

Jamaica Improving Climate Data and Information Management Project

Matrix of Comments and Team Responses – Germany (May 30, 2015)

Comments	IBRD Team Response
<p>The majority of the project's budget (USD 3.89 million) is earmarked for hardware to improve data collection capability (Component 1). In order to secure functionality of this hardware in the medium and long term, the proposal states that it "would seek to secure increased resources for operations and maintenance". Yet, it does not specify how these resources would be secured. Therefore, we recommend that the proposal includes a concrete plan for securing long-term financing options to ensure the operations and maintenance of the data collection hardware upon conclusion of the project.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. Sustainability of equipment (including O&M) is a key consideration for the Project. Indeed many countries have a weak record regarding the sustainability of hydro-met investments and responsible agencies continue to be faced with declining user fees for services provided and aging/unserviceable equipment. In the case of Jamaica, the existing radar is obsolete (over 20 years old and there are no readily available parts in many cases) and the costs of servicing the same are currently unsustainable. Therefore it is foreseen that replacing this radar with a newer model that has readily available parts and services would greatly lower the O&M costs. Also, past history and current commitments from the Government reflect a level of ownership that would ensure that the equipment procured is maintained as a core part of capacity and institutional strengthening for enhanced climate resilience island-wide. The sustainability through securing O&M costs has been discussed with Government and has already been included in the national capital budget. The proposed Project has already presented the case for the need to secure O&M resources in the national budget exercise. (See Para.25)</p>
<p>We appreciate that the proposal foresees carrying out vulnerability assessments in selected priority sectors. Yet, while naming agriculture and water as two potential sectors, it does not provide information about why these two were selected or if a prioritization process has already taken place. Thus, we kindly suggest providing additional information regarding the pre-selection of agriculture and water as priority sectors for vulnerability assessments.</p>	<p>The SPCR identified water resources, agriculture, tourism, human health, and human settlements as priority sectors. (See Annex 6.). The focus on agriculture and water is critical since (a) some of the most vulnerable and poor communities in Jamaica are farmers, (b) food security in Jamaica is closely linked to the impact of climate variability and change (e.g., pests and increasingly longer droughts, floods, storms) which affect productivity, and (c) Jamaica is increasingly faced with either too much water (due to heavy and intense rainfall leading to floods) or too little water (due to frequent</p>

	<p>droughts). The economy-wide knock-on effects of reduced agricultural productivity and or too little/too much water tend to be negative almost always and in most cases increases the vulnerability of poor communities/households to climate related hazards. Jamaica's SPCR clearly articulated some of these issues and hence the design of the Project is meant to contribute to implementing measures in areas that were consultatively identified in the SPCR as priority sectors. We will highlight this point in the PAD.</p>
<p>Moreover, given the cost-implications of carrying out country-wide sectoral vulnerability assessments and the significant additional work planned under Component 2, the allocated budget (USD 1.32 million) seems relatively small. Against this backdrop, we recommend further elaborating the scope of the envisaged vulnerability assessments and carefully planning the feasibility of these activities within the stated budget.</p>	<p>Major activities under Component 2 are the vulnerability assessments and the costed sector plan for the health sector. The costing of these activities is informed by the experience in developing the SPCR and the Phase I of PPCR. In addition, some earlier work on vulnerability assessments has been undertaken for example on the water sector. What the early work was missing included data gaps, downscaled climate models, and robust analytics and this is where the Project would really add value. Indeed selectivity will guide the final scoping (building on other past work) for the development of vulnerability assessment will be carefully done to ensure value for money.</p>
<p>We further welcome that sub-component 2.4 foresees "carrying out community risk profiling and developing targeted early warning messaging for vulnerable groups". Yet, as the scope of this activity is not clearly defined, we suggest indicating how many community risk profiles are to be carried out, how the communities are to be selected, and how vulnerable groups are to be targeted.</p>	<p>The GoJ and the Bank have just conducted appraisal of the Project and agreed on the indicators. In addition, a Working Group will be established in the first quarter of the Project implementation period in order to consultatively develop appropriate strategies for achieving behavior change and ensuring that the most vulnerable groups are appropriately targeted and reached.</p>
<p>The proposal states that the project will include "the development of a number of products based on climate change scenarios that are relevant at the scale of individual watersheds". One important output of these activities is tracked by the third Project Development Objective Indicator ("Number of people (disaggregated by gender) supported by the Project to cope with climate change and risks, specifically through targeted early warning systems for vulnerable groups and other measures"). However, it remains unclear what these "other measures" exactly entail. We thus recommend detailing what sorts of (knowledge) products will be developed as a result of the climate change scenarios in order that the end-use of the climate data</p>	<p>The anticipated products at local level include early warning communication messages and dissemination of information regarding adaptation measures; targeted attitude and behavioral change campaigns in which various materials are developed and used such as animation, cartoons, support materials for school curriculum, and training; and Climate change information, education and communication (IECC) initiatives which will use creative arts to further promote climate awareness at the community and national levels.</p>

as well as the scope of the third Project Development Objective Indicator is made clear.	(See Annex 2 Component 2). Local end-users also benefit from the development of State of Jamaica 2015 and 2019 as well as the multi-agency climate and natural hazard risk data and information sharing system and clearing-house. The details of M&E definitions and measures are described in the POM.
Moreover, this indicator does not contain a specific target so far, which makes it difficult to judge on its level of ambition. We kindly ask to provide information how many people will be targeted by the third Project Development Indicator.	A Working Group for awareness raising and behavioral change led by Climate Change Division under the Ministry of Water, Land, Environment and Climate Change will be established in the first quarter of the Project implementation period in order to consultatively develop appropriate strategies for reaching the most vulnerable groups. It is based on the number of targeted vulnerable communities that the Project will compute the direct and indirect beneficiaries of this activity.
The institutional arrangement of the proposed project foresees that the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) serves as the executing agency, and further assigns an advisory and oversight role to the PPCR Steering Committee. Actual implementation, however, will fall to seven different agencies. Lack of experience and coordination among different implementing agencies are considered a moderate risk. Against this backdrop, we would suggest including an intermediate indicator that would be applicable to each focal point within the implementing agencies and hold each agency accountable for its deliverables.	Thank you for the suggestion. This is considered an output-level indicator, thus it will be included into the M&E plan in the Project Operational Manual (in the PAD we are strongly asked to focus on results indicators).
We highly appreciate that the project design “drew on the extensive coverage and findings of the 2005 and 2012 Climate Change Knowledge, Attitude and Behavioral Practice (KAP) Surveys”. Yet, it remains unclear why the related Intermediate Results Indicator 3 (% increase in climate change knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP)) uses the KAP survey from 2005 and not 2012 as a baseline. Therefore, we recommend examining if Intermediate Results Indicator 3 could also use the KAP survey from 2012 as a baseline and assessing if its target would have to be adjusted.	Thank you for pointing it out. The language on the baseline was updated during the recent Project appraisal where 2012 is indeed the baseline.
Gender The proposal cites a higher vulnerability for women in the face of climate change based on the higher incidence of poverty for women in rural areas, and their role as subsistence farmers, which makes them more vulnerable to changes in the climate. While it includes certain gender-sensitive indicators, we feel that gender	The vulnerability assessments will take into consideration gender aspects and differential vulnerability profiles such as some basic gender concepts including examination of the household as a site of uneven gender power relations. The analysis then considers the direct and indirect impact of climate-related events attempting to quantify the

<p>considerations could be further strengthened in the project design itself. Thus, we recommend that the proposal includes a description of how the improved climate data could be used to generate gender-sensitive knowledge products and adaptation measures. Furthermore, we recommend assessing how gender considerations could be integrated into Component 1’s training activities, as well as Component 2’s health sector assessment.</p>	<p>unrecorded losses that accrued to women specifically. (See Para. 24 in Annex 2.)</p> <p>Based on these assessments and other interventions such as the Working Group for awareness raising and behavioral change led by CCD, the behavioral change campaigns would consider different strategies for men and women to reach vulnerable groups. (See Para. 41 in Annex 2.)</p> <p>Training activities under Component 1 are for data providers, and are not targeting vulnerable communities/groups.</p>
---	--