/programs

Market expansion for clean cookstoves and lighting products      Scale up of grid-connected RE generation      Grid-extension      Improved grid infrastructure (transmission, storage)      New mini-grids

Community energy provision

Renewable Energy  
•Infrastructure  
•Capacity  
•Financing (grants and highly concessional loans)

New & additional resources supplementing existing ODA flows

# SREP indicators

CIF

Impact:  
Support low carbon development pathways by reducing energy poverty and increasing energy security

Indicator 1: National measure of 'energy poverty' such as Energy Development Index (EDI) or the Multi-dimensional Energy Poverty Index

Indicator 2: Increase in annual electricity output from RE - GWh

Outcome 1:  
Increased access to clean energy

Number of women/men and community/ businesses benefitting from improved energy access

Outcome 2: Increased supply of renewable energy (RE)

Annual electricity output from RE delivered by SREP (GWh)"

Outcome 3: New and additional resources for renewable energy project/ programs

Leverage factor of SREP: \$ financing from other sources (contributions broken down by MDBs, governments, multilaterals and bilaterals, CSOs, private sector)

SREP Sub-Committee did not endorse revised SREP  
results framework

**BUT**

- **endorsed in principle** the revised logic model;
- **agreed to focus indicators on impact and outcome** level mainly; and
- requested CIF AU and the MDBs to fine-tune some of the indicators

# Linking projects/programs with investment plan objectives

CIF

The pilot country is the **central reporting unit**

This requires that we work together to establish good baseline data and targets for the five core indicators

This requires that projects/programs...

- ❖ ... clearly articulate how the outputs will contribute to a PPCR outcome
- ❖ ... results frameworks at the program/project level comprise a set of concise output indicators
- ❖ ... submitted for Sub-Committee approval include a DRAFT project/program results framework for review

# PPCR results framework - Simplification

CIF

## PPCR results framework

– approved Nov 10

National level indicators: 15

Project/program indicators: 8

Total: **23**



## SPCRs

Bangladesh

Bolivia

Cambodia

Mozambique

Nepal

Niger

Tajikistan

Yemen

Zambia

South-Pacific – Samoa, Papua New  
Guinea, Tonga

Caribbean - Dominica, Grenada, Haiti,  
Jamaica, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent & the  
Grenadines



**Living document**



## REVISED PPCR results framework

– DRAFT for discussion May/June 2012 -

National level indicators: ?

Project/program indicators: ?

Total: **5, 8, 10, 12?**

**Learning-by-doing**

Let's work together:

Review PPCR logic model:

**Do we need to change the logic model?**

Identify limited number of indicators

**Which indicators are really needed versus nice to have?**



# Managing for Results – working together

CIF

**Thank you!**