



Workshop report
Tonga National Lessons Learnt Meeting
Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project
MEIDECCC Conference room
16th October 2015, 9am- 1pm

Workshop Objectives:

1. To share information about Tonga's GCCA: PSIS project's key result areas and exit strategy.
2. To discuss successes and challenges faced in implementing the coastal protection project and technical assistance activities in Tonga.
3. To develop recommendations for improving future projects and discuss ways of sharing these nationally.

Workshop Chair: Mr Sione Fulivai, Climate Change Finance Specialist, MEIDECCC

1. Opening, Welcome and Introductions

The chairman opened the meeting and explained its purpose. The workshop agenda is presented as Annex 1.

Manu Manuofetua, Tonga Project Coordinator, welcomed everyone on behalf of the Department of Climate Change. Gillian Cambers, SPC Project Manager, described how this workshop fits into the overall project's aim to share lessons learnt.

All of the participants (listed in Annex 2) then introduced themselves and explained what they would like to take away from this workshop.

2. Viewing of Tonga's Lessons Learnt Video and Interviews with Project Stakeholders Video

The two ten minutes videos were viewed during morning tea.

3. Group work session 1: What would we do the same? What would we do differently?

These questions were discussed in three groups and then each group reported back. The following is a summary of each group's presentations:

Group 1:

- What would we do the same:

- Use of regular community consultations
- The process involved in designing the coastal protection measures:
 - A Feasibility Study
 - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
 - Design and costing report
 - Regular monitoring by government and coastal engineer- to be continued after the project closes
- What would we do differently:
 - Ensure monitoring system based on EIA
 - The sand source used is unsustainable, so good to identify a long term sand source. This could have been more embedded in the project design.

Group 2:

- What would we do the same:
 - The process involved in designing the coastal protection measures:
 - A Feasibility Study
 - Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
 - Community consultation
 - Design and costing report
 - Public awareness
 - Successful coastal protection measures
 - The set-up of the JNAP Technical Working Group as the project steering committee
- What would we do differently:
 - Collection of more extensive data for EIA as some equipment was not available
 - Obtain monitoring equipment
 - More public awareness including social media; social media provides good feedback
 - More community participation- headed by leaders
 - Having a legal agreement between the community and the project

Group 3:

- What would we do the same:
 - Set up of the technical working group
 - Communities involvement
 - Public consultation
 - Awareness programmes with schools and nationally
 - Pre, during and post construction monitoring
 - Keep using the project's technical expertise when they performed well i.e. same consultants
- What we would do differently:
 - A vehicle was needed for the duration of the project to travel to the project site. One was rented for 3 months but it was not long enough, so private vehicles were often used
 - Having a sister project- linked to disaster planning in the communities i.e. having an evacuation route and evacuation centre in place
 - Be aware that there are political issues within the communities which may affect the decision-making process at the community level

- Monitoring is important to be conducted prior, during, and post project implementation

Discussion:

Geology Division has already carried out 3 beach profiling surveys of the coast. They will continue to monitor this area after the project as per their mandate to conduct monitoring of the beaches and coast and they now have a Geology Assistant who has this function as part of his job description. The project has provided surveying equipment for this (total station). Other monitoring such as for ocean currents is not needed at this time.

Also, a survey of a possible sustainable source of sand located offshore in Eastern Tongatapu has been carried out in collaboration with SPC Geoscience Division and with funding support from the project. The Geology Division explained it appears this site will have more than enough sand for continued beach replenishment. However, sand extraction equipment is needed in Tonga e.g. a small dredge or suction pump.

Community consultations have often been overdone in Tonga with raising community expectations and little outcomes. Therefore a balance between too much and too little consultation must be found. Also, all community members cannot make it to every meeting, so it must be up to the community leaders to ensure consensus is reached for community projects. This project took the approach of not consulting too much until the actual design and implementation stages were ready to begin, so that the consultation would not be seen as just talk and so that the best information could be relayed.

A binding agreement between the communities and the government could have been useful to ensure community consensus was met. The mandate and locations for sand extraction could have been included in this.

The role of the Tonga Climate Change Fund is to fill the gaps in funding between projects and also to maintain and monitor the project outputs. So for example the project communities could apply for funding from the fund to maintain the coastal protection measures and replenish the beach. This is a trial project so the outcomes and long-term maintenance needs have yet to be seen.

4. Group work session 2: What are we most proud of? What did not go as planned?

These questions were discussed in the same three groups and then each group reported back. The following is a summary of each group's presentations:

Group 1:

- What are we most proud of:
 - This project is the first of its kind in Tonga
- What did not go as planned:
 - The source of sand used- from another beach nearby. This could have been better planned.

Group 2:

- What are we most proud of:

- Offshore breakwaters and groynes a success- new type protection measures trialled in Tonga
- Possibility of replication to other sites in Tonga
- Meeting the needs of the communities and their happiness at the outcome of the project
- What did not go as planned:
 - Issues with source of sand
 - A larger budget was needed for vehicle use
 - Communication breakdown with communities at times
 - Monitoring still needed
 - No sitting allowance for the JNAP Technical Working Group

Group 3:

- What are we most proud of:
 - Successful implementation of the coastal protection measures with all parties happy- communities, government, construction company, SPC
 - The parks and playground for children
 - Revised Climate Change Policy
 - Proposal preparation training with various stakeholders i.e. women's groups
- What did not go as p planned:
 - Changed location for sand mining
 - Coastal management plan not being completed

Discussion:

The Geology Department explained that the beach where the sand was extracted is continually replenished due to the prevailing south east trade winds. Therefore this beach should not be significantly affected.

It was suggested to use the same expertise/ consultants/ construction firms that were used as part of this project for future projects in Tonga, as the implementation has been so successful. However, this is sometimes difficult with procurement procedures.

The project model of having a one-on-one approach with one adviser for just 2-3 countries was very useful as there was a go to person available for any needs of the country.

5. Group work session 3: How to share the lessons nationally?

This question was discussed in the same three groups and then each group reported back. The following is a summary of each group's presentations:

Group 1:

- Talk back show
- Radio and TV

- Newspaper
- Documentary
- Social media

Group 2:

- Publication of success story
- Documentary as visual story
- Social media
- Kava sessions- tell the story

Group 3:

- National and regional CC website
- Social network
- Newspaper/ radio
- Bright Spots Newsletter

6. Development of an Action Plan

Key actions for sharing the lessons from the project were discussed in plenary. The two actions decided on were as follows:

- Write up key elements of the 'success story' of the project in an article to be circulated to various media outlets (Manu, Sione, and Juliana to lead this activity and then circulate to the workshop participants for comments)
- Filming a short (10 minute) documentary to illustrate this success story (Manu and Juliana to lead on this with input from others)

7. Closing and Evaluations

The chairman closed the meeting and evaluation sheets (see Annex 3) were completed.

Annex 1: Workshop Agenda



Agenda

Tonga National Lessons Learnt Meeting
Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project
Funded by the European Union &
Implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community
16th October 2015

Time	Topic	Presenter
9:00-9:15 am	Opening and Welcome	-Mr. Paula Ma'u, CEO, MEIDECCC -Dr. Gillian Cambers, Project Manager, SPC
9:15- 9:30 am	Introductions	
9:30- 10:00 am	Viewing of Tonga's Lessons Learnt Video and Interviews with Project Stakeholders Video	
10:00-10:45 am	Group work session 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What would we do the same?• What would we do differently? Report back in plenary- 3 minutes per group Discussion	
10:45-11:00 am	Morning tea	
11:00-11:45 am	Group work session 2: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are we proud of?• What did not go as planned? Report back in plenary- 3 minutes per group	

	Discussion	
11:45-12:45 pm	Group work session 3: How to share the lessons nationally? Report back in plenary- 3 minutes per group Development of Action plan	
12:45-12:55 pm	Closing and Evaluations	-Mr. Paula Ma'u, CEO, MEIDECCC
12:55-1:00 pm	Prayer	
1:00-2:00 pm	Lunch	

Annex 2: Participants List

Tonga Lessons Learnt Meeting

16 October 2015

Participants' List

No.	Name	Ministry	Email
1	Mr Paula Taufu	MEIDECC - PACC	taufapaula@gmail.com
2	Mr Kakau Foliaki	MEIDECC - Energy	kfoliaki30@gmail.com
3	Mr Quddus Fielea	TWB	qfielea@gmail.com
4	Mr Rennie Vaiomo'unga	MLNR - Lands	rjegen@naturalresource.gov.to
5	Ms Seini Fotu	UNDP	sfotu09@gmail.com
6	Ms Sela Fa'u	MOH	sakolofau@gmail.com
7	Mr Leveni Fiho	NEMO	levenih5@gmail.com
8	Dr Gillian Cambers	SPC	gillianc@spc.int
9	Ms Juliana Ungaro	SPC	julianau@spc.int
10	Mr Talo Fulivai	MEIDECC – CC Dept	talo_isa@hotmail.com
11	Mr Manu Manuofetoa	MEIDECC – CC Dept	manuofetoa_m@yahoo.com
12	Ms Aneti Havili Akauola	MEIDECC – CC Dept	berna.windy@gmail.com
13	Ms Lilu Moala	MEIDECC – CC Dept	lilumoala@gmail.com
14	Mr Ma'asi Lepa	MEIDECC – CC Dept	maasi.lepa@gmail.com
15	Mr Fuka Kitekeki	GEOCARE	fooksie1@gmail.com
16	Mr Kutusi Fielea	JNAP Task force	

Annex 3: Evaluation Outcomes

Tonga National Lessons Learnt Meeting

Evaluation Form Analysis

Gender: Female Male

Workshop rating: 1 – Not useful; 3 – Somewhat useful; 5 - Excellent				
Using the rating system given above, indicate (with a tick) your rating for this workshop.				
1	2	3	4	5
				9

What went well? What aspects were most useful to you?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The group discussion.• The success of the project.• Feedback from stakeholders is vital for attaining a realistic perspective on the entire scope of the GCCA: PSIS project.• Learning challenges and success stories of the project and how it can be applied to other projects.• Sharing ideas on what to do if beginning a project; what will be the same and what will be different.• The discussion on community consultation and sand mining.

What could have been done better (recommendations)?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Follow up on participants to ensure better participation especially those who were directly involved with the project from the beginning. It would have been better to hear from all those who didn't turn up.• Doing not only the public awareness through face-to-face mode but also using social media, etc.• The meeting was well structured. It would have been even better had more participants attended.• All good!

Other general comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It was an informative ½ day workshop.• All good! GCCA is a role model for other projects.• Better than ever!