

March 18, 2013

Comments from United Kingdom on Approved by Mail: Yemen: Climate Information System and PPCR Program Coordination (IBRD)

Dear Andrea,

We do have some comments (attached) and we'd be grateful if you would pass them on.

Many thanks,
Anna

Anna Bobin | Policy Analyst, Low Carbon Development and Adaptation Teams | Climate and Environment Department

UK comments on Yemen SPCR project – Climate Information System and PPCR Program Coordination

- The political and security risks to success of the project don't appear to be adequately addressed in this document, which is lacking in specific measures to address these. It should outline how the project would maintain flexibility as the political and security context changes, as it is likely to do following the election. The broader context of the transitional government and upcoming elections will surely make the difficulty of coordination between different agencies in the hydromet chain even harder. We would like to see the risks better considered and plans in place to mitigate in implementation, and details to be shared with the sub-committee.
- How will the hydromet services be designed to ensure they are in a useful format for end-users? Quite a difficult thing to do and not clear how this will happen or what mechanisms are for stakeholder consultation to do this, such as participatory downscaling.
- There seem to be opportunities for linking with the private sector not maximised in this project design, domestic and international business would surely find climate information useful for planning investments – most significantly in the agricultural and fisheries sectors - and insurers and financial institutions for calculating risk.
- The original SPCR document states that weather forecasts will be published in national newspapers; aired on radio and television. In the project proposal there is no mention of how and whether the forecasts will be distributed to the media. It would be useful to know who would own the weather forecast data, whether it would be supplied to the media by the Government, and if this is a commercial arrangement (and who benefits from this).
- On monitoring and evaluation some of the indicators could be improved. Most are process indicators and are not easily quantifiable, baselines and targets are lacking as are details on how they will be monitored. It is good that institutionally responsibilities and budget

have been allocated to M and E, more details would be appreciated on when and how the Results Framework will be improved for these points. Specific feedback on some of the indicators:

- Result indicator e: the original SPCR document specifies that there would be early warning systems in three at risk regions. This has now been scaled back to two. Why is this? It would also be useful to know where these regions are and the rationale for choosing them
- The indicators on integration of climate change into development planning (f, h and i) could be improved as they are all process and don't seem measure this outcome, given the importance of this aspect for investment criteria and as a core indicator. Could they pick up on some indicators from the recent Zambia PPCR Hydromet project that was measuring similar things?
- The project appears to have quite a high proportion of costs on supervision services (5% of the value of the programme cost), and within the programme budget on consultancy and training (\$7.5m out of a total budget of \$19m). Could a further breakdown of the costs be provided?
- Little evidence of the sustainability of the PCU arrangements in the long term, will this really build national core civil service capacity? Does the PCU has sufficient financial management expertise to manage fiduciary risks associated with a large amount of infrastructure and procurement – especially given Financial Management controls are rated substantial in the risk annex.