

April 5, 2011

**Comments from Germany on the Endorsement by Mail of the SPCR for
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**

Dear Andrea,

Please find attached our comments on the SPCR proposal for Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Although in principal we very much support the proposal we would suggest a number of major structural changes which we believe will not be possible during implementation but should rather be done before any further work commences. In our view it is particularly crucial to link in a results chain objectives and interventions with outcomes, which is not the case for a number of sectors and especially so for the cross-cutting issues.

Thank you very much for the hard work the PPCR team has already put into this proposal and we are confident that with our suggested improvement it will be an excellent SPCR.

Kind regards
Annette

Dr. Annette Windmeisser
Klimapolitik und Klimafinanzierung
Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung

Climate Policy and Climate Financing
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development

Comments on St Vincent and the Grenadines' Strategic Programme for Climate Resilience

Summary

We would like to commend the government St Vincent and the Grenadines for presenting a very elaborate SPCR document. Its selection of vulnerable sectors (water, health, coastal and inland environment, tourism, agriculture, fisheries, and infrastructure) appears sensible. It addresses the right issues, and presents an extensive analysis of climate change and its likely future impacts, especially in particularly vulnerable areas (the red zone). Much thought has been given to identifying key areas of intervention, and to outlining individual interventions, the majority of which will in all likelihood improve climate resilience and contribute to capacity building on different levels. However, the range of interventions presented does appear somewhat broad and unspecific, and partly disjoint. At the same time, some key interventions obviously required to reach the desired outcome described in the SPCR appear to be lacking. Also, resource allocation does appear somewhat unbalanced between individual interventions. Furthermore, the proposed interventions have a certain technical bias, causing us to suppose that issues of gender, learning and knowledge sharing may fall somewhat short.

In summary, there are no major objections from our point of view.

However, we would like to suggest that some adjustments and clarifications be made in the SPCR document, as recommended below (see **bold** highlights).

Comments on Individual Projects / Measures

Unlike other SPCR documents, the Saint Vincent and the Grenadines phase two proposal does not differentiate between “investment projects” and “technical assistance measures”, but rather groups activities into four major components. This would appear to be a rather sensible approach, because it combines investment in hard infrastructure with the studies to prepare such investment, and the capacity building measures to bring them to full use.

However, this design is also quite demanding, because it requires proper integration of hard and soft measures within the individual components, and because it makes it harder to design a coherent logical framework with clearly attributable and measurable outcomes. And here the current SPCR document reveals some weaknesses. Outcomes are defined in at least three different places: (1) in the *Description of SPCR* (in the *Narrative*), (2) in Key Indicators and Baseline (in *Part Two ... Components*), and in (3) the Logical Framework (also in *Part Two ... Components*). The defined outcomes differ between these three places. Probably owing to this unclear description of outcomes, the proposed indicators to measures these outcomes remain rather vague. Furthermore, for most of the interventions proposed in *5. Components and Activities* (of *Part Two ... Components*) it remains somewhat unclear whether and how they will contribute to achieving the intended outcomes. Vice versa, some of the expected outcomes have no corresponding activities that would contribute to achieving these outcomes (gender-sensitive policies are a case in point, see below).

Obviously, much thought has been given to elaborating the individual proposed interventions. Project outlines with volumes ranging from US\$ 2 million (*1.2.1 River Defense*) down to US\$ 7,500 (*4.7 Extension of Social Risk Assessment*) have been prepared. Some of the proposed (smaller) interventions are rather activities, which could be integrated into others, in order to reduce complexity and increase coherence and manageability of the SPCR. For instance, 1.3.4 (modelling, US\$ 100,000) and 1.3.5 (coastal defense, US\$ 1,900,000) seem to be part of one larger package (protecting Georgetown from coastal erosion) rather than individual “projects”.

For some of the proposed interventions, rather limited resources appear to have been allocated. For instance, the reviewers doubt whether, even though the population of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is just over 100,000 people, a *Public Education and Capacity Building Programme* (4.1) could be implemented with a budget of only US\$ 300,000, or whether US\$ 60,000 would be sufficient for *Planning and Development of an Early Warning System* (4.2). By comparison, the project for *Enhancing the Technical and Institutional Capacity of the Metrology Office* (3.3) has a rather generous training budget allocation of US\$ 125,000.

We therefore recommend:

In order to sharpen the focus, the formulation of objectives and expected outcomes should be homogenised (reduced from the current three versions to just one).

In order to clarify the impact logic, and in order to avoid spreading resources too thin, the current broad range of proposed interventions should be consolidated into fewer, more coherent, and possibly larger packages. While consolidating, it may be advisable to drop some of the interventions.

At the same time, it should be clarified for each of the remaining packages precisely how the package will contribute to achieving the expected outcomes.

Specific Comments on National Spatial Data Infrastructure

Numerous countries already have a National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) in place. And a NSDI certainly is a useful prerequisite for properly managing climate and climate change data. However, it is questionable whether, in the absence of an existing NSDI, the highly concessional PPCR loan resources should be used to establish an NSDI. **We therefore recommend to examine whether the initial establishment of an NSDI could be (co-)funded from other resources, while PPCR resources would be used to ensure proper integration of climate and climate change data. For the entire *Component 2 Data collection, Analysis and Information Management*, we also recommend to elaborate linkages and cooperation with the PPCR's regional track in greater detail, since data collection without strong and well-defined linkages to the regional track will be incomplete and will likely result in considerable duplication.**

Comments on Cross-Cutting Issues

Participation

As reported in the Narrative, substantial efforts were made to ensure participation of different stakeholders, and participatory processes were used extensively during the SPCR design. It is highly commendable that these processes gave priority to vulnerable communities and families. Among others, an in-depth social assessment based on a statistically valid sample was conducted, focusing in particular on communities and families in vulnerable locations. Furthermore, a number of consultations with public and the private sector representatives were held. Also, in section 5. *Components and Activities* (of *Part Two ... Components*), the importance of stakeholder and community participation is mentioned explicitly in several proposed interventions. However, consultations and stakeholder involvement are missing in several of the larger and more important proposed interventions, for instance in 1.1.4 (where participatory elements to decide upon the to-be-implemented forestry management activities would be sensible); 1.1.5, 1.2.5, 1.3.2 (where community involvement would be highly appropriate while delineating drainage channels and buffer zones, and defining legal and legislative implications for the communities); and 3.7 (where participation in design the water conservation and management policy and action plan might be advisable). **We recommend reviewing proposed interventions once again in order to make sure sufficient room for participation will be provided during actual implementation of the SPCR. Especially for *Component 3 Strengthening of Existing Policy...* as a whole, a stronger process-orientation and increased efforts to include groups of relevant actors is recommended.**

Gender

During preparation of the SPCR, substantial efforts to ensure participation and gender-differentiation in assessing and addressing the impacts of climate change have been made. Under *Programme Results*, a *Gender-sensitive Shelter Management Policy* is listed as an outcome indicator. The Narrative explains that sectoral plans, derived from the National Economic and Social Development Plan, will be climate and gender sensitive. However, it remains unclear how this outcome will be reached. None of the proposed interventions listed under any of the four components directly contributes to addressing the issue of gender-sensitive shelter management. Furthermore, shelter management is only one small aspect of gender considerations to be expected in a comprehensive climate change programme. **We therefore recommend to (a) include interventions that directly contribute to achieving the stated result of gender sensitive disaster risk management and to (b) incorporate gender issue more prominently and visibly in the components of the SPCR and the proposed interventions, in particular in Component 4.**

Learning

One of the PPCR's key objectives is to enable learning and sharing of lessons at the country as well as at the regional level. While aspects of learning and sharing lessons are being emphasised in a number of places throughout the SPCR document, there are no proposed interventions (apart from proposed intervention 4.12 that targets the *regional* exchange, and interventions 2.2 and 3.3 mentioning the potential usefulness of close collaboration, once again with *regional* organisations) that support knowledge management and learning from the experiences made during implementation of the SPCR. Rather, it appears that the SPCR document is assuming that knowledge management will be brought about automatically through "actions ... throughout the four components", without specifying what these actions would consist of. Also, it remains unclear which institutional arrangements (e.g. with universities) and networks will be used to support learning and sharing lessons. **We therefore recommend that (a) the SPCR lay out in greater detail how knowledge management and learning from experience will be ensured, how lessons learned will contribute to successful scaling up, and how insights gained will feed back into policy making, including proposed institutional arrangements, and that (b) actual interventions be proposed to directly support knowledge management, learning from experience, and scaling up.**

Incorporating German Climate Change Related Engagement in the Country / Region

German Development Cooperation has currently no activities in St Vincent and the Grenadines, but is working at the regional level with CARICOM through GIZ. There has been an appraisal mission by GIZ in November 2010 for a regional proposal, which aims to foster marine and coastal protected areas in the CARICOM region. St Vincent and the Grenadines are part of this regional proposal. **We recommend that reference be made in the SPCR document to this regional proposal, in order to ensure alignment with other donor funded activities as required in the PPCR objectives.**