



SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

# **Strategic Program for Climate Resilience (SPCR)**

Comments and Response  
SPCR Phase Two Proposal

18 April 2011

Prepared for the  
Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR)

## St. Vincent and the Grenadines

Date for endorsement: April 7, 2011

Comments received from Members of the Sub-Committee:

[Germany](#) (April 5, 2011)

[United Kingdom](#) (April 8, 2011)

### Comments

The following comments were received from Germany and the UK:

#### 1. UK Department for International Development (DFID)

April 8, 2011

Comments from United Kingdom on the Endorsement by Mail of the SPCR for Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Dear Patricia

Overall we thought the proposal was strong and are happy to endorse it. We welcome the fact that it pays special attention to gender issues, it is potentially transformative, it has a basic results framework, and it gives special emphasis to the vulnerable families and communities living and working in the vulnerable coastal areas.

We would like clarification, however, on exactly how loans are being used for components 2 and 3. Also, with respect to the role of the private sector, Project 4.10 seeks to establish collaborative mechanisms between government and the private sector, and the SPCR states that there are various areas to the private sector that would be of particular importance for climate resilience. Please could we have clarification as to how this will be followed up?

Many thanks,

Anna

Anna Bobin | Policy Analyst | Climate Change Adaptation and Low Carbon Development | Policy and Research Division | UK Department for International Development

### RESPONSE:

While the private sector was and continues to be represented in the Technical Working Group that is guiding the SPCR process, it was deemed to our collective advantage to better engage the private sector in a range of possible partnerships and collaborative actions in the early stages of Phase Two. See also Project #3.8 also as an example where NEMO can work more efficiently with the private sector.

The intention then of the small project (4.10 to establish collaborative mechanisms between Government and the private sector) is to involve the business sector, general public and the financial and insurance sector in discussions on how and where collaborative opportunities can be developed regarding climate resilience. For example, with the development of an improved early warning system, Telecom companies may be willing to extend their current support for early warning messaging, to cooperate amongst the Telecoms and further develop this media as a means of updating the public on the status of hurricane activities nearby to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

Another opportunity that could be mutually beneficial to businesses, is the development of weather forecasting in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Sponsoring training or radio programming, public information systems and materials etc. are a few possible areas for future possible collaboration. There are a lot of areas/opportunities where private sector can make financial, human or other contributions to climate resilience.

The concessional financing loans for Component Two (Component 2: Data Collection, Analysis and Information Management) will be for activities:

- i) To improve the decision making capacity of the public and private sectors through the use of primary climate-related data in support of key climate resilience decisions;
- ii) To develop coastal inundation models (based on different hazards) for use in land use planning, disaster management and public education;
- iii) To build community awareness (and build knowledge and capacity) of coastal hazards and their destructive potential;
- iv) To assist in bridging the gap between scientific monitoring/modeling and land use planning;
- v) To develop a harmonised platform for data analysis and data management country-wide; and
- vi) To facilitate unhindered data dissemination, data sharing, and data quality assurance among all stakeholders.

For Component Three (Strengthening of Existing Policy, Legal and Institutional Framework to Address Climate Change), the SPCR support will be:

- i) To develop a draft integrated watershed conservation and management policy and action plan;
- ii) To strengthen institutions for adjusting to climate resilience;
- iii) To improve the technical and institutional capacity of the Metrology Office to collect, analyse, predict, and disseminate climate data to all stakeholders;
- iv) To strengthen the technical capacity of the Central Water and Sewerage Authority (CWSA) in the areas of hydrology, drainage and waste water management;
- v) To raise awareness of climate change and resilience issues amongst Government and the private sector in particular; to describe the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders (incl. regional responsibilities); and to describe the mutual benefits of partnerships;
- vi) To mainstream climate resilience into the Policy and Legislative framework of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines;
- vii) To develop and legislate comprehensive water conservation and management policy and action plan for the Grenadines and by extension SVG;
- viii) To improve the institutional capacity of NEMO to guide the national programmes both of the public and private sectors in building resilience in support of climate change adaptation using public education as a vehicle;
- ix) To develop and implement a national public education programme that will provide information and guidance necessary to build community based climate resilience;
- x) To build skills, knowledge and awareness of climate change and resilience issues for high school teachers and youth; to develop appropriate curriculum materials for all levels of high school students, to research and utilize existing examples from the region or elsewhere to be adapted for SVG.

## 1.2 GIZ 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 crosscutting 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 it 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 (modeling, 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 homogenized (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.**

#### **RESPONSE:**

The design of the SPCR was an inclusive process with a range of Government and non-Government individuals and organizations forming the Technical Working Group responsible for guiding the preparation of the SPCR. The inclusion (or not) of interventions, irrespective of the scale of operation, was and should remain the decision of the stakeholders.

In order to streamline the implementation process, it has been foreseen that for practical reasons (procurement, contracts, work plans, mutually supportive activities etc.), there will be a consolidation of certain activities during project preparation and implementation.

Indeed, it was thought to be a sensible measure to retain “investment projects” and “technical assistance measures” together to provide a clearer picture of how the hard issues (goods) are clearly supported by the softer support services, knowledge management etc. We are pleased you applaud this arrangement. Yes indeed, “it requires proper integration of hard and soft measures within the individual components” as illustrated in the documents.

Regarding indicators: there are a number of purposes for which indicators have been developed in the SPCR including for example; project management, monitoring, achievement of objectives, performance, risk aversion etc. For this reason the opportunity to monitor and measure change over time is seen to be a valuable means of tracking such variables. The PPCR Guidelines and templates include all the sections mentioned (in Part Two: Section 4. Key Indicators and Baseline, Section 7. Results and Performance Logical Framework and in Part One: Expected Key results from the Implementation of the Investment Strategy - consistent with PPCR Results Framework).

All key concerns will be addressed in the project implementation phase, including those urgent matters that can be addressed during the project preparations, expected to commence as soon as possible.

End