

## **Re: Sixth Replenishment of GEF Resources (GEF-6), Documents prepared for meeting in New Delhi, India, September 10-11, 2013- Comments from the World Bank as an Implementing Agency**

### **Introduction**

The Bank, in its role as an Implementing Agency for the GEF, believes that unprecedented growth in the urgency, complexity, and interconnectedness of global environment issues across our planet provides a compelling reason to increase the mobilization of funds in the 6<sup>th</sup> Replenishment cycle to help all countries address these challenges.

The GEF was established, and operates, with a global reach and mandate as the financial mechanism for the large global environmental international conventions, is well placed to help channel incremental but critically important grant resources to fund actions to stimulate early stage capacity and building block investments.

The World Bank Group similarly holds a global mandate with a special development focus on ending poverty and boosting prosperity for all. We believe there remains an important opportunity and role for GEF funding to help countries innovate, demonstrate, catalyze, and mainstream action on global environment issues within larger investment frameworks that the World Bank supports in partnership with client countries.

Over the past two replenishment cycles of the GEF, we have seen an increasing fragmentation of GEF resources, driven by a number of GEF reforms including, the adoption of the RAF and the updated STAR allocation systems, an increase in the number of priorities and global environment issues addressed by the GEF, as well as Trust Funds, and an expanding number of implementing partners with direct access to grant resources. This is evidenced by a statement in the Strategic Positioning paper that highlights that, **“the average grant size of the GEF during GEF-5 to date is \$2.5 million USD”**, which is far below levels that can make a substantial impact in a national development investment context. While the average size of GEF grants in the World Bank program is larger than the average, the opportunities for programming sufficiently sized projects has, in general, declined.

While these reforms may have been introduced for compelling reasons on their own merit, these factors, combined with challenges being experienced to financially sustain our basic corporate engagement, are testing the World Bank’s ability to remain a proactive GEF partner. Nonetheless, we feel that there persists a shared interest in channeling GEF grant resources through the World Bank Group to a diverse client base to meet both the demands of a continually growing global environmental agenda and to ensure that concessional funds are cost effectively integrated within larger national and regional investment strategies for widest impact.

The topics raised and debated upon in the Second Replenishment Papers in New Delhi are considered timely with respect to the need to take stock and explore the collective vision for the GEF. What is an acceptable average grant size to ensure cost efficiency and impact? How do donors believe GEF resources can be most efficiently channeled, and based on what balance of equity and impact? How can that be matched with the needs and expectations of recipient countries to tackle these agendas within their own contexts and capacities? If some of these larger strategic questions can be answered then it may help provide more focused direction toward a common vision.

There is a need for a collective effort to ensure that the sum of the GEF’s funding parts is greater than the whole. The World Bank Group believes that the answer lies, in part, in the urgent need to revitalize the partnership. The agencies, the operational arms of the GEF, collectively possess vast experience and ongoing engagement through their core development programs on similar or complementary issues. GEF funding should flexibly and strategically compliment rather than try to initiate or lead this work.

We welcome the opportunity to provide the following comments on the replenishment documents below. We would like it noted however, that it would be more effective, in future, to solicit agency inputs more upstream to help minimize the number of comments and questions at this stage. The detailed comments provided below have been organized by replenishment paper, to facilitate ease of reference.

- We agree with the analysis on **multi-focal area projects** being more complex, facing more requirements, therefore, contributing to lower ratings (pp5-10).
  - Two concerns:
    - (a) urgently need to simplify MFA requirements: and
    - (b) avoid more fragmentation in funding, which leads to ‘non-integrated activities bundled together’ (Table 3)
  - Without this, the Programming Strategy emphasis on synergies will not work.

**Replenishment issue 1: Take account of potential underfunding of focal areas, countries or modalities.**

- We agree that the ‘admirably ambitious proposals for an increase in scope and diversification of GEF’s strategies’ may be too ambitious for the level of funding expected.
- We believe there is need to focus the scope or risk further fragmenting support and impact.

**Replenishment issue 2: Programming of GEF support should continue (NPFE).**

- We do not fully understand this recommendation given that the support – and results - was not found to be successful, effective nor efficient.
- We agree that the modality of the GEF Secretariat providing grant agreements was not appropriate for these kinds of micro-grants, as advised at the outset. Earlier approaches of umbrella projects were more efficient, if the goal is efficiency and speedy disbursement.
- In line with the mainstreaming principle, would it not be more cost-effective to build capacity for global environment project formulation into larger national programming exercises?
- We disagree that ‘focus on eligibility issues’ will resolve the profound issues pointed out.
- The recommendation to start programming before the end of GEF-5 is good, but we are late already so it is inevitable there will be delays in completion by the start of GEF-6.
- Recognizing that countries liked the support for pre-identification phase and need considerable support on GEF eligibility, why not build such general capacity building into the cross-cutting focal area support but without linking it to development of a specific project list?

**Replenishment issue 3: Project design and implementation should allocate resources to activities supporting broader adoption.**

- We welcome establishment of a community of practice and learning platform around this, IF resources are allocated and more procedural requirements can be avoided at design stage.
- ‘Broader adoption’ is useful - but not a clear recipe for operational design. Projects already focus on this (i.e. mainstreaming, replication, scaling up, and market change) – what does the EO think we need to do differently?

**Replenishment issue 4: Project cycle remains slow and cumbersome and will need to become an issue for discussion at the December Meeting.**

- We fully recognize that a certain percentage of GEF-5 projects will not meet the 18-month standard from concept to approval and strongly welcome further analysis and discussion on this. This standard was set artificially, without adequate study of its realism, and we have seen creep in requirements and scrutiny in the project cycle since.
- Performance issues and project cycle management are not limited to elapsed time only. We are missing more analysis of underlying factors and qualitative issues, content and effort.
- The Bank has delivered a large share of its Programmatic approach projects faster than an average project, demonstrating the advantage of simplification at concept stage and reducing duplication of cycles.
- All kinds of efforts on innovation, technical content and quality of GEF-6 programming strategy will *not* be effective without further advances in simplification and streamlining. The GEF is still seen as cumbersome and slow and this is not an image that serves it well.

**Replenishment issue 5: Reduce the burden of targets, indicators and tracking tools, and reform RBM.**

- We fully agree that we need to reform the RBM system to ensure consistency, better measurement and reliability. The multitude of measurement tools and approaches has not led to improved performance. The data and results are not relevant to projects and not used for decision-making and improvement.
- The Bank is providing cross-support to the GEF Secretariat on the lessons of the Bank's various results frameworks and will be happy to share the findings at the 2013 December Replenishment meeting.

### ***Strategic Positioning for the GEF***

Document GEF/R.6/12

#### ***Part 2: Differentiated Financing***

**Differentiated financing.** We are concerned that the options under this item have not been adequately vetted with the Bank and the RDBs implementation teams who have experience with such type of financing, as any type of loan-based instrument is extremely complex to design and implement.

- Both Option 2 and Option 3 introduce country based differentiated financing based on loans. It is imperative to consider the policy reforms in their totality: for example how to reconcile Direct Access with GEF loans, while it is recognized that 'only the MDBs and IFAD would likely be able to administer loans to eligible GEF countries'? As previously mentioned, the very small size of GEF projects makes it 'highly questionable how many of these countries would be willing to go through the added "hassle" of negotiating loans of this size'. In addition, the cost of loan management from the agency, country and GEF perspectives would be considerable.
- It is essential that GEF financing is relatively predictable for programming (Option 4). Differentiated grant elements or leverage targets by country classification will leave large room for individual interpretation and moving goal posts. While HICs and UMICs may have larger capacity than smaller countries to access a competitive group allocation, the RAF-1 group allocation system was a failure.
- We also note that the country demand for selective use of non-grant instruments is very low (Option 1), and would not help to offset the perceived issue of distribution and burden-sharing.
- Suggest GEF apply further consideration to recommendations for the proposed loan scheme.

#### ***Part 3: Resource Allocation System***

The time is now opportune to take a new look at the resource allocation system, to draw lessons and determine how it fits with the future vision. Tradeoffs between impact, focus and entitlement-based allocations will have to be considered. Some concern is noted that the link between resource allocation and global environmental benefits may be further weakened. As the document states, GEF is not created for poverty reduction but for mitigating global environmental degradation.

- It would be helpful in proposing various options to clarify the global environmental impacts that different options are expected to be able to deliver in order to justify the thinking behind the necessity of such options.
- Any combination of the different options under each policy recommendation would have vastly different effects.
- The fact that 'The average size of GEF projects during GEF-5 to date is US\$2.5 million' is essential to focus on. Is this the level of support that is considered sufficient to address large global environmental problems, or generate impact on scale? Even as leveraging and catalyzing would be limited, and the administrative costs of the system to manage a huge number of small grants is not cost-effective. The GEF is not well served with this kind of fragmentation.
- We find that all the options, though complex in design and implementation, are all geared towards providing less funds to the large countries and more to smaller SIDS/LDCs. If this is the policy direction which the GEF seeks to follow, the simplest and most straight-forward approach should be selected. At the same time, any kind of reform would not have the desired effect for impact if country allocations remain limited, scattered and fragmented. We support allowances for full flexibility to aggregate in this regard.
- As the large countries have delivered on some of the largest successes, such reforms would need to be accompanied by a commensurate level of ambition and requirements (in terms of generation of GEBs).
- Lessons from RAF competitive group allocation must be considered.
- We welcome the willingness to increase funding floors for the focal areas. However, there is concern that such increases may not be up to the level necessary to provide sufficient resources for countries with less significant global environmental impacts to prepare and implement sizable GEF projects.

#### *Part 4: Private Sector Engagement*

**Enhance private sector engagement.** Based on the role and expertise of IFC and the Bank in private sector engagement, the proposed strategy does not seem to reflect the underlying issues and documented barriers to private sector engagement in the GEF, and is not adequate as a basis for developing a 'work plan'. The vision for mainstreaming of private sector engagement across 'regular' GEF projects is not clear and remains challenging. Where such engagement was successful in the past, it involved specific projects targeted to private sector and risk reduction. Some corporate alliances were trialed, so far with mixed results. It would be most realistic to magnify private sector engagement through a set-aside, provided it was managed in a decentralized dynamic manner in select markets. The programming documents deals with private sector across all sections making a clear vision difficult to discern.

#### ***Draft GEF-6 Programming Directions***

Document GEF/R.6/13

#### **Part I - Focal Area Strategies**

**General Comments. (SSA) Focal Area Set Asides (FAS):** There is only mention of this in BD (pg 30) and CC (pg 58), not in any other. Does this imply that only these two FAs will have FA set asides?

~ Clarifications are required: there is mention that FAS will be used for enabling activities and *supra-national strategic priorities* - what are these?

~ It is not clear how the FA resources link to the signature program resources - we assume that the signature programs come from regional set asides?

- **Innovative programming options:** Interesting but is not clear in its implications. Are these meant to be priority directions for programs in GEF-6 within the FAs using the allocated resources OR do they intend these to be a menu of options that need to be considered within projects?
- The general push to make private sector involvement a priority is not always possible in the African context.
- Overall the strategies do not provide any consideration for IA's comparative advantage.

#### **Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy**

**\*\* GEF 6 BD Strategy key objectives (implemented through 11 programs)**

- Improve sustainability of protected area systems*
- Reduce threats to biodiversity*
- Sustainably use biodiversity*
- Mainstream conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into production landscapes/seascapes and sectors*

Overall we support the objectives and content of the strategy, though we have a concern that the complexity of some of the programs might compromise the ability of some of our LDC and SIDs clients to participate due capacity and funding constraints (e.g., linking financial reforms to valuation, and expanding PA estate without covering management costs).

- Link to Aichi Targets is useful and important for clients to reduce their transaction costs. Could reporting arrangements provide Parties information they could use for CBD reporting?
- Some programs will require engagement with non-traditional GEF actors (e.g. Ministries of Finance, Planning, Agriculture, Extractives, etc). How will the role of the GEF Focal Points be updated to ensure that these non-traditional partners are effectively engaged?
- Some programs give the impression of reinventing the wheel instead of providing support for ongoing initiatives (e.g. WAVES under Program 10; the GPO aims under Programs 2 and 7). Shouldn't the strategy provide support for or through these existing initiatives rather than start new ones?
- New focus on wildlife crime is welcome, but recommend it be widened to include different geographic regions and any species that are listed under CITES and being illegally traded. The action on demand reduction should be highlighted as the key strategy of this program.

### **Climate Change Focal Area Strategy**

The Strategy paper misses a number of opportunities to highlight and take credit for key past achievements of the GEF.

- In principle the Bank is in favor of an integrated approach to Cities, but it is not clear how the Sustainable Cities “Signature Program” overlaps with Program 3 on Urban Systems.
- Same comment for Chemicals on multi-focal synergies. The Bank is concerned that at no time is it acknowledged that multi-focal approaches could lead to trade-offs and reduced cost effectiveness for quantitative indicators such as CO<sub>2</sub> abatement – at least in the short/project term.
- We do not see much distinction between Program 2 and the second part of program 1 (on policy) and we believe project teams will be confused.
- Welcome the highlights on urban systems, LULUCF and CSA in the strategy. The strategy however, is unclear how GEF-6 might finance SLCP related activities.
- The proposed support for performance based emission reduction mechanisms is welcome but there would need to be flexibility with re: co-financing arrangements given recognition that such activities may not directly link to investment activities, particularly those used to set up a mechanism, or on MRV activities.

### **Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Strategy**

Overall, the Bank welcomes the integrated approach the GEF is taking to cover Chemicals and Waste, moving away from a narrow emphasis on a limited number of chemicals. In principle this should be better aligned with countries’ development priorities and facilitate integration and mainstreaming with Bank programs.

- We are concerned however that this can complicate the usefulness of the Strategy as a guide to what is eligible for GEF funding. Particularly when the structure of the paper can be confusing: there are too many objectives (8) which partly overlap, and it will not always be clear for recipient countries and agency teams which objective is relevant.
- The Strategy emphasizes synergies between focal areas. The Bank is fully supportive of synergetic approaches, in principle, as this should benefit our client countries. However, in practice, there is a significant disincentive to pursue multi-focal area projects as this leads to multi- review and multi-reporting all of which put barriers to implementation and attractiveness of the concept for project teams. Until reasonable modalities to limit transaction costs from multi-focal area projects can be developed, the potential for the GEF to promote multi-focal area approaches will not be fully utilized.
- Whilst the Bank finds that proposing a set aside from the CCM focal area to support climate benefits from HCFC phase out is worth considering, we note that the concept is absent from the CCM strategy. Moreover, our experience with GEF and MP funding multi-source funding is that transaction costs are high and it is difficult to align project cycles so that funds are available when required; this would have to be addressed.
- Regarding Annex 1 on innovative programming options, we are concerned with the suggestion to include at least one project executed by a regional center in every work program in GEF 6 and to set aside resources for regional center executed projects. The proposal goes much further than any convention guidance, and support to regional center executed activities should be merit based and country driven only.
- We are concerned that a number of concepts related to private sector engagement are ill-defined, with notions that “private sector project ideas that can be submitted and cleared through agency processes quickly” and “competitive bidding”. We are also concerned about the proposed use of non-grant instrument that is envisaged with respect to the comparative advantage of the GEF.
- Suggest that the strategy for more clarity present a targeted number or share of priority POPs/mercury activities.
- Seek clarification whether inclusion of CO<sub>2</sub> as one type of harmful chemical/waste to be eliminated is considered under this strategy.

### **International Waters Focal Area Strategy**

- *The World Bank welcomes and endorses the objectives and focus of the International Waters focal area strategy* - seen as largely complementary of the Bank's work in assisting client countries to manage water, aquatic, coastal, marine and other natural resources in support of sustainable, wealth-generating, development. It would also compliment the Global Partnership for Oceans (GPO).

- ***Recommend greater emphasis on incentives and institutions that support effective governance and investment in sustainable natural resource management*** - The Bank recognizes the need to augment the more traditional planning and regulatory approaches to management of water, aquatic and marine resources with a greater emphasis on building governance arrangements that could provide for and promote increased investment in sustainable management. (i.e. It is not completely accurate to suggest, for example, that the "ocean is a victim of massive market failure", if agreement on ownership of the resources being traded, and development of the institutions needed to support their governance, have not yet been established. Rather it is a "victim" of a lack of these two critical needs, which has frequently allowed for unsustainable use, and impoverishment.)
- ***The Results Framework should explicitly include targets and indicators for resource allocation and institutional arrangements for effective governance of natural resources*** - Rather than emphasizing the need to adopt Integrated Coastal Zone Management or ecosystem based approaches (which are both outcomes rather than instruments for achieving the desired outcomes), the Bank would argue that the IW strategy and the outcomes and indicators detailed in the Results Framework should explicitly target agreements and the development of policy options for allocating water, aquatic, coastal and marine resources, and building the institutions that can support their effective governance. This emphasis could be usefully added to all three IW goals.
- ***The Bank is supportive of the proposed signature program for rebuilding global fisheries***, given the complementarity with the GPO, and its emphasis on developing and operationalizing prototypes for rights based management of fisheries resources, and the positive impact this is likely to have on sustainable resource management, wealth generation, as well as providing the incentives and legal basis for addressing all three IW 3 outcomes,

***Success will be reliant on rights based approaches designed to suite local needs, supported by strong institutions*** - Success will require strong government institutions that can work effectively with communities and business to set up and monitor systems of access, use and management. Even where institutions and the rule of law are weak, traditional or community-based approaches to allocating access and user rights have proven effective at managing fisheries sustainably. With fisheries around the world ranging from small-scale fisheries to industrial, rights-based approaches need to be designed on a case-by-case basis and tailored to the range of national circumstances - political, economic, cultural and social.

Some concern is noted regarding the proposed indicator - frequency and extent of hypoxia – associated with the objective of reducing land-based pollution. Many sources of pollution contribute to such problems. Given limited grant support, it is not realistic to expect that GEF funding could effectively support achievement of results on hypoxia and proper measurement. We suggest that indicators on the releases of nutrients be used as measurable project impacts.

### **Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy**

We are pleased to see that landscape approach is central to the strategy and that SLM for Climate Smart Agriculture is an emerging opportunity. Clarification required: Given that there is no mention of a set aside, are the STAR LD resources expected to cover cross cutting and enabling activities (in which case this would be a situation of doing more with the same resources)?

### **Sustainable Forest Management Focal Area Strategy**

This SP is of particular interest and overall, the strategy is welcome and considered comprehensive. However, we need to learn from the experience in GEF-5. The SFM top-up did not function adequately as an incentive for countries – or agencies. The requirement to have a minimum of two other focal areas to obtain SFM tends to create artificial multi-focal area projects driven by funding issues, and comes with additional procedural GEF requirements. It should suffice to have the incentive linked to *one* focal area.

## **Part II – Signature Programs**

**General Comments.** There needs to be a realistic assessment of ‘drivers’; and the GEF role and funding in Signature programs (SP). We agree that there is potential for impact in the GEF funds targeting the “root-causes” of environmental degradation, by adopting a stronger focus on the drivers that lead to unsustainable usage of resources.

- **Increment.** The line between the global environmental benefits and development issues is not always easy to draw, however, so this would have implications for the incremental nature of the GEF, which might overlap with development issues. A clear focus is needed, and assessment of implications of what the GEF will fund and how the incrementality and co financing.
- **Fragmentation.** Targeting the drivers of environmental degradation is considerably more ambitious than historic approaches; a critical mass of intervention is needed to generate impact. Will 100M or so make a significant difference per signature program? The trends towards fragmentation of GEF funding will greatly jeopardize its potential.
  - The GEF funding would be split into (a) five Focal areas, across 140+ countries as well as set-asides, (c) cross-cutting ‘taxed’ focal areas as SFM and the SP; (c) a large corporate program; and (d) five SPs; all of the above again divided into numerous sub-programs, goals and targets. Under each category, the funding would be parceled out through a variety of modalities, innovative approaches, incentive systems etc.
- **Potential Overlap.** We welcome the themes of the signature programs, which generally correspond to the major drivers influencing sustainable development that the Bank and other development partners also are working on. The notion of the “GEF as convener” does not take account of the existing initiatives and expertise, and the large role cofinancing is expected to play. The SPs should build on existing partnerships and initiatives, and fully use available agency expertise and capacity cost-effectively.
- **Operations and implementation.** There is not enough learning on issues with programmatic approach and STAR set-asides, needed to design dynamic delivery modalities. Over-reliance on perceived synergies between focal areas and inter-linkages between conventions does not take account of the real operational issues and complexities in programming this entails. The entire GEF system is geared towards a ‘silo’ approach in Focal Area and country programming; unless addressed, this risks bogging down the SPs.
- **Technical complexity associated with the proposed multi-sectoral approach.** With respect to the Sustainable City Program, at least two or three focal area activities are targeted: CC, POPs and possibly IW. Just under the CC focal area, the program may cover everything from agriculture, energy and transport to industrial and building sectors. This would be very challenging, and there is no indication of how such a program could clearly present its global environmental benefits to avoid treating each area separate.
- **Funding sources.** It is unclear how the SP will be financed. The Strategic Positioning and the Draft Policy Recommendation documents provide no information about how this, and other, SPs fit in with the proposed financing options.

**Commodities Signature Program** This theme is interesting for Africa where the Social Corporate Responsibility angle that is driving a lot of the sustainability discussion of the big multinational firms.

**Sustainable Cities.** In principle the Bank is in favor of an integrated approach to Cities. However, with \$20-25 million for a large country, the GEF's signature programs risk not making enough of a splash to be noticed. Moreover, this concept is for multi-sectoral projects so investment per sector will be even lower, hardly enough for a transformational impact. The Africa Region colleagues suggest including an ‘Urbanscape’ angle to the SP that would allow for urban protected areas and biological corridors; and green ICT in the design of Climate smart cities.

**Sustainability and Resilience for Food Security in SSA.** Recommend to include the concept of dry land for the Middle East under this theme. As with IW Programs and Fisheries, complementarity of the SP with relevant existing or completed programs/projects (i.e. TerrAfrica) should be fully explored to ensure not reinventing the wheel but rather, building on existing foundations, capacity and other enabling environments. The Africa region views this SP as highly relevant for the WB poverty and shared prosperity agenda. However, note that it is unclear what would be financed by the baseline projects and what would be incremental. It would be important to include a Landscape Approach in the design of the program. It would be important to emphasize complementarity (as in other SPs) in that the SP would be building on years of experience of SLWM in the region (TerrAfrica and GEF), as well as on work led by the World Bank with many partners under the Dryland Flagship. It is unclear why AGRA is indicated as the preferred executing agency (such decision should be made during program preparation, since the capacity of the institution is a key criteria to define institutional arrangements).

**Amazon Signature Program.** The implementation arrangements are not defined. Under "implementation plan", the text just indicates that the concept has been developed by Government, national consultants and the GEF Secretariat, and that a comprehensive design and implementation plan will be determined during further program development. For a regional program, it seems to include very little regional emphasis.

Note: Comments on the Rebuilding Global Fisheries SP are provided earlier in the IW section.

### ***Draft Policy Recommendations for GEF-6***

Document GEF/R.6/14

**Strengthen results based management.** The GEF EO findings on the complexity of the GEF RBM system are accurate, and we agree with the need to revamp the system to provide more relevant and focused information on results for decision-making and learning. The use of internationally recognized approaches would require the GEF to refocus its efforts and attention, though. The Bank is now providing support to the GEF on our lessons on RBM.

**Build a knowledge management system.** We fully agree with the need to strengthen the RBM and knowledge management (KM) systems, provided these work in a collaborative network-wide way recognizing existing systems and expertise for best value proposition. It would not be cost-effective for the GEF to establish and build up a functioning KM system on its own. We would like to see GEF pro-actively facilitate exchange among partners on knowledge but not be an intermediary "bundler" of products or knowledge outputs.

**Mainstream gender consideration.** The importance of gender is fully recognized. The Bank applies and supports the mainstreaming of gender into its programming. The assessment of Agencies against with the GEF Gender Mainstreaming Policy will provide the Replenishment process with information on where gaps may lay that require focus. We support drawing lessons and good practices from relevant projects. However, the Policy Recommendations presented are more detailed than the other recommendations, and more prescriptive than strategic. We find that this does not add value to the current policy which, first and foremost, speaks to the uptake of the recent GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming.

**Enhancing resilience in programming.** As part of our ongoing institutional efforts to mainstream climate resilience into development planning and project investments, the World Bank has recently developed a set of screening tools to support the systematic assessment of risks from climate change. These tools help determine the risk from climate change at the national level and sectoral levels. We would suggest that the GEF rely on already developed tools such as these described further below and avoid trying to reinvent the wheel with GEF specific requirements or approaches.

At the strategic level, the National Climate Impact Screening (NCIS) enables the systematic identification of climate vulnerabilities of programmatic activities, including a geographic/spatial component that helps identify vulnerable areas. This tool draws on the Climate Change Knowledge Portal, for climate and climate related data, and other key resources to generate an assessment of vulnerable geographic and sector hotspots. This analysis is complemented by the Institutional Readiness Scorecard (IRS) which provides a rapid assessment score of institutional and adaptive capacity needs for clients to better understand and act on information about climate impacts at the national level.

At the project level, HEAT (A Hands-on Energy Adaptation Toolkit) is an example of a tool that helps assess climate vulnerabilities and adaptation options in the energy sector. Screening Tools for other sectors and/or sub-sector have also been developed and include: a) Agriculture: a focus on irrigation and drainage; and soil and water management in the rural landscape; b) Water: a focus on urban water supply and sanitation; coastal flood protection; and water resources management (small dams and reservoir operations; and c) Infrastructure: a focus on roads. All screening tools will be publically available online via the CCKP.

**More simplification is needed; caution on new requirements.** Additional requirements on countries, projects or agencies need to be accompanied by commensurate funding. The considerable additional demands of gender mainstreaming, climate resilience mainstreaming, and evidence-based design and M&E will require additional time and resources that need to be recognized.