



**SPC**  
Secretariat  
of the Pacific  
Community



## **GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE: PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND STATES PROJECT**

### **REPORT ON KIRIBATI ADAPTATION PROJECT PLANNING WORKSHOP 22-23 JANUARY 2013**



*Abandoned vehicles in South Tarawa make good mosquito breeding grounds*

#### **Introduction**

The Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) Project in Kiribati is entitled “Improving Implementation of Environmental Health Surveillance and Response to Climate Sensitive Health Risks in Kiribati.” This climate change adaptation project is centred on providing the Environmental Health Unit (EHU) of the Ministry of Health and Medical Services (MHMS) with the necessary equipment and training so that the EHU can monitor and respond to vector-borne diseases, especially dengue fever, and other climate sensitive health impacts such as food poisoning, ciguatera, and other water-borne disease.

A Planning Workshop was held on 22-23 January 2013 at Taboreo in South Tarawa to:

1. Introduce to the key stakeholders a proposed climate change adaptation project.
2. Discuss and agree on the proposed activities of the project.
3. Discuss and agree on the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders.
4. Discuss and agree on the implementation arrangements (institutional, management, etc).
5. Discuss the monitoring and evaluation framework.

The workshop was organised and chaired by Tebikau Tibwe, Senior Health Inspector at EHU.

### **Workshop Participants**

There were 25 participants. Participants came from the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural Services; Ministry of Foreign Affairs; MHMS; Ministry of Public Works; Kiribati Meteorological Services; Climate Action Network; National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (New Zealand); University of Fiji; and the World Health Organisation. The list of participants is presented as Annex 1.

### **Workshop Agenda**

The workshop agenda is presented as Annex 2. At the start of the workshop participants were asked to complete a questionnaire designed to gauge key information as to the extent to which climate change is integrated into institutions in Kiribati and participants' understanding of climate change issues.

### **Workshop Results**

Dr. Teatao Tiira, Director for Public Health Services, gave some opening remarks. He noted that climate change and health was a significant issue and that Kiribati was working hard to incorporate climate change into its planning.

After introductions and a description of the workshop objectives, there was a presentation and discussion about the overall GCCA: PSIS project. Key discussion items were as follows:

- The official agency for CROP (Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific) is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which is responsible for all international communications. All information about climate change projects should be sent to the Office of the President and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It was noted that an official internal circular should be sent out regarding this arrangement.
- The four criteria for direct budget support were highlighted: (1) sound sectoral strategies, plans and budgets; (2) stable macro economic framework; (3) progress towards sound public financial management systems; and (4) visibility. It was noted that sectors are directly responsible for criterion 1 and can be proactive in this regard, whilst the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning is responsible for the other criteria.
- Type of training available under the GCCA: PSIS: this covers short courses, on-the-job training and attachments relating to climate change. A simple application template was presented and provided to participants on memory sticks. Applications for training can be made at any time. It was noted that in Kiribati requests for training need to be approved by Cabinet and then forwarded to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for submission.
- Role of non-governmental organisations (NGOs): The Kiribati National Climate Change Framework includes civil society; and the joint national action plan for disaster risk management and climate change adaptation (JNAP0 represents another opportunity for NGO involvement.

This was followed by a presentation on the project to improve the implementation of environmental health surveillance and response to climate sensitive health risks in Kiribati by Tebikau Tibwe, Senior Health Inspector.

Key discussion points following the presentation included:

- Geographical focus of the project will be on South Tarawa, and two outer islands where activities will be conducted as part of the SPC "whole of island" approach. Criteria were developed in 2012 for the selection of the outer islands, and the actual selection of islands is awaiting endorsement by Cabinet.

- Administration of the project will be conducted by EHU; however, the GCCA: PSIS project will also be supporting a Kiribati-SPC Climate Change Coordinator position in the Office of the President.
- Oversight of the project has yet to be confirmed but will likely be conducted by an existing committee.
- Linkages between disease outbreaks and climate variability/climate change. The Meteorological Service provides 3-monthly seasonal outlooks and El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) predictions. However, data are limited especially in the outer islands.

Participants then divided into small groups to discuss some key questions. The discussions around these questions provided some useful insights about environmental health and climate change and are summarised in the table below.

Key question	Summary of small group discussions
1. What are some of the priorities in environmental health in Kiribati? And what disease outbreaks have there been over the past few years?	<p>Priorities include: Identify and remove risk factors for general population; control and prevent disease outbreaks; capacity building and improved collaboration; data sharing improvement &amp; dissemination</p> <p>Disease outbreaks: water borne diseases; respiratory diseases (H1, TB); food related/food borne diseases; vector borne e.g. dengue</p>
2. What data on environmental health-related issues are you currently collecting?	<p>Dengue: mosquito breeding sites, brackish water, water tanks</p> <p>Diarrheal: contamination of shellfish, contaminated water, poor sanitation, poor hygiene</p> <p>Typhoid: poor hygiene, poor water quality</p>
3. How are the data analysed?	<p>The Met Service store data in the CLIDE database and examine long-term trends and correlations; Microbiology laboratory store data in an Excel database and prepare quarterly reports; EHU store data in Access (water, community groundwater wells, household inspections, number of toilets, pig pens, open water sources) – need capacity building in data analysis.</p>
4. How are the results from this analysis used?	<p>EHU compare the data with WHO standards, if abnormal, they report it to the Director of Public Health. It was generally agreed there is a need to improve the use of data.</p>
5. What problems have you encountered in environmental health surveillance?	<p>Finding contacts who might have been infected (because clinic/hospital data collection forms do not include a precise location of the patients residence/village);</p> <p>Transportation deficiencies for collecting surveillance data forms and responding to outbreaks;</p> <p>Lack of sustainability with project based work;</p> <p>Few resources e.g. 1 computer for 9 staff;</p>

Key question	Summary of small group discussions
	<p>Lack of storage; Need for training;</p> <p>Data are not often analysed or used – need improved capacity in data analysis and use of data for response/decision-making/annual planning/etc. This recommendation includes analysis of data regarding water quality, as well as data regarding incidence of morbidity. Also need computers and analysis software (e.g., Epi-Info – free software).</p> <p>Lack of high level recognition of the importance of environmental health work, not routinely budgeted.</p> <p>Sharing of information between different divisions within MHMS is often poor.</p> <p>Need improved community awareness/education re prevention of climate-change related diseases (e.g., improved hygiene, treatment of drinking water, clearance of vector breeding sites, etc). Also need to better engage church leaders.</p> <p>Need better sharing of health information with Dept of Education for ensuring curriculum is evidence-based and inclusive of relevant health messages.</p> <p>It is expensive to maintain some weather monitoring equipment – it’s better to use simple, less expensive equipment. No full country coverage with the MET stations – need more.</p>
6. How have you addressed these problems?	Prevention measures such as household inspections; borrowed transport from staff and hired transport; seeking donor support; community awareness raising and getting help from churches.

A presentation was then given on the logical framework analysis. Three participants said they had some experience with logical framework analysis.

The participants worked as a plenary group to define the overall objective and the project purpose. They then divided into two smaller groups to define the key result areas. The results of the small group sessions are presented in Annex 3. Participants then worked to agree on the key result areas.

**Overall Objective:** To increase the resilience of I-kiribati to the adverse health impacts of climate change

**Principal Purpose:** To contribute to the prevention and control of climate sensitive diseases through environmental health surveillance and response

During the second day, participants worked in small groups to define key result areas, indicators and project activities. The results of the group work were then discussed in a plenary session.

All three small groups identified three main key result areas (KRA):

KRA 1: Routine surveillance systems for climate sensitive diseases strengthened

KRA 2: Preparedness for response to outbreaks of climate sensitive diseases strengthened

KRA3: Communities received the necessary information to address the health risks of climate change

In addition, two of the groups identified additional KRAs:

KRA 4: Sustainable coordination, planning, resourcing and budgeting mechanisms in place for environmental health

KRA5: Legislation relating to public health revised.

The plenary group discussed KRA 4 and 5, and agreed that they were both important and should be included in the log frame.

Some of the groups also identified activities. These were recorded and will be used in the design of the project log frame. The horizontal logic of the log frame was explained and participants practiced developing indicators, means of verification and the assumptions, although there was insufficient time to complete this activity.

The workshop was then closed. Next steps include developing the project design document by the end of April 2013.

### **Workshop Evaluation**

The results of the workshop evaluation are presented as Annex 3. Thirteen people completed the form. Twelve people found the logical framework approach useful for project planning (one person did not answer this question). Several people mentioned that they found the log frame approach very useful for project planning and could use it in their own work. Several mentioned that the workshop documents should have been circulated at least a week in advance so that participants could be better prepared and that the workshop should have been conducted over a longer period.

### **Conclusion**

The workshop was successful in allowing different stakeholders to play a role in the initial planning of the project and paved the way for further training in the logical framework approach..



*Tebikau Tibwe, Senior Health Inspector, Environmental Health Unit*



### Annex 1 Participants List

Name	Organisation	Title	Email	Phone
Dr Teatao Tiira	MHMS	Director Public Health	<a href="mailto:teataotiira@gmail.com">teataotiira@gmail.com</a>	
Tebikau Tibwe	EHU/MHMS	Senior Health Inspector	<a href="mailto:tnoran@gmail.com">tnoran@gmail.com</a>	
Dr Andre E Reiffer	WHO	Country Liaison Officer	<a href="mailto:reiffera@wpro.who.int">reiffera@wpro.who.int</a>	
Kireata Ruteru	WHO	NCD Officer	<a href="mailto:ruteruk@wpro.who.int">ruteruk@wpro.who.int</a>	
Ueneta Toorua	Met Service	Climate Officer	<a href="mailto:uenetat@gmail.com">uenetat@gmail.com</a>	
Riibeta Abeta	ECD/MELAD	Environment Officer	<a href="mailto:riibetaa@gmail.com">riibetaa@gmail.com</a>	93215
Ben Namakin	CAN/Pew Environment Group	Fellow	<a href="mailto:tammy.ahleiom@gmail.com">tammy.ahleiom@gmail.com</a>	61905
David Teaabo	MFAI	Pacific Plan Desk Officer	<a href="mailto:dopp@mfa.gov.ki">dopp@mfa.gov.ki</a>	
Rosemary Tekoaau	Laboratory/MHMS	Chief Lab Officer	<a href="mailto:rosemarytek@gmail.com">rosemarytek@gmail.com</a>	
Nikarana Karoua	EHU/MHMS	Health Inspector	<a href="mailto:nika.baueri@gmail.com">nika.baueri@gmail.com</a>	
Teina Temaku	WEU/MPWU	Water Quality Monitoring WEU Officer	<a href="mailto:dtamaroa@gmail.com">dtamaroa@gmail.com</a>	
Bungia Kaitaake	EHU/MHMS	Health Inspector	<a href="mailto:bkterunga78@gmail.com">bkterunga78@gmail.com</a>	
Harry C Langley	TUC	Water Superintendent	<a href="mailto:harrylangley576@gmail.com">harrylangley576@gmail.com</a>	
Teanibuaka Tabunga	MHMS/HIS	Surveillance Coordinator	<a href="mailto:teanibuakatabunga@gmail.com">teanibuakatabunga@gmail.com</a>	
Bibiana Bureimos	MOE/CDRC	Curriculum Advisor	<a href="mailto:bbbkaiea@gmail.com">bbbkaiea@gmail.com</a>	
Nautonga	MELAD	Senior Agriculture Officer	<a href="mailto:mamarau@gmail.com">mamarau@gmail.com</a>	
Marella Rebgetz	KAPIII/MPWU	Senior Water Engineer	<a href="mailto:m.rebgetz@gmail.com">m.rebgetz@gmail.com</a>	
Kate Kennett	UoF	Researcher	<a href="mailto:kenn0224@flinders.edu.au">kenn0224@flinders.edu.au</a>	
Els Maas	NIWA	Project Leader	<a href="mailto:els.maas@niwa.co.nz">els.maas@niwa.co.nz</a>	69896
Damian Hoy	SPC	SPC Public Health Surveillance Specialist	<a href="mailto:damianh@spc.int">damianh@spc.int</a>	
Pasha Carruthers	SPC	SPC GCCA: PSIS Climate Change Advisor	<a href="mailto:pashac@spc.int">pashac@spc.int</a>	97179
Gillian Cambers	SPC	SPC GCCA: PSIS Project Manager	<a href="mailto:gillianc@spc.int">gillianc@spc.int</a>	96674

## Annex 2 Workshop Agenda

### Day 1: Tuesday 22 January 2013

Time	Activity/Topic	Lead Person
8:30-09:00	Registration	
09:00-09:30	Introduction – prayer, remarks by reps from Kiribati and SPC, introduction of participants (self), objectives of the workshop	MHMS
09:30 –10:00	Outline of SPC Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Islands States Project	SPC – Pasha Carruthers
10:00-10:05	Completion of baseline questionnaire	SPC – Gillian Cambers
10:05-10:30	Morning Tea	
10:30-11:00	Outline of Climate Change Adaptation Project in Kiribati: Improving Implementation of Environmental Health Surveillance and Response to Climate Sensitive Health Risks in Kiribati	EHU MHMS – Tebikau Tibwe
11:00-12:30	Small Group Sessions: Priorities for environmental health surveillance and climate sensitive health risks	SPC - Damian Hoy
12:30-13:30	Lunch	
13.30-14.00	Outline of logical framework analysis	SPC – Gillian Cambers
14.00-15.30	Small Group Sessions to identify Key Result Areas	SPC Facilitate
15.30-16.00	General discussion and close	SPC - Gillian Cambers

### Day 2: Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2013

08:30-09:00	Recap of Day One: Summary of overall objective, project purpose and key result areas	SPC – Gillian Cambers
09:00-10:30	Small Group Sessions to identify project activities	SPC Facilitate
10:30-11:00	Morning Tea	
11:00-12:00	Discussion on indicators, responsibilities, implementation, monitoring and evaluation	All
12:00-12:30	Next steps and wrap-up; workshop evaluation	SPC Gillian Cambers
12:30	Closing Prayer and Lunch	



### Annex 3 Workshop Evaluation

Thirteen people filled in the workshop evaluation form.

1. Did you find the Logical Framework Approach useful for project planning?

12 answered 'yes', one person did not answer this question.

Comments:

- I appreciate the idea of information sharing and dissemination of the climate health related issues. The education sector can certainly inform and educate future generations about the impacts and responses to them. Well done, keep it up. I like the KRA about data collection and dissemination.
- This climate change and health workshop is very interesting as it has provided participants with very important information in terms of funding, support, training and capacity building.
- It leads planning in a logical way. A bit more time on this may have been helpful, but I recognise that time is limited.
- This is a good exercise that will enable participants to apply to other related projects. Good hands-on exercise.
- Good for planning and understanding goals and requirements for implementing a project.
- Project planning is one of the tasks that falls within my job description as head of livestock and animal health of the Division of Agriculture. Having participated in this workshop, now I can do planning for project proposals in a logical way using the steps in this workshop.
- Based on my limited presence at the workshop the log frame approach is useful in preparing the activities and indicators for the KRAs.
- I can apply this workshop in my work place.
- The approach is quite straightforward and easy to follow.
- It helps a lot given that climate change is integrated and well reflected in the EHU work plan.
- It was a good way to get participation from all stakeholders, especially for the high level objectives, purpose, KRAs. Maybe too much to go through the activities but great to see many different stakeholders making contributions.
- Log frame is the way to go. Well done.

2. Recognising this meeting is a first stage in project planning, how could the meeting have been improved?

- Can we have it in a venue where we can have access to internet? – we miss out on reading important and urgent e-mails.
- To share the information from the meeting with other staff who did not attend the meeting.
- Disseminating the workshop materials by project overview in advance will be good for participants to come prepared and have a fair understanding of the overall aims of the workshop.
- I think day 1 was very good for involving stakeholders in the project concept and developing the objective, purpose and KRAs. I think working on the activities and indicators would be more productive with a smaller group of people who work directly in the area.
- Need more time, preferably more than 2 days – better say 4 days.
- More timely invitations, provision of a projector for the entire workshop, some key participants missing e.g. UNICEF.
- Add one or two more days so it runs smoothly and get all the ideas from participants.
- Information on the workshop needs to be circulated a week before the workshop so that we come up with more inputs.

- The meeting is great. We just need to have more stakeholders in the future, such as Fisheries, Office of the President, so all understand what is discussed.
- It was a good introduction to the projects, but maybe a little too much in-depth detail at the end around activities.
- The meeting would have been more constructive when stakeholders were informed in advance in terms of what type of information they need to bring; and also by sharing copies of the concept note in advance.
- Progressed great.