

CIF MDB Committee Terms of Reference

Comment Type	Commenter Name	Commenter Profile	Comment	Date
Comment 1	jan.wilscher@giz.de	Germany	<p>Germany thanks the MDBs and CIFSEC for preparing the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the MDB Committee. We welcome the outlined objectives and responsibilities of the MDB Committee as well as its strengthened role within the context of TFC meetings. Moreover, we appreciate the harmonization of MDB activities and the envisaged closer coordination by the MDB Committee.</p> <p>The proposed TORs reflect the recommendations made by the independent consultants in the report of the Governance Review Phase 1, that also highlighted the importance of stronger MDB engagement. We thus see that the ToR will greatly contribute to achieving this goal.</p> <p>We have a few suggestions for amendments below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paragraph 13 - We highly appreciate the MDBs' evaluations and views if possible in advance of TFC meetings and encourage the MDB Committee to share its views in writing so we would suggest deleting "to the extend feasible" and add "when feasible ahead of the meeting" at the end of the sentence. - Paragraph 26 - One day before the TFC meetings, the CIF CEO and the MDB Committee have a regular meeting in-person or virtual. Is this the same as the preparatory meeting we are usually scheduling between the TFC and the MDBs one day ahead of the formal meetings? This meeting should remain in place. - Paragraph 28 - Since it is planned to give the MDB Committee its own agenda item, called "Matters arising from discussion of the MDB Committee" during the TFC meetings, the question for us is whether this agenda item is included in each meeting format (Joint TFC, CTF and SCF meeting, as well as the GCAP Sub-Committee Meeting)? - Paragraph 31 – We welcome that the CIFSEC should support the MDB Committee. But given the number of several programmes running in parallel and the operationalization of the CCMM, we would need further clarification if the CIFSEC has sufficient capacities for this additional workload. We would welcome if the CIFSEC could give us an estimate of the additional workload that would result from this newly given role. - Paragraph 38 - We welcome the planned actions under paragraph 38(f) and invite the MDB Committee to include these reviews as part of its agenda item - "Matters arising from discussion of the MDB Committee" - during the TFC meetings. In addition to that, we would like to see the following text in the brackets included under paragraph 38(f): "Undertake regular reviews of the <i>[CTF/SCF portfolio, status of implementation, funding allocations and disbursements for the previous period, pipeline of projects and funding projections, administrative costs incurred, monitored impacts and other pertinent information]</i> and individual funding windows[, provide resulting information to the TFC if so requested] and assist the TFC and CIFSEC with assessing the strength of the <i>[CTF/SCF]</i> pipeline vis-à-vis funding availability, with coordinating MDB activities, and exploring opportunities for joint MDB operational work." - Paragraph 38 - Furthermore, in paragraph 38(h) there might be a typo – the MDB Committee members share information also with the CIFSEC and 	12/15/2023 3:12:48 PM

			<p>the TFC and not just amongst themselves.</p> <p>Furthermore, could you give us an approximate timeline (including the planned next steps) for when the MDB Committee will be operational under its new TOR?</p> <p>We look forward to your response and wish you a nice holiday season!</p> <p>Jan</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Response 1 dlevymolner@worldbankgroup.org CIF Secretariat

Detailed Responses

1/25/2024
12:00:00
AM

Paragraph 13

Comment

We highly appreciate the MDBs’ evaluations and views, if possible, in advance of TFC meetings and encourage the MDB Committee to share its views in writing so we would suggest deleting "to the extent feasible" and add "when feasible ahead of the meeting" at the end of the sentence.

Response

This editing suggestion clarifies and furthers the purpose and intent of Paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 shall be revised accordingly. (See revised ToRs).

Paragraph 26

Comment

One day before the TFC meetings, the CIF CEO and the MDB Committee have a regular meeting in-person or virtual. Is this the same as the preparatory meeting we are usually scheduling between the TFC and the MDBs one day ahead of the formal meetings? This meeting should remain in place.

Response

Thank you for flagging this. To make this clearer, the text of the TOR has been amended as follows:

“Approximately one day before the beginning of the TFC meetings, the CEO will convene an in-person meeting with members of the TFC, the MDB Committee, and CIFSEC to discuss the agenda items of the TFC meetings as well as any other relevant matters. The CEO may convene a virtual meeting further ahead of the TFC meetings, as needed.”

Paragraph 29 (Para. 28 in prior Draft ToRs)

Comment

Since it is planned to give the MDB Committee its own agenda item, called "Matters arising from discussion of the MDB Committee" during the TFC meetings, the question for us is whether this agenda item is included in each meeting format (Joint TFC, CTF and SCF meeting, as well as the GCAP Sub-Committee Meeting)?

Response

Yes, MDBs would like to keep this as an optional possibility for Joint TFC, CTF and SCF meetings, as well as for GCAP meetings, to ensure they have

the space as an MDB Committee to raise issues that are important to the MDBs, but not covered as part of the actual agenda. This, however, does not imply that we need to have such an agenda item, in the form of a placeholder, for every such meeting. "Matters arising from discussion of the MDB Committee" need only be added as an agenda item if there is a specific item the MDB Committee would like to discuss.

Paragraph 32 (Para. 31 in prior Draft ToRs)

Comment

We welcome that the CIFSEC should support the MDB Committee. But given the number of several programmes running in parallel and the operationalization of the CCMM, we would need further clarification if the CIFSEC has sufficient capacities for this additional workload. We would welcome if the CIFSEC could give us an estimate of the additional workload that would result from this newly given role.

Response

The MDBs view CIFSEC support as critical to the continued smooth implementation of CIF programs and, accordingly, suggest that such support be prioritized. The MDBs expect that the support requested of CIFSEC on organisational matters associated with the MDB Committee's activities will be lean and will mainly cover scheduling meetings, preparing the agenda, and summarizing key action points. CIFSEC is confident that, at present, CIFSEC has the right staff, skills, and capacity to provide the necessary support and does not anticipate that the operationalization of the MDB Committee ToRs will make a material difference to its staffing needs and capacity. CIFSEC will monitor this situation over time and will keep the TFCs apprised of any change in CIFSEC's experience and/or assessment of CIFSEC's needs in this regard.

Paragraph 38(f)

Comment

We welcome the planned actions under paragraph 38(f) and invite the MDB Committee to include these reviews as part of its agenda item - "Matters arising from discussion of the MDB Committee" - during the TFC meetings. In addition to that, we would like to see the following text in the brackets included under paragraph 38(f): "Undertake regular reviews of the *[CTF/SCF portfolio, status of implementation, funding allocations and disbursements for the previous period, pipeline of projects and funding projections, administrative costs incurred, monitored impacts and other pertinent information]* and individual funding windows, *[provide resulting information to the TFC if so requested]* and assist the TFC and CIFSEC with assessing the strength of the *[CTF/SCF]* pipeline vis-à-vis funding availability, with coordinating MDB activities, and exploring opportunities for joint MDB operational work."

Response

We have omitted the suggested bracketed text that Germany suggested for inclusion in Paragraph 38(f) because adding such text would not conform with the division of responsibilities between the TFCs, CIFSEC, and the MDB Committee provided for in the Governance Frameworks, as clarified under Annex 1 of the Hosting Arrangement.

Specifically, adding such text would impose responsibilities on the MDB Committee that the Committee would not be able to discharge. CIFSEC has a full view of the full CTF/SCF portfolio, but the MDB Committee does

not. Nor does the MDB Committee have the authority to request the required information of the MDBs. Further, imposing that responsibility on the MDB Committee would duplicate responsibilities assigned to, and being discharged by, CIFSEC. Under the CTF and SCF Governance Frameworks, as clarified by Annex 1 of the Hosting Arrangement, CIFSEC, not the MDB Committee, is charged with responsibility for monitoring and reporting to the TFCs on such information.

The MDBs will be pleased to provide the information listed in Paragraph 38(f). However, the MDBs propose that they provide the information in the context of, and linked to, their presentations of the relevant TFC agenda items where operational progress is discussed during TFC meetings, *instead of* under the “Matters arising from discussion of the MDB Committee” agenda item.

Paragraph 38(h)

Comment

Furthermore, in paragraph 38(h) there might be a typo – the MDB Committee members share information also with the CIFSEC and the TFC and not just amongst themselves.

Response

Paragraph 38(h) is not a typo. The provision clarifies the expectation that the MDBs will share such information amongst themselves as members of the MDB Committee. The MDBs’ obligations to share such information with the TFCs, CIFSEC and the World Bank as Trustee is separately provided for in the Governance Frameworks and other governance documents, such as the Financial Procedures Agreements.

Comment

Furthermore, could you give us an approximate timeline (including the planned next steps) for when the MDB Committee will be operational under its new TOR?

Response

The ToRs will go into effect immediately upon approval by the CTF and SCF Committees, expected early to mid-February. In due course, the substance of the TOR provisions will be formalized in the SCF and CTF Governance Frameworks and/or CIF Operational Manual, as appropriate. Should the second phase of the Governance and Operational Review indicate that further updates to the MDB Committee ToRs are warranted, such updates would be effected and, in due course, formalized, in a similar manner.

Additional Editorial Clarifications

In addition to responding to Germany’s comments and suggestions in the manner indicated above, the revised ToRs reflect some editorial clarifications as follows:

Paragraph 31 (Para. 30 in prior Draft ToRs)

Original text

The understandings concerning the Pre-, Post- and During TFC meetings reflected in these ToRs will be reflected in the CIF Operations Manual.

Revised text

The provisions concerning the Pre-, Post- and During TFC meetings reflected in these ToRs will be reflected in the CIF Operations Manual.

Paragraph 38(o)

Original text

Consult with the CEO of CIFSEC in respect of the recruitment of CIFSEC Program Coordinators.

Revised text

Consult with the CEO of CIFSEC in respect of the recruitment of any Deputy CEO and CIFSEC Program Coordinators.

Paragraph 42

Original text

Such processes will be developed with a view to the MDB Committee representatives having an equal role along with other recruitment panel members, whenever such recruitments involve the convening of a recruitment panel.

Revised text

Such processes will be developed with a view to the MDB Committee representatives having an equal role to each of the other recruitment panel members, whenever such recruitments involve the convening of a recruitment panel.

Next Steps

The revised ToRs have been reviewed and approved by the MDB Committee, CIFSEC and the World Bank as host and Trustee of the CIF. Accordingly, they will now be circulated to the TFCs of the SCF and the CTF for approval on a no-objection basis.

It is expected that the review process will be completed shortly and that the ToRs will go into effect in February 2024.