



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 02/11/2003	
PROJ ID:	P040739	Appraisal	Actual
Project Name :	Planning For Adaptation To Global Climate Change (CPACC) Project (GEF)	Project Costs (US\$M)	6.6 6.22
Country:	Caribbean	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	6.6 6.22
Sector(s):	Board: ENV - Central government administration (100%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)	
L/C Number:		Board Approval (FY)	97
Partners involved :		Closing Date	12/31/2001 03/29/2002
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
John English	Alice C. Galenson	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
The CPACC project's overall objective was to support CARICOM member countries in preparing to cope with the adverse effects of global climate change (GCC), particularly sea level rise in coastal and marine areas, through vulnerability assessment, adaptation planning, and capacity building linked to adaptation planning . Specifically, to:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strengthen regional capacity for monitoring and analyzing climate and sea level dynamics and trends, seeking to determine the immediate and potential impacts of GCC; • identify areas particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of GCC and sea level rise; • develop an integrated management and planning framework for cost -effective response and adaptation to the impacts of GCC on coastal and marine areas; • enhance regional and national capabilities for preparing for the advent of of GCC through institutional strengthening and human resource development; and • identify and assess policy options and instruments to help initiate the implementation of a long -term program of adaptation to GCC in vulnerable coastal areas . 			
b. Components			
At appraisal there were four subcomponents for regional activities, four for national level activities, and two project management activities.			
Regional components - (total estimated cost US\$2,206,000 or 35% of project cost)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and establishment of sea level/climate monitoring network, (US\$824,000) • Establishment of databases and information systems (US\$392,000) • Inventory of coastal resources and use (US\$690,000) • Formulation of a policy framework for integrated coastal and marine management, (US\$300,000) 			
National Components - (total estimated cost US\$1,340,000 or 22% of project cost)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coral reef monitoring for climate change, (US\$406,000) • Coastal vulnerability and risk assessment, (US\$433,000) • Economic valuation of coastal and marine resources, (US\$312,000) • Formulation of economic/regulatory proposals, (US\$189,000). 			
Project management activities - (total estimated cost US\$2,708,000 or 43% of project cost)			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional project implementation and capacity building, (US\$2,038,000) • Executing agency costs, (US\$670,000) 			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
The estimated project cost of US\$ 6.6 million was covered by a GEF grant of SDR 4.66 million. During implementation the value of the SDR fell relative to the dollar so that there was a shortfall of about US\$ 435,000 (7% of expenditure) in the dollar amount available for implementation. This resulted in some downscaling of activities at the end of the implementation period .			

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:

The overall objectives of the project were largely achieved, although some activities (e.g. dissemination and study tours) were curtailed because of the financing shortfall. In particular, substantial progress was achieved in enhancing relevant regional and national capabilities. A Regional Programme Implementation Unit (RPIU) was established together with National Implementation Coordinating Units (NICUs) and National Focal Points (NFPs) in each of the participating countries. However, there were shortfalls in establishing the climate and sea level monitoring systems because of ongoing maintenance problems at some of the small stations established by the project. Thus, the data bases established to date have some gaps. The project was able to assess and identify key policy options for all countries, although the options were not immediately applicable in all cases to government programs. However, the work has provided the basis for implementation of a long-term program.

4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

The RPIU has developed into an effective mechanism for coordinating climate change activities in the region and, through the RPIU, the project had a direct link to the political decision making process. This has led to the recognition at the decision making level of the leadership role in the advocacy for climate change issues which the RPIU now performs in the region. In addition the NFPs and NICUs have emerged as a prominent source of expertise and advocacy for climate change issues nationally and regionally. CPACC has also facilitated the articulation of regional positions for participation in international fora, and regional personnel, mainly NFPs, play a prominent role in the negotiating process. During the course of the project, RPIU staff and NFPs increasingly assisted, and on many occasions represented, the region at global and regional meetings and provided key technical inputs to support the position of the region, thus effectively guiding its agenda.

5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):

The major shortcomings relate to the sustainability of the operation. The ICR reports that considerable progress was achieved in obtaining political buy-in in the CARICOM states, but this was not reflected in a willingness to fund operations. The project was 100% financed from the GEF grant and, when the shortfall due to SDR devaluation appeared, no other financing source was available and operations were scaled back.

The ICR indicates that the project is to be followed by a "Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change" (MACC) project, which will continue operations, but no financing source is reported. In fact, the report on the ICR workshop notes that the "World Bank was commended for its efforts to bring in extra trust fund resources (Canadian and Dutch) in the preparation of MACC and to recover some of the lost CPACC activities."

The ICR reports that "the CARICOM Secretariat is in the process of implementing the decision of the Heads of States to establish a permanent and independent Caribbean Community Climate Change Center". This would presumably be the major actor in implementing the follow-on MACC project. However, it also notes that "much work remains to be done to ensure a sustainable basis for its operations." This apparent state of affairs calls into question the extent of local ownership of the CPACC project and, therefore, its sustainability.

Note: This project was unusual in a number of ways. It was entirely grant funded and implemented in 12 small countries. It arose from the negotiation of the UN sponsored Framework Convention on Climate Change, when it became clear that the small countries of the Caribbean (grouped in CARICOM) needed to collaborate if they were to effectively follow up on the initiatives proposed by the convention. The GEF grant was seen as an appropriate vehicle for kick-starting this process. But, it is not clear who was envisaged as being the **ultimate owner** of the project, and it is also not clear what entity was expected to pick up the baton and continue the effort when this first operation was complete. The experience of this project suggests that the GEF should consider a broader review of policy with respect to the funding of, and responsibility for, climate change related operations in groups of small and/or poor countries.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
Outcome:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Substantial	
Sustainability :	Likely	Unlikely	While the ICR indicates broad political and rhetorical support for this operation, it does not show that financial support is available to allow the program to be continued (see section 5).
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The project was unusual in having a large number of agencies on the implementation side. Additionally, since the operation was grant funded there was no "borrower" per se and no single entity responsible for implementation.

Quality of ICR :

Satisfactory

NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

1. For small developing countries, with scarce human resources and weak adaptive capacity, most effective use can be made of resources by adopting a regional approach (where possible) to meeting their obligations under multilateral environmental agreements .
2. The use of SDR denominated GEF grants introduces a currency risk that needs to be taken into account by building contingency funds in the financing plan .
3. There is a danger that the efforts promoted by GEF and the UNFCCC at large in the area of climate change may be seen by some as an opportunity to capture financial resources instead of the mechanism by which adaptation needs are understood, formulated, internalized and acted upon .
4. Political buy-in is a major implementation and sustainability issue in adaptation to climate change and can be enhanced through a highly visible regional coordination institution, multi -stakeholder committee, public awareness campaigns and involvement of a variety of relevant national ministries .
5. Data networks need strong support at the national level to perform at the level that is expected .

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No**9. Comments on Quality of ICR:**

This is a good quality ICR that provides a great deal of detail on the wide range of activities undertaken by the project. The presentation of the achievements under the wide range of project outputs is exemplary .