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Introduction**[[1]](#footnote-1)**

The World Bank Group has brought together donors (see table below) from across the globe to discuss challenges, lessons learned, and opportunities to better screen and manage climate risks.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Multi-lateral agencies | Bilateral agencies |
| Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) | German development agency (GiZ) and development bank (KfW) |
| African Development Bank (AfDB) | Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA)  |
| Asian Development Bank’s (ADB)  | Millennium Challenge Corporation(MCC)  |
| European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) | Nordic Development Fund (NDF) |
| European Investment Bank (EIB)  | Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)  |
| Inter-American Development Bank’s (IDB)  | U.K. Department for International Development (DFID) |
| World Bank Group (WBG)  | U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) |
| Other |   |
| Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), U.S. Department of the Treasury |

# Climate Screening

* Most donor institutions:
	+ Are motivated to carry out screening because of high-level directives (USAID, MCC, ADB, AfDB, GIZ, IDB, WBG); managing reputational or financial risks (EBRD); mainstreaming; (EIB, SDC, JICA, USAID).
	+ Carry out climate screening early stages of planning processes in order to guide development before major decisions are made. Some organizations (such as BMZ, SDC, JICA) screen at all stages
	+ Incorporate climate screening as a part of an already existing mainstreamed process. For example, IDB and AfDB link climate screening to their safeguard procedures.

* Scope of current screening processes varies:
	+ Most focus on projects (ADB, EBRD, AfDB, AFD, WBG and JICA)
	+ Some also include national/strategic/programmatic screening (USAID, DFID, WBG)

* Integration of screening with other agendas: climate & disaster (WBG), with environment and social safeguards (IDA, AfDB), ESIA (USAID, EBRD)
* Roll out process: it is important to define clear guidelines, accountabilities and responsibilities, incentives for teams, training, help desk needs, and back stopping
* Modality of tool application: varies (web based, guidance, and scoring system) but similarity of logic.
* Time requirements to carry out screening. Time constraints pose a serious challenge, and there is a need to balance between adequate levels of screening against over-burdening the process. The time taken to apply a tool varies widely across organizations, ranging from a few minutes to several days, depending on the depth of assessment. For instance, GIZ’s screening tool takes about 20-60 minutes, while its in-depth assessment could take up to 5 days. WBG’s project tools take 2-3 hours to complete depending on the user’s familiarity with web-based tool use and background in climate change.
* Climate data/information: considerations about data usability, uncertainty, limitations, resolution or access to local data; proprietary vs open access data (how can we encourage collaboration?)
* Post screening: there is a need for sectoral guidelines, tools for managing for risks

Success factors for climate screening

* Leadership matters. Organizational mandates accelerate tool development and rollout (strong signals from management). We are trying to achieve a behavioral change.
* Changing attitude is as important as the tool itself
	+ Process of applying the screening increases the acceptance of climate risk and internalization of the learning process
	+ Incentives and obligations are both necessary to motivate users of screening tools.
* Success factors for applying a screening tool
	+ **Simplicity** increases acceptance, use, and sustainability
	+ **Link to existing policies and processes**
	+ **Have to have a system to support the tool** through guidance, expert support, and /or trainings
	+ **Expectations management**: need to balance experts and users expectations
	+ **Monitoring of tool application** is important to accurately measure and track success and areas for improvement. Did the project improve as a result of our efforts?

# Climate data and information

GIZ shared results of a recent survey of donors on their climate adaptation systems.

* Most important barriers (in order of priority) to integrating climate resiliency into programs and investments: climate information, time constraints, limited human resources/expertise
* Greatest potential for collaboration: data / climate information and tools were the two most important
* Most important data sets identified by donors: **World Bank Climate Portal** (<http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/>). Some also use IPCC reports or KFW country sheets.

One theme that emerged is that there is a “fire hose” of information being churned out by climate scientists, but unfortunately it is not always what donors (or project engineers) need to better adapt projects to climate change.  Participants emphasized the need for usable information, derived from the IPCC data, to inform development decision-making (e.g. storm surge on top of sea level rise, river flooding, groundwater availability, seasonal timing and intensity of rainfall, groundwater availability).  This suggests opportunities to link these needs to (1) our own efforts to link USG development and sciences agencies and programs and (2) the Public-Private Partnership on Climate Data and Information for Resilient Development.

1. This is an unofficial, high level summary intended to capture key ideas. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)