



SPC
Secretariat
of the Pacific
Community



GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE: PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND STATES PROJECT

REPORT ON NAURU ADAPTATION PROJECT PLANNING WORKSHOP 5-6 MARCH 2013

Introduction

The Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) Project in Nauru is entitled “Increasing the rainwater harvesting capacity in Nauru” This climate change adaptation project will complement the efforts of AusAID and the European Union (EU) to provide storage tanks, guttering and downpipes to households in Nauru by enhancing and increasing residential roof capacity for rainwater collection. The project will be implemented by the Commerce, Industry and Environment Department (CIE).

A Planning Workshop was held on 5-6 March 2013 at the University of the South Pacific in Nauru to:

1. Introduce to the key stakeholders the 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 Bryan Star, Director of Environment, CIE.

Workshop Participants

There were 17 participants. Participants came from CIE and other government ministries and there were 7 community representatives. 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 Nauru and participants’ understanding of climate change issues.

Workshop Results

Mr. Bryan Star gave some opening remarks. He noted that climate change and water was a significant issue and that Nauru was implementing several projects relating to this sector.

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

- The role of the SPC- Nauru Project Coordinator.
- The role of the community in the GCCA: PSIS project

- Linkages between the GCCA: PSIS project and other ongoing water sector climate adaptation projects funded by AusAID and the EU.
- Opportunities for co-funding between the GCCA: PSIS project and other donors.

This was followed by a presentation on the climate change adaptation project to increase rainwater harvesting capacity in Nauru by Graham Sem and Bryan Star. Key discussion points following the presentation included:

- How particular districts and communities would be selected for this particular project. Five districts were identified in the Project Concept Note based on previous assessments done by SOPAC. However, there is a possibility that this project could extend to include other communities – more but less dense coverage.
- Ways to expand the project so as to include more houses and communities. There are 1647 inhabited domestic houses in Nauru and previous surveys have indicated 400 houses have roofs that need some level of refurbishment.
- Willingness to pay aspects – this should include monetary contributions as well as in-kind payments.
- Discussions are ongoing with AusAID about removing asbestos roofs and disposing of the material in a safe manner. Most of the houses with poor roofs are made of asbestos. One company in Nauru is certified to remove and dispose of asbestos – this adds significantly to the cost of roof/house repair/refurbishment.
- AusAID have recently put out a tender for water storage tanks and these are likely to be installed in April 2014

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

KEY QUESTION 1: How many extreme water shortages have there been in the last 10 years?

Groups 1, 2, 3: There were two recorded droughts, one lasting 26 months (June 07 – August 09) and a second lasting 10 months (Sept 2010 – July 2011)

KEY QUESTION 2: How many people do you know who have properly maintained and well managed rainwater harvesting systems (roof catchments)?

Group 1: None in Aiwo, Boe – 1, Yaren/Menen – none

Group 2: There are about 3 families that are known to ensure that their rainwater harvesting systems are working well.

Group 3: Not many. A few examples: all AusAID buildings, New NSS School, Capelle & Partner, M&M Mackay

KEY QUESTION 3: Discuss 2 priority actions to ensure rainwater harvesting is well accepted and managed by local households

Group 1: (a) Willingness to pay and promotion of households taking ownership; (b) Design of the system is long term, cost effective and productive.

Group 2:

Education, awareness and community capacity building on

- How to maintain rainwater harvesting
- Cost of production
- Process of production and delivery
- Campaigns (clean our water tanks day, etc)
- Kitchen table approach

Group 3:

- (a) More in depth knowledge about the statistics of recharge rates e.g. roof size (catchment area) versus tank size (litres per square meter).
- (b) Government should lead by example, and provide incentives/rebates/subsidies.
- (c) Further awareness about the health benefits of proper water management (harvesting and efficient use).

KEY QUESTION 4: What measures need to be in place to generate a “willingness to pay” for water supply.

Group 1: When roofing is installed, we would be paying less in the long term so the promotion of benefits

Group 2:

- (a) Education
- (b) Advertisements
- (c) Education for water efficiency
- (d) Improved water services

Group 3:

- (a) An educative awareness campaign needs to be carried out for each time RONWAN or any other major monetary payment is given out. This will help remind people where money could be best spent.
- (b) A package deal (similar to the housing scheme) needs to be designed that will create a legal agreement between household representatives and Government that will enable Government to remove ‘x’ amounts from pending salaries or other payments etc.

A presentation was then given by Gillian Cambers on the logical framework approach. About a quarter of the participants said they had some experience with the logical framework approach.

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. Results were then shared and a framework log frame prepared.

On Day 2 of the workshop, participants worked in small groups to define project activities. Results were then shared in a plenary session. A presentation was given on indicators, verification sources and assumptions. The participants then worked further in small groups to define indicators, verification sources and assumptions. The combined results of all the small group sessions are presented in version 1 of the log frame shown in Annex 3.

The workshop was then closed. Next steps include fast-tracking a technical assistance consultancy to develop the criteria and commence selection of the houses to have their roofs refurbished and costing.

Workshop Evaluation

The results of the workshop evaluation are presented as Annex 4. Fourteen people completed the form. Thirteen people found the logical framework approach useful for project planning (one person ticked “other”). Most of the participants found the logical framework approach useful for planning the project and the following comment summarised the participants’ response: “A good tool, simplified, makes it easier to understand, step by step. Different perspectives given, reviewed, improved on”.

(Unfortunately it was not possible to provide the participants with memory sticks with the project documents as has been done in other countries because the facilitators’ luggage had not arrived on the flight from Brisbane).

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.

Annex 1 Participants List

Name	Organisation	Email	Phone
Graham Sem	SPC	grahams@spc.int	679 337 9448
Gillian Cambers	SPC	gillianc@spc.int	679 337 9450
Nixon Toremana	NUC	Nixon.toremana@naurugov.nr	5574053
Vincent Scotty		Vincent.scotty@naurugov.nr	5573147
Madeleine Dube	Aiwo Community leader	Madeleinedube1957@yahoo.com	5581154
Claudette Wharton	Observer	Claude.s.wharton@gmail.com	5567192
Ivan Batiouk	CIE Environment project officer	Ivan.batiouk@naurugov.nr	5565933
July Debat	NRC	Jemc84@gmail.com	5573313
Nodel Neneiya	CIE	Nodel.neneiya@naurugov.nr	5563690
Mavis Depaune	CIE	Mavis.depaune@naurugov.nr	5563977
Bryan Star	CIE	Bryan.star@naurugov.nr	5573117
David Dowiyogo	Baitsi Community	ddowiyogo@yahoo.com	5573059
Francis Deireragea	Baitsi Community	baitsicapt@gmail.com	5585585
Hansome Adumr	Denig Community	hadumr@yahoo.com	67575
NeridaAnn Hubert	Anabar Community		81892
Stephanie Ziersch	CIE	stephanieziersch@gmail.com	5581840
Jaden Agir		Maria7agir@gmail.com	5580984

Annex 2 Workshop Agenda

Day 1: Tuesday 05 March 2013

Time	Activity/Topic	Lead Person
8:30-09:00	Registration	All Invited participants
09:00-09:30	Introduction – prayer, remarks by representatives from Nauru and SPC, introduction of participants (self), objectives of the workshop	Russ/Bryan (CIE)
09:30–10:00	Overview Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Islands States Project	Graham
10:00-10:30	Morning Tea/Coffee	Vendor/Supplier
10:30-11:00	Project concept: Increasing rainwater harvesting capacity on Nauru	Russ/Bryan
11:00-12:30	Small group sessions: Priorities for water resources management in Nauru	
12:30-13:30	Lunch	Catering vendor/supplier
13.30-14:00	Outline of Logical Framework Analysis	Gillian
14:00-14:30	Plenary discussion to define Overall Objective and Project Purpose	Graham/Gillian
14:30-14.45	Afternoon tea	
14.45-16:00	Small Group sessions to define key result areas	
16:00-16:30	Q&A, General discussion and Close	Russ/Bryan

Day 2: Wednesday 06 March 2013

08:30-09:00	Recap of Day One: Key Points	Graham/Gillian
09:00-10:30	Small group sessions to identify project activities	
10:30-11:00	Morning Tea/Coffee	Vendor/Supplier
11:00-12:00	Discussion on indicators, responsibilities, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, project oversight	Gillian
12:00-12:30	General Discussion, next steps, wrap up	Bryan/Russ/CIE/SPC
12:30	Closing Prayer and Lunch	

Annex 3 Project Log Frame Version 1

Project title: Increasing the rainwater harvesting capacity in Nauru			
Description	Verifiable Indicators	Verification Sources	Assumptions
Overall Objective: Building and enhancing resilience of communities in Nauru to climate change through improving water security.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve capacity of water catchment systems in at least 80% of selected households by Dec 2014 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workforce and materials available for this Project Materials readily available and bureaucratic procedures do not delay the project
Purpose: Improving rainwater catchment for households in Nauru	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing catchment areas by at least 50% of each selected household by Dec 2014 		
Key Result Area 1: Identification of vulnerable households in a fair and transparent manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of houses (2-300 houses) identified and endorsed by cabinet by March 2014/Nov 2013/Oct 2013* 1% of Nauru community attending consultation workshop by Q3 2013 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Willingness of communities to contribute
Key Result Area 2: Roof refurbishment for vulnerable households implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract signed for roof refurbishment by Feb 2014 75% of identified houses have their roofs refurbished by June 2015** 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient technical expertise on island Waste material effectively and safely disposed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 60% of selected households with refurbished roofs by Dec 2014 		
Key Result Area 3: Water catchment (security) awareness raised and capacity built within communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness programmes conducted in 15 communities by Dec 2014 At least 3 publications or awareness materials which incorporate gender sensitive issues produced per quarter by Dec 2014 At least 60% of selected households receive training in water catchment maintenance by Dec 2014 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Available media time Communities willing to attend trainings Communities able and willing to utilise training
Key Result Area 4: Willingness to pay investigated and documented peer review by SPC and others	Willingness to pay draft report completed by Dec 2013		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Willingness of communities Existence of applicable models elsewhere in the region
Activities 1.1 Tech adviser consolidate census/SOPAC review 1.2 Development of criteria and consult with community and get endorsement by Nauru Community based organisation and Water Technical	Means:	Indicative Budget	

<p>Committee/Project Steering Committee</p> <p>1.3 Application process</p> <p>1.4 Assess applications (a) verification of condition of property (b) willingness to pay by CIE and Water Technical Committee</p> <p>1.5 Report to existing Project Steering Committee (CIE) to make recommendations</p> <p>1.6 Minister endorses final decision</p> <p>1.7 Inform community</p> <p>2.1 Set a time frame for building period</p> <p>2.2. Establish selection panel for tender</p> <p>2.3 Advertise for tender</p> <p>2.4 Oversee work in progress</p> <p>2.5 Developing M&E framework by Project Coordinator/TA Engineer</p> <p>2.6 Project coordinator to act as project manager for this KRA possibly with a short term TA for an engineer</p> <p>3.1 Conduct awareness through community workshops and collate capacity needs</p> <p>3.2 Use existing communication media for promotional purposes</p> <p>3.3 Provide training to develop community skills</p> <p>3.4 Focus on awareness/toolkit about maintenance with selected households; integrate in training in life skills of Youth Affairs Department</p> <p>3.5 Broader water awareness campaign</p>			
--	--	--	--

<p>3.6 Collaborate with education department on awareness of CC and clean water.</p> <p>4.1 Research of possible models from region</p> <p>4.2 Develop 1 or 2 models and consult with KRA1 activities</p> <p>4.3 Community consultation</p> <p>4.4 Develop a strategy to build political support</p> <p>4.5 Write a report on research for Nauru and the region (Project Coordinator) with peer review by SPC and others</p>			
--	--	--	--

*Different end dates selected by each group

**Assuming project extension obtained

Workshop Evaluation

Fourteen people filled in the workshop evaluation form.

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

13 answered 'yes', one person ticked "other".

Comments:

- Learned a SMART way to create indicators. Group discussions and interactions were learning experiences. Healthy debates. Walking out with a better understanding of the project.
- Good refresher and brought about good targeted discussions
- First time so I found it very useful and a starting point towards similar projects
- A good tool, simplified, makes it easier to understand, step by step. Different perspectives given, reviewed, improved on.
- Providing hard copies of guided materials would have been good
- It is quite useful but the process is taking too long. I know for a fact the framework needs a lot of work.
- Simpler language and more breakdown of activities especially for community members. Realistic choices must be made available for communities and proper education.
- Helped me understand the project fully as to what it entails
- To determine results of households and dwellings that need to access safe drinking water and possibly involving roofs/gutters/tanks and other water catchment improvement.
- Very useful for I see the steps and levels and how to go about the project. Also more transparent.
- Good systematic approach to planning that works well in a group situation
- This will push donors to fund this project
- Going through the steps provided a much needed refresher
- Understanding the whole purpose of the GCCA: PSIS project better; ensuring that different stakeholder views were incorporated into the drafting of the log frame.

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

- Cooler venue, house rules, longer session.
- Need to control people speaking in turn
- More training on these types of issues and planning processes
- All good
- No comments
- Longer from stakeholders
- More details of the work can assist a lot with communities
- Nil
- More time, more examples, more exercises
- Nothing much
- Could have reduced the project concept and priorities session, which would reduce the overall workshop time – by the end tempers were fraying!
- Need more workshops