Netherlands comments relating to topics discussed at the June 22, 2010 SREP Sub-Committee meeting

Dear SREP Co-Chairs and CIF Admin Unit,

With regard to the SREP draft summary mentioned above the Netherlands would like to reiterate its position with regard to the following:

- = SREP Programming Modalities and Operational Guidelines =
- + para 10: blending op SREP financing with co-financing should not be a condition, especially for LIC's. NL has objections because of the debt repayment problems of LIC's
- + para 12 (a): transformative impact. NL would like to know how this will be measured. What is the progress with respect to the elaboration of the indicators of the result measurement framework as agreed in the SC of March 2010?
- + para 12 (f)(iv): high cost for consumers should not result in subsidies
- + sub 34 (a): GWh refers to energy but should be MW as the indicator is installed capacity. Should explicitly refer to 'Renewable Energy' instead of 'Energy'
- + sub 34 (c): It is unclear what 'Energy Services'refers to. As 'Low Carbon Development'(NAMAs) may include fuel switching, it is appropriate to mention 'Renewable Energy Only'in this paragraph
- + para 45 advances: not needed to get approval from SC for advance payments
- + para 46 joint mission: local donors active in the energy sector should be informed during the identification missions to ensure added value of SREP interventions. Importance of communication at country level via e.g. briefings for stakeholders and donors.
- = Information Note on the Use of Hybrid Systems under SREP =
- + SREP funding should only be used for RE as defined in the guidelines.

Non-RE should be financed from other sources

- + para 20 (a) and (b): agreed
- + Para 20 (c) and (d): not agreed

- = SREP financing modalities =
- + para 6 : blending should not be a condition/obligation. Should also be possible to have stand alone SREP projects
- + para 9 : also important to involve the LOCAL private sector
- + para 16: advance requests should not be approved by the SREP SC. The MDB committee will have the delegated authority
- + para 30: not in favour of concessional loans to LDC's because of the repayment problems of debts
- + para 59: as the standard percentage fee allocation on supervision for private projects is not defined, it is difficult to agree with this issue.