

**Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) project
Final Record of Second Planning and Steering Committee Meeting
3-5 December 2012**



3rd December 2012

Introductions and Background

Participants were welcomed to the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Second Planning and Steering Committee Meeting of the Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) project by Ms. Patricia Sachs-Cornish, Acting Director, Strategic Engagement and Policy Planning Facility, SPC.

Since the first Steering Committee Meeting in May, significant progress has been made with the project. Some highlights include:

- Five countries have determined their focus for a climate change adaptation project and have had project Concept Notes approved, and two of those countries, Cook Islands and Tonga, are already advancing detailed project design.
- Seven of the nine countries have signed a letter of agreement with SPC endorsing project arrangements and financial procedures.
- 14 country missions have been undertaken to advance project planning.
- Arrangements are underway with several countries to recruit national coordinators.
- Five requests for mainstreaming climate change into specific sectors have been received.
- In collaboration with other SPC Divisions and SPREP, three regional/sub-regional training activities have been conducted and three national training activities, in areas covering climate change finance, media training, Climate Change Portal training and JNAP planning (Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management).

In October an external evaluation of the project using Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) was conducted by the European Union (EU). Specific recommendations included revision of the project's log frame and the preparation of a risk management strategy and an exit strategy.

Ms. Gillian Cambers, Project Manager GCCA: PSIS project, gave a presentation of the background to the meeting. The project approach is based on the concept that mainstreaming climate change into a particular sector will assist the sector with implementing well targeted climate change responses and help countries qualify for direct budget support for climate change response actions in the coming

years. Following the results of the EU-ROM evaluation and the feedback from the first Steering Committee Meeting, 28-29 May 2012, the meeting has been designed with the following objectives:

1. Share national information about activities undertaken to date, challenges faced and lessons learnt.
2. In the context of the EU ROM review of the GCCA: PSIS project that was conducted in October 2012, revise and endorse the project log frame and the year 2 work plan.
3. Prepare an exit strategy and a risk management strategy.
4. Advance work planning and prepare country specific work plans for the second reporting period of the project (1 July 2012 – 31 December 2013).
5. Share information about regional coordination of climate change activities.

The agenda for the meeting is presented as Annex 1. The actual Steering Committee on 6th December and the morning of 7th December was a closed session for country representatives, the Project Team and Steering Committee members from EU, Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), SPC and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) only. The sessions on 5th December and the afternoon of 7th December were open sessions to which other organisations and projects were invited. The list of participants is presented as Annex 2. Participants from Palau were unable to attend because of Typhoon Bopha.

Country Presentations: Progress, Challenges and Lessons Learnt

The morning session was chaired by Ms. Lu'isa Tu'i'afitu-Malolo from Tonga and the afternoon session by Mr. Sauni Tongatule from Niue.

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA (FSM)

Ms. Cindy Ehmes described the plans for the GCCA: PSIS project in FSM and specifically their focus on food and water security in two atoll islands. She emphasised that the project needed to be country driven and to encourage state ownership, especially in FSM with its system of national and state governance.

Discussion items:

- In answer to a question about state ownership, it was emphasised that a decision had been made to change focus from the main islands in each state and to select outer atoll islands. Two atoll sites had been selected because a project of €0.5 million should provide benefit to a significant number of people. Transportation costs are a significant expense in FSM.

NAURU

Mr. Ivan Batiouk explained that Nauru is currently formulating a detailed project plan focusing on improving water security for the people of Nauru. The GCCA: PSIS project activities, improving rainwater catchments, will complement existing and on-going projects, such as additional rainwater tanks (funded by AusAID) as well as an overhaul of gutters and downpipes (funded by EU B Envelope). Key challenges relate to limited human resources in the Climate Change Unit. It was also emphasised that project implementation must ensure ongoing government and community support.

Discussions items:

- A similar route of using the GCCA: PSIS project funding to complement existing projects is being used in Niue.
- The contribution of local householders to the project was discussed. It was emphasised that there has to be local commitment and that each household has to connect to the solar water purifying system. In addition a GCCA: PSIS technical assistance/consultancy will specifically

consider ways in which householders can make a monetary contribution to the individual water catchments.

- The human resources constraint arises in every country and there was some discussion as to how to address it. In Nauru the existing financial management system is very complex for a small country and causes considerable delays in project implementation.
- A Water Unit is being established within the Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Environment in Nauru. This is being established by government and will be staffed by nationals and is seen as a significant initiative.
- It was noted that there is no Meteorological Service in Nauru and that the Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Program will soon be closing down. SPREP said they are willing to assist with training of meteorological officers.
- The USP EU GCCA project is also focusing on community water issues in Nauru.

NIUE

Mr. Sauni Tongatule described how Niue was also focusing on water for their adaptation project activities and that with the added benefit of the GCCA: PSIS project they would be able to cover every household in the country. He mentioned that it was a challenge to get all government agencies to focus on water. Among the other challenges he mentioned was the similarity between the two regional GCCA projects and that perhaps the SPC GCCA: PSIS and the USP GCCA should have teamed up as regards demonstration projects.

Discussion items:

- There was some discussion about the size of the water tanks. It was noted that the design for 5,000 litre size tanks was based on a cost benefit analysis. The tanks were also seen as a disaster risk management measure, since in Niue the announcement of a “yellow alert” results in power supplies being cut and this affects water supplies. It was noted however, that in Tuvalu, based on the recent drought, a tank size of 5,000 litres is not sufficient.
- The provision of sufficient freshwater storage needs to be provided for in building codes.
- There was discussion about some duplication with the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) Project and it was noted that it was more a case of upscaling and replication than duplication.

MARSHALL ISLANDS

Mr. Warwick Harris noted that water is the selected focus area for the Marshall Islands although the Concept Note has yet to be developed. He discussed several other donor-funded water initiatives that are ongoing in Majuro and Ebaye, as well as the outer islands, and it was necessary to get up-to-date information about these activities so that the GCCA: PSIS project can complement ongoing activities. A major challenge has been how to select the project focus in a way that involves senior levels of government as well as all the stakeholders. He also noted that a new Ministry of Environment, Energy and Conservation may be established in the near future.

Discussion items:

- In the Marshall Islands the National Climate Change Committee, which consists of senior government officials had identified in August 2012 three possible sectors for the GCCA: PSIS project: coastal resource management, food security and water. In November 2012, a multi stakeholder group had recommended focusing on water in the outer islands. It was pointed out that the GCCA: PSIS Project Manager will require a formal letter from the government indicating the area of focus for the adaptation project and that this refers to all countries. (Some countries had already provided such letters: Kiribati and Nauru).

- There was some discussion about Japanese funding for solar reverse osmosis units in 15 of the outer islands (USD3.1 million). There appeared to be a lack of information about the details of this project. Nauru mentioned they were also accessing Japanese funding for one reverse osmosis unit.

KIRIBATI

Mr. Andrew Teem told the participants that Kiribati had selected the health sector mainly because this sector had a national plan of action on climate change and health in place and was in a position to move ahead with a climate change adaptation project. He noted, however, that they had had some difficulty with choosing a sector since there were no clear guidelines, and some sectors, e.g. water, had several climate change projects ongoing. He emphasized the need for donors to collaborate in climate change activities.

Discussion items:

- There was some discussion about the need for countries to ensure that donor-driven climate change projects pool resources.
- The challenges associated with getting Ministries of Finance to sign the Letters of Agreement were discussed.
- Difficulties with procurement in small countries, especially obtaining three quotations, were raised.

TONGA

Ms. Lu'isa Tu'i'afitu-Malolo explained that Tonga had chosen a coastal protection project based on the areas prioritized under their Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management (JNAP). They had also selected associated mainstreaming activities: preparation of a coastal zone management plan and revision of the building code. She also described in detail the collaboration that was ongoing with other climate change projects and activities in Tonga.

Discussion items:

- There was some detailed discussion about how Tonga's JNAP was used to select the climate change adaptation project. It was explained that Tonga have a prioritized list of projects as part of their JNAP and these projects have budgets attached. So it was possible to use this list to select projects that still required funding, that were high priority and matched the funding available under the GCCA: PSIS project.

TUVALU

In her presentation, Ms. Moe Tuisiga Saitala mentioned that there had been some delays with the identification of a climate change adaptation project although it was planned to complete this process by the end of the year. One of the main challenges was to identify synergies with existing projects.

Discussion items:

- Particularly in the smaller islands, the shortage of human resources is a major issue since offices are significantly under-staffed. The question remains how to address this issue.

COOK ISLANDS

Mr. George Turia in his presentation described the process for selecting and designing their climate change adaptation project. Marine resources was the sector selected and the climate change adaptation

project will focus on environmental monitoring to enhance community livelihoods and build resilience to climate change in the low lying atolls of the Cook Islands. The distance to the northern atolls is a significant challenge in the implementation of this project. An inadequate lead-in time for the GCCA: PSIS project was noted as a major constraint at the beginning of the project cycle, although this had now been overcome.

Discussion items:

- There was discussion about the need for projects to have a longer lead-in time for project planning and start-up so that they can be aligned with government's budgetary processes.
- There is a need to check up on the status of repair of a previous water quality monitoring buoy that had been sent to SPC approximately one year ago.
- The need for effective communication of the environmental monitoring results to the pearl farmers was emphasised and this is an important part of the project.
- The need to link the GCCA: PSIS project in the Cook Islands to a NZAID project that had focused on providing credit to pearl farmers was discussed.

Summary and Close

Ms. Gillian Cambers provided a summary of some of the highlights from the presentations:

- Countries had used a variety of processes to select key focus areas for the GCCA: PSIS project. While in some cases this had posed a key challenge, it did promote ownership of the activities.
- Several countries had combined the GCCA: PSIS adaptation project activities with other donor-funded climate change adaptation projects, e.g. Nauru and Niue, and this was recognized as up-scaling and replication.
- Countries are already looking at ways of trying to make project activities sustainable beyond project life.
- The need for good, accessible information about all climate change activities planned and ongoing in each country is very important so as to avoid duplication.
- The challenges of internal coordination and donor coordination were mentioned by several countries.
- Challenges posed by national finance systems and reporting to different donor organisations remain major issues and there is a need to align externally funded projects with national budgetary systems.
- The importance of having communication strategies in place that respond to the needs of all stakeholders was stressed,

Mr. Sauni Tongatule closed the first day's session and thanked all the participants for the very interesting presentations and discussions.

Participants completed evaluation forms. These showed that all participants found the presentations interesting and useful and gained information that can be applied to their work. Some key highlights noted by several participants were as follows:

- Targeting the most vulnerable group of people and focusing on a commercial activity – pearl farming (in the Cook Islands).
- Combining both food and water security in one project (in FSM).
- Facilitating projects funded by different donors to focus on one sector (in Nauru and Niue).
- Use of cost benefit analysis in project design (in Niue).
- Existence of an institutional framework linked to the JNAP process to identify project needs (in Tonga).

4th December 2012

The representative from FSM, Ms. Cindy Ehmes, was elected as chair person. The proposed agenda was accepted. PIFS sent their apologies that they were unable to attend the day's meeting. Palau's absence due to Typhoon Bopha was also noted. The following represents the Statement of Record for the discussions on 4th December that was endorsed by all participants on 5th December 2012.

Statement of Record, 4th December 2012

Monitoring and evaluation of the project – perspectives from the EU by Mr. Thierry Catteau, EU Delegation

A Result Orientated Monitoring mission to review the project was undertaken in October 2012. Ratings range from A – D, with A being the highest rating and D representing serious issues within a project. The results for the GCCA: PSIS were:

Relevance – B

Efficiency – C (Project faced delays in the first 6 months only using 44% of resources)

Effectiveness – C (Products are good quality outputs and project purpose can be achieved but may require an expanded time frame)

Impact prospects – B

Potential sustainability - B

Recommendations arising from the evaluation were:

- Make the objectively verifiable indicators smarter
- Design a risk management strategy
- Design an exit strategy
- Recruit two more climate change technical advisors and a project liaison officer.

Discussion:

- The additional climate change technical advisors will likely be based on Suva. The existing two technical advisors have a very heavy work load, one responsible for four countries and one responsible for five countries. The additional advisors will allow a better division of labour, approximately 2-3 countries per advisor.
- Advisors with cross-sectoral expertise will be recruited. The applications will be carefully reviewed to determine how best to address country needs – the main sectors identified by the countries to date are water, health and coastal resources/management. SPC's Applied Geosciences Technical Division (formerly SOPAC) is also available to provide technical advice.
- A regional technical support mechanism is being established by CROP which can provide additional support.
- Funding will come from the existing core team budget line and will not divert funds from any other priority areas.
- The next ROM evaluation is likely to take place in about one year's time to assess the anticipated accelerated implementation rate. Once the project log frame and especially the indicators have been revised it will be easier to monitor progress.
- The USP GCCA project also underwent a ROM evaluation at the same time as the GCCA: PSIS.
- SPREP and SPC are working closely to implement the GCCA: PSIS. A GCCA: PSIS supported climate change coordination advisor is based in SPREP and she participates in regular meetings and activities with the rest of the project team. Work is underway in several areas to implement activities jointly and to apply experiences being utilised in existing projects such as the PACC project.
- The EU recognises that it may not be possible to complete the project by December 2014 and it may be possible to request an extension of up to one year. However, this can only be

requested 6 months before the end date. No new funding would be available for such an extension. The present GCCA funding cycle, which started in 2007, ends in 2013.

- It was agreed that for present work planning purposes the end date of December 2014 would be retained. The issue of project completion timing can be discussed again at the next Steering Committee meeting.
- The EU representative noted that many projects that have a slow start-up period do end up making up the time during project life.

Overview of logical framework analysis and version 1 of the project log frame by Ms. Gillian Cambers

This presentation provided a short overview of project cycle management and the logical framework approach; reviewed the recommendations made by the external evaluators for revision of the project logframe; and described the major changes in version 2 of project logframe. The Project Team had been working over a period of five weeks to revise the logframe. No changes had been made to the substance of the project or the funding allocations. Key result areas had been re-aligned so as to make reporting clearer and more transparent. Based on a show of hands at the beginning of the presentation, about half of the meeting participants were familiar with logical framework analysis.

Discussion

- Successful experiences using the logframe as a project planning tool in the Cook Islands in November 2012 were described. This involved about 20 stakeholders in Rarotonga and Manihiki working together via skype to plan project details: overall objective, project purpose, key result areas and project activities.
- As a follow-up to this process, a project steering committee was established with terms of reference and this is likely to become the formal point of contact for the project in the Cook Islands.
- It is proposed to use a similar participatory process to design the climate change adaptation projects in the other countries also using the logframe as a tool.
- Should other countries wish to consult directly with outer island stakeholders for the purposes of project planning, funding is available for this using a separate budget line to the climate change adaptation project budget line.

Key results area 1: climate change mainstreamed into national and/or sector response strategies by Ms. Pasha Carruthers

This presentation described in detail the main changes made to the climate change mainstreaming key results area; this also includes communication activities. It was noted that for all four key results areas, the indicators in the logframe have been set to reflect the minimum the project is certain to achieve. It is hoped that many of the activities will be achieved in all nine countries.

Discussion

- Whilst many of the countries already have climate change policies in place there may be opportunities to assist with action/implementation plans. The project can also complement mainstreaming work already undertaken by PACC, and can use mainstreaming tools already developed, e.g. a mainstreaming guide.
- SPC developed a climate change communications plan in 2012 with GCCA: PSIS funding. This is presently awaiting SPC Executive approval before being available for distribution. Implementation of the plan will create awareness, share resources and best practices, and provide input for planning and budgeting.
- SPREP is also developing a climate change communications policy and there is the opportunity to collaborate with SPC and CROP agencies to ensure single climate change messaging for the region.

- Other work is ongoing in the region supported by the Coping with the Climate Change in the Pacific Islands Region (CCCPIR) project and other initiatives to prepare educational tools such as text books, posters and other materials covering energy and climate change.
- Visibility is an important aspect of EU projects and is required to provide European taxpayers with information about how their tax dollars are being used. It was proposed that a short paragraph about EU funding should be included in the climate change profiles so as to provide information to stakeholders about the EU.
- The opportunity exists to contribute to the JNAP process and this will depend on country requests.
- To date only one formal (written) request for mainstreaming assistance has been received, although several requests have been made verbally. Firm requests for mainstreaming assistance need to be sent in writing to the Project Manager.

Discussion items about the work plan for KRA1:

- Countries were informed that in order for mainstreaming and training requests to be considered they had to submit a written request to the Project Manager. A template will be provided on the usb sticks which will be distributed after this meeting.
- Requests for training and technical assistance for mainstreaming-related activities can be submitted between now and December 2013.

Key results area 2: well articulated adaptation strategies that address budget support criteria are in place by Mr. Graham Sem

The four criteria for EU budget support were defined and the project will focus on building capacity in the first criteria – the existence of well articulated adaptation strategies.

Discussion

- It is very difficult for some Pacific countries to fulfil the criteria for direct budget support. One country in particular, Nauru, has been the focus of an extensive study on climate change finance led by PIFS with input from several other CROP agencies.
- Budget support is central to EU objectives in the region. Already several Pacific countries have accessed direct or sectoral budget support, and there are lessons to be learnt from this. In addition the EU has provided €4.5 million to the Pacific Financial Technical Assistance Centre (PFTAC) to help countries advance their public finance management systems.
- The GCCA: PSIS national coordinator will coordinate project activities as well as other SPC climate change activities in country. These positions are being recruited by the countries using government pay scales. Draft terms of reference have been included in the letters of agreement. For those countries that have signed letters of agreement they are eligible to request in writing to the Project Finance Officer (Sheik Irfaan sheiki@spc.int) the first payment tranche for the project coordinator (€27,000).
- The meeting requested that information surrounding the process of recruitment of national coordinators is shared.
- For KRA2 on the log frame, rephrase the first verifiable indicator as “ Climate change coordinators in place *and contracts signed* in at least four countries by 12/2013

Discussion items about the work plan for KRA2

- During 2013 it is planned to recruit technical assistance to assist countries’ readiness for budget support particularly relating to criterion 1 – existence of national or sector policies or strategies that meet the criteria of relevance and credibility.
- The EU will work directly with country beneficiaries to assess their overall readiness for budget support.

Feedback from the Asia Pacific Adaptation Network meeting on climate financing and proposal preparation, 25-26 October, by Mr. Sanivalati Tubuna

The objective of this workshop was to:

- Build an understanding amongst Pacific Island Countries (PIC) of specific donors and types of climate change financing available to the Pacific.
- Build an understanding of individual donor policies and financing criteria.
- Enhance PIC skills in proposal writing, and log frame development.
- Enhance PIC understanding in monitoring and evaluation, and reporting requirements for donors.

One of the outputs of the workshop was a draft donors directory. Several of the participants recommended the need for longer national workshops covering the entire logical framework approach that would provide the training to many more people in each country.

Countries interested in such workshops should send in a request to the project manager (Gillian Cambers gillianc@spc.int)

Key results area 3: national climate change adaptation projects by Ms. Pasha Carruthers and Mr. Graham Sem

This presentation focused on the activities associated with the on-the-ground climate change adaptation projects in each country.

Discussion

- The indicator shows only seven countries achieving implementation and again this has been set to take into account possible risks such as political change and natural disasters. However, it is anticipated that all nine countries will achieve this key result.
- Projects will have to be carefully designed to take into account the available funding - €500,000.
- Some countries may determine that additional staff, e.g. a project manager or senior technical advisor needs to be recruited to implement the project. Such costs can be included within the €500,000. However, staff costs should only represent a proportion of the project budget and there needs to be tangible on-the-ground benefit. These staff will be in addition to the national coordinator.
- The letter of agreement covers arrangements for the entire project. Annex 2 of the letter of agreement refers specifically to financial arrangements for the on-the-ground climate change adaptation project.

Discussion items about the work plan for KRA3

- Once the country has determined its area of focus for the climate change adaptation project (€500,000) and the concept note has been approved, a formal letter confirming the choice of project must be submitted to the Project Manager by the officer responsible for the particular sector (e.g. a Director or Principal/Permanent Secretary). A template letter is provided on the usb stick provided to participants at the end of the meeting.

KRA 4 Streamlined technical assistance that supports national adaptation responses delivered by regional organizations in a collaborative manner by Ms Tagaloa Cooper¹

¹ During the review of the Statement of record on the December there was considerable discussion about the wording of this key result area. The proposals put forward on 5th December were further discussed by the Project Team on 7th December and this wording represents the outcome of those discussions.

This presentation focused on the analytical tools as well as the regional collaboration activities

Discussion

- A sub-regional climate change portal training will be conducted in the north Pacific 19-20 February 2013. This complements the training already conducted in the south Pacific in November 2012. Sub-regional trainings have been organised so as to accommodate the geographical spread of the countries. Further national training may be available later.
- Only information that is publicly available will be uploaded to the portal.
- For KRA4 on the logframe rephrase the second verifiable indicator to read “Minimum of ten national representatives *representing a minimum of three countries regularly* contributing to the climate change portal by 12/2014”
- SPREP with the support of CCCPIR are working with countries who wish to have national portals linked to the regional portal. It was recommended there should be just one national portal per country, possibly combining several different projects.
- Funding for additional computer equipment and office equipment is available in the budget line for the national coordinators – up to €54,000 is available per country over the life of the project. This is intended to cover the salary of a national coordinator over the life of the project at national salary scales and funds left over can be used for local travel, office equipment, although it should be noted that like with all funding this has to be properly acquitted.
- The opportunity exists to link up with the PACC project for communications and joint activities.
- Clarification was sought as to how the countries can be informed about the outcome of regional collaborative mechanisms such as the CROP CEOs Climate Change Sub-Committee (WACC). It was noted that these mechanisms were still in the very preliminary stages and the wider sharing of information would likely come later and may be distributed via the Climate Change Portal.

Discussion items about the work plan for KRA4

- In July 2013 there will be several regional meetings held concurrently: Water and Sanitation, Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, Disaster Risk Management Net and the Meteorological Services network. Following these meetings a joint meeting will be held to discuss the roadmap for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management. FSM had offered to host this meeting, however due to the escalating size of the combined meetings there were insufficient facilities in the country.

The logframe presented as Annex 3, represents the logframe as agreed by the Steering Committee with the changes noted above included.

Revised reporting period 2 work plan by Ms. Gillian Cambers

This work plan covers the period July 2012 to December 2013. This is so as to synchronise the work reporting time framework with the financial reporting.

The discussion items relating to the work plan have been inserted under the respective KRA discussions.

The work plan presented as Annex 4, represents the work plan for the period July 2012 to December 2013 as agreed by the Steering Committee.

Discussion of risk management and exit strategy by Ms. Gillian Cambers

One of the recommendations of the evaluation was to prepare a risk management strategy and an exit strategy. Participants were asked to write down two risks to successful project implementation, papers

were then exchanged and participants were asked to prepare mitigation measures. These were discussed and compared with the risks identified by the project team. (The draft risk matrix is presented as Annex 5).

There was little time to discuss an exit strategy. Based on several discussion items noted during the meeting a draft project exit strategy is presented as Annex 6.

Presentation on the financial and administrative arrangements for the GCCA: PSIS project by Mr. Sheik Irfaan

This presentation covered the budget allocation for the entire project, procurement procedures, eligible and non-eligible costs, and especially the importance of acquittals.

Discussions:

- Disbursement of funds for the climate change adaptation projects will be in tranches which will likely be 20% of the total grant value and further instalments based on 80% acquittals on prior disbursements. However, there can be some flexibility here e.g. if a country needs to purchase an expensive piece of equipment item at the beginning of the project then the value of the tranche can be adjusted.
- The project does not cover insurance of the goods purchased, so it is important to consider quality when procuring goods.
- A request was made to insert a more familiar currency e.g. US\$ (instead of the Pacific French Francs) in the SPC Procurement Guidelines – a conversion table can be included.
- In some countries, the Ministries of Finance may need a letter from SPC for procurement of large items. This can be provided if needed, but countries are requested to also use the project design document for justification purposes.
- Some countries are using procurement guidelines from other donor countries e.g. AusAID. These would also be acceptable for SPC.
- Financial reporting can be based on committed items based on submission of relevant documents. It will be necessary to maintain a running list of the committed items.
- Funding has to be channelled through a country's Ministry of Finance as this is SPC's procedure. However, in exceptional cases, other routing could be considered if sufficient justification exists.
- Several countries described limitations and constraints with their national financial systems.
- For large item disbursements e.g. €50,000+ procurement and direct payment to the vendor could be undertaken by SPC if requested by the country.
- For technical assistance and consultancy contracts, SPC's procedures are rigorous and time consuming and should not be seen as a short cut.

At the end of the day, the participants completed evaluation forms. Almost all the participants found the revised project logframe an improvement on the original version indicating it was more understandable and easy to work with as well as being more realistic. Similarly participants found sessions on the risk management strategy, work plan and financial arrangements very useful and noted the need for regular revision of the work plan.

5th December, 2012

After a brief introduction, countries worked to draft their work plans for the reporting period July 2012 – December 2013 using the four key result areas from the project logframe.

Countries then exchanged their work plans with partner countries and discussed and revised them. National representatives then presented their work plans. These work plans are an important starting point for national project planning and allowed participants to gain a better understanding of logframe work. The exchange of work plans provided alternate perspectives and the opportunity to learn from others to build experience.

The national work plans will be further developed by the participants in collaboration with the Project Team as the project progresses.

Linking the GCCA: PSIS project to regional activities

Panel Session 1: Regional Frameworks – Panel Chair: Ms. Tagaloa Cooper

PACIFIC ISLAND FORUM SECRETARIAT PRESENTATION BY MS. CORAL PASISI AND MR. LEONAITASI TAUKAFA

The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) is currently involved in the political side of climate change in the region, with a focus covering political organization for climate change coordination, climate change financing in the region as well as the Pacific Environment Community or PEC fund which is administered by PIFS on behalf of the government of Japan and has been working on distributing solar power generation systems as well as salt water reverse osmosis plants.

JOINT NATIONAL ACTION PLAN FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTION AND DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT (JNAP) BY MR. MOSESE SIKIVOU, SPC, AND MR. ESPEN RONNEBERG, SPREP

A brief overview was given of the JNAP process and how it ties climate change adaptation and disaster risk management together to develop synergies and ensure the efficient use of resources. The GCCA: PSIS project can combine efforts with the ongoing JNAP process particularly through the mainstreaming and on-the-ground adaptation projects. There are currently funding modalities available to implement some JNAP work within the SPC work plan, Tonga has gone as far as setting up a committee to oversee their JNAP implementation. Funding can be secured through various bilateral and multilateral modalities.

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME BY MR. KEVIN PETRINI

There are currently quite a few ongoing UNDP projects which tie into the GCCA:PSIS work plan. These include an upcoming mainstreaming guide developed with SPREP under the PACC project, a Pacific Climate finance assessment framework and a Climate Public Expenditure and Institutional Review. There are also a number of case studies available on climate change finance including the Tuvalu Trust Fund and the Micronesia Conservation Trust Fund. In addition there is the Pacific Solutions Exchange in Climate Change, which allows stakeholders with an interest in climate change to share ideas and information.

Panel Session 2: Regional Projects – Panel Chair: Ms. Pasha Carruthers

COPING WITH CLIMATE CHANGE IN THE PACIFIC ISLAND REGION PROJECT (CCCPIR) BY MS. CHRISTINA FUNG

A brief overview of the CCCPIR was provided including how it is working closely with the GCCA: PSIS project particularly through close collaboration among the two projects' climate change advisers and the on-the-ground national coordinators, as well as the development and implementation of the JNAP in several countries. They are also working closely with other climate change projects

implemented by USAID and USP GCCA, and are currently running a series of cost benefit analysis workshops in different countries.

VEGETATION AND LAND COVER MAPPING AND IMPROVING FOOD SECURITY FOR BUILDING RESILIENCE TO A CHANGING CLIMATE IN PACIFIC ISLAND COMMUNITIES BY MS. VUKI BUADROMO

This project is funded by USAID and addresses food security and agriculture and includes capacity building at the national and community levels. The project seeks to develop and implement innovative techniques for building resilience into farming systems including vegetative mapping using GIS technology and the incorporation of traditional knowledge. The project is working with the GCCA: PSIS project in Kiribati, building on work already done on the ground to have a more far reaching effect and prevent duplication of effort.

UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE PROJECT BY MS. SARAH HEMSTOCK, USP

The sister GCCA regional project is implemented by USP and covers 15 countries, 11 of which have USP campuses. National coordinators have been recruited and placed at the USP campuses, or in government offices or national NGOs. The project has three components: formal and non formal trainings through scholarships for post graduate diplomas in climate change; community engagement; and applied research. The project is seeking to implement best practices and develop a knowledge centre. The project uses a slightly different approach from the GCCA: PSIS project, in that it uses a bottom-up approach, however the two projects are running side by side and seek to contribute to similar goals.

PACIFIC ADAPTION TO CLIMATE CHANGE PROJECT BY MR. ESPEN RONNEBERG, SPREP

The project focuses on climate change adaption across a number of sectors depending on the countries preference and including water management, coastal protection and food security. The project is carried out through key development sectors which implement projects on the ground with the support of regional coordination. Several guides have been developed including a community vulnerability assessment guide, socio-economic assessment guide, mainstreaming guide, gender assessment toolkit and cost benefit assessment guide. Support is being provided to raise awareness on climate change issues. Collaboration with the GCCA: PSIS is ongoing through work on communications, capacity building in climate change adaptation and the implementation of pilot projects particularly in the water sector.

All panellists were thanked for their important and useful contributions and the meeting was closed.

List of Annexes

1. Meeting agenda
2. List of participants
3. Log frame Version 2
4. Work plan, July 2012 – December 2013, V2
5. Risk Management Strategy
6. Exit Strategy

Annex 1 Meeting Agenda



Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States (GCCA: PSIS) project

Planning and Steering Committee Meeting 3-5 December 2012 Pasifika Conference Room, Lotus Building, Nabua, Fiji

AGENDA

Day 1, Monday 3 December 2012, 0900-1630: Sharing Lessons Learnt

Introductions and background

- 09.00 Welcome, Patricia Sachs-Cornish, Acting Director Strategic Engagement and Policy Planning Facility, SPC
- 09.10 Background to the meeting: Progress with the Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project May-December 2012: Gillian Cambers
- 09.30 Introductions

Country Presentations: Progress, Challenges and Lessons Learnt while Planning and Implementing the GCCA: PSIS Project to date

- 09.45 Presentation from Federated States of Micronesia
Discussion
- 10.15 Presentation from Nauru
Discussion
- 10.45 TEA BREAK
- 11.15 Presentation from Niue
Discussion
- 11.45 Presentation from Palau
Discussion
- 12.15 Presentation from Marshall Islands
Discussion
- 12.45 LUNCH
- 13.45 Presentation from Cook Islands
Discussion
- 14.15 Presentation from Kiribati
Discussion
- 14.45 Presentation from Tonga

- Discussion
- 15.15 TEA BREAK
- 15.30 Presentation from Tuvalu
Discussion
- 16.00 Evaluation of Day 1
- 16.10 Summary and wrap-up

Day 2, Tuesday 4th December, 0900-1630, Steering Committee Meeting

- 09.00 Nomination of Chair and acceptance of the agenda
- 09.05 Monitoring and evaluation of the project – perspectives from the EU by Thierry Catteau, EU Delegation
Discussion
- 09.30 Overview of logical framework analysis and version 1 of the project log frame by Gillian Cambers
Discussion
- 09.45 Revised project log frame: Presentations followed by discussion
Key Results Area 1 Climate change mainstreamed into national and/or sector response strategies by Pasha Carruthers
Key Results Area 2 Well articulated sectoral adaptation strategies that address budget support criteria in place by Graham Sem
- Feedback from the Asia Pacific Adaptation Network Meeting on climate financing and proposal preparation 25-26 October 2012 by Sanivalati Tubuna
- Key Results Area 3 National climate change adaptation projects by Pasha Carruthers & Graham Sem
- Key Results Area 4 Streamlined adaptation finance and technical assistance that support national adaptation responses delivered by regional organisations by Tagaloa Cooper
- 11.00 TEA BREAK
- 11.30 Revised project log frame continued
- 12.30 Presentation of the revised year 2 work plan: Gillian Cambers
- 13.00 LUNCH
- 14.00 Discussion of revised year 2 work plan
- 14.30 Discussion on risk management strategy and exit strategy: Gillian Cambers
Discussion
- 15.00 Presentation on the financial and administrative arrangements for the GCCA: PSIS Project by Sheik Irfaan
Discussion

- 15.30 TEA BREAK
- 16.00 Endorsement of Statement of Record.
- 16.30 Close and evaluation of Day 2

Day 3, Wednesday 5th December, 0900-1715: National Work Planning and

Linking the GCCA: PSIS Project to Regional Activities

National Work Planning

- 09.00 Introduction to the work planning process by Gillian Cambers
- 09.10 Countries draft national work plans for year 2 in collaboration with project team
- 10.45 Country to country feedback
- 11.00 TEA BREAK
- 11.30 Countries present outlines of their year 2 work plans
- 12.30 LUNCH BREAK

Linking the GCCA: PSIS Project to Regional Activities

- 13.30 Overview of regional collaboration activities by Gillian Cambers

13.45 Panel Session 1: Regional Frameworks – Panel Chair: Tagaloa Cooper

Short presentations from each member of the panel on how a particular organisation or activity relates to the GCCA: PSIS project, followed by discussion

Representatives on the panel from:

- Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management (JNAP) – presented by Mosese Sikivou, SPC and Espen Ronneberg, SPREP
- Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat tbc
- United Nations Development Programme tbc

- 15.15 TEA BREAK

15.30 Panel Session 2: Regional Projects – Panel Chair: Pasha Carruthers

Short presentations from each member of the panel on how the particular project relates to the GCCA: PSIS project, followed by discussion

Representatives on the panel from:

- Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region project by Christine Fung
- Vegetation and Land Cover Mapping and Improving Food Security for Building Resilience to a Changing Climate in Pacific Island Communities by Vuki Buadromo
- University of the South Pacific Global Climate Change Alliance project by Sarah Hemstock/Aliti Koroi
- Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project by Espen Ronneberg

17.00 Close and evaluation of afternoon session

17.15 Cocktail reception.

Annex 2 List of Participants

COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES

Cook Islands

Mr. Kelvin Passfield
Senior Policy Advisor,
Ministry of Marine Resources,
Rarotonga, Cook Islands
+682 22271
kelvin.passfield@gmail.com

Mr. George Turia,
EU Coordinator,
Development Coordination Division,
Ministry of Finance and Economic
Management,
Rarotonga, Cook Islands
+682 22271
george.turia@cookislands.gov.ck

Federated States of Micronesia

Ms. Cynthia Ehmes
Assistant Director,
Division of Environment and Sustainable
Development,
Office of Environment and Emergency
Management,
PS 69, Palikir, Pohnpei State, FM 96941
Federated States of Micronesia
+ 691 320 8814, 8815
climate@mail.fm

Kiribati

Mr. Terieta Mwemwenikeaki
Deputy Secretary,
Office of Te Beretitenti,
Kiribati.
+686 21183; +686 62232
terieta@ob.gov.ki

Mr. Andrew Teem
Senior Policy Advisor,
Strategic National Policy Unit,
Office of Te Beretitenti,
Kiribati.
+686 21183; +686 62232
ateem@ob.gov.ki

Marshall Islands

Mr. Ywao Elanzo
Office of Environmental Planning and Policy
Coordination,
Office of the President,
Majuro, Marshall Islands.
ye28@yahoo.com

Mr. Warwick Harris,
Acting Director,
Office of Environmental Planning and Policy
Coordination,
Office of the President,
Majuro, Marshall Islands.
warwick47@gmail.com

Nauru

Mr. Ivan Batiouk
Environment Project Officer,
Department of Commerce Industry &
Environment,
Yaren District, Nauru.
ivan.batiouk@gmail.com

Ms. Mavis Depaune
PACC Project Coordinator,
Department of Commerce Industry &
Environment,
Yaren District, Nauru.
mavis.depaune@naurugov.nr

Ms. Liluv Itsimaera
Co-Chair to the Nauru GCCA Steering
Committee,
Department of Commerce Industry &
Environment,
Yaren District, Nauru.
liluv.danielle@gmail.com

Niue

Ms. Margret Siosikefu
Manager -Project Management &
Coordination Unit
Department of Treasury - Government of Niue
Niue Public Service Building
Fonuakula, Alofi, Niue.
+683 4018 ext. 152
Margaret.Siosikefu@mail.gov.nu

Mr. Sauni Tongatule
Director,
Department of Environment,
P.O. Box 80,
Fonuakula, Alofi, Niue.
sauni.tongatule@mail.gov.nu

Palau (Unable to attend because of Typhoon Bopha)

Mr. Jeff Ngirarsaol
Grant Coordinator,
Office of Budget and Grants Oversight,
Office of the President,
P.O.Box 6051,
Koror, Palau 96940
+680 488 4411
purepalau09@gmail.com ;
ropgrant@palaugov.net

Mr. Ngiratmetuchel Reagan Belechl
Chief Financial Officer,
Office of Environmental Response and
Coordination,
P.O. Box 6051,
Koror, Republic of Palau 96940
+680 767 8681
nrbelechl@gmail.com

Tonga

Ms. Luisa Malolo
Team Leader, JNAP Secretariat,
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change,
P.O. Box 917,
Nuku'alofa, Tonga.
+676 27262
ltuiafitumalolo@gmail.com

Ms. Andrea Taliauli
Ministry of Infrastructure,
Nuku'alofa, Tonga.
ataliauli@yahoo.com

Tuvalu

Mr Avafoa Irata
Acting High Commissioner,
Tuvalu Embassy,
Suva, Fiji.
avafoairata@yahoo.com

Mr. Mataio Tekinene
Director of Environment
Government of Tuvalu
Private Mail Bag,
Funafuti, Tuvalu.
+688 20117
dfa@gov.tv

Ms. Moe Tuisiga Saitala
Assistant Environment Officer,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trade, Tourism,
Environment and Labour,
Private Mail Bag, Funafuti, Tuvalu.
qmoe.saitala@gmail.com

DELEGATION OF THE EUROPEAN UNION TO THE PACIFIC

Mr. Thierry Catteau
Regional Integration, Environment and
Natural Resources,
Delegation of the European Union for the
Pacific,
Level 4, Development Bank Centre
360 Victoria Parade, Suva, Fiji.
PMB G.P.O Suva
+679 331 3633 Ext- 134
Thierry.Catteau@eeas.europa.eu

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)

Ms. Coral Pasisi
Regional and International Issues Adviser,
PIFS,
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 775 8612
coralp@forumsec.org.fj

Secretariat of the Pacific Community

Ms. Vuki Budromo
USAID Climate Change and Food Security
Project
SPC,
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 337 9294
vukib@spc.int

Ms. Gillian Cambers
Project Manager, GCCA: PSIS Project,
SPC,
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 337 9450
gillianC@spc.int

Ms. Pasha Carruthers
Climate Change Advisor North Pacific,
GCCA: PSIS Project,
SPC Regional Office North Pacific,
P.O. Box Q,
Kolonia, Pohnpei,
Federated States of Micronesia 96941
+691 320 7044
pashaC@spc.int

Ms. Christine Fung
Deputy Team Leader/Land Use Planning and
Facilitation Specialist
SPC/GIZ Coping with Climate Change in the
Pacific Island Region Programme
Module 2, Level 3, Plaza 1, Downtown
Boulevard, 33 Ellery Street,
P.O. Box 14041, Suva, Fiji.
+679-3305 983 (ext 102)
christine.fung@giz.de

Ms. Christina Hazelman
Climate Change and Food Security Intern
Strategic Engagement, Policy and Planning
Facility,
SPC,
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 337 9294
ChristinaH@spc.int

Mr. Sheik Irfaan
Finance Officer,
GCCA: PSIS Project,
SPC
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 337 9204
sheikI@spc.int

Ms. Victorina Loyola Joab,
Project Assistant,
CCCPIR and GCCA: PSIS Projects,
SPC,
P.O. Box Q, Kolonia, Pohnpei,
Federated States of Micronesia.
+692 320 7044
victorinalj@spc.int

Ms. Patricia Sachs-Cornish
Acting Director,
Strategic Engagement and Policy Planning
Facility,
SPC,
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 337 5313
patriciaSC@spc.int

Mr. Graham Sem
Climate Change Advisor South Pacific,
GCCA: PSIS Project, SPC,
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 337 9448
grahamS@spc.int

Mr. Mosese Sikivou
Manager Community Risk
Applied Geosciences and Technology Division
SPC
Private Mail Bag,
Suva, Fiji
+679 338 1377
mosess@spc.int ; mosese@sopac.org

Mr. Dean Solofa
Climate Change Officer
Land Resource Division
SPC
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji
+67 3379305
Email: DeanS@spc.int

Mr. Sanivalati Tubuna
Project Liaison Assistant, GCCA: PSIS
Project,
SPC,
Private Mail Bag, Suva, Fiji.
+679 337 9438
sanivalati@spc.int

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme

Ms. Tagaloa Cooper
Climate Change Coordination Adviser
SPREP,
P.O. Box 240, Apia, Samoa.
+685 21929 ext 246
tagaloac@sprep.org

Mr. Neville Koop
Science and Policy Programme
SPREP
P.O. Box 240, Apia, Samoa.
+685-21-929
nevillek@sprep.org

Mr. Espen Ronneberg
Climate Change Adviser,
Science and Policy Programme,
Climate Change Division,
SPREP,
PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa.
+685 21929 ext. 248, direct +685 66248
espen@sprep.org ; eronneberg@gmail.com

United Nations Development Programme

Mr. Kevin Petrini
Regional Climate Change Policy Advisor
UNDP Pacific Centre
7th Floor, Kadavu House
414 Victoria Parade, Suva, Fiji Islands
+679 330 0399 D.D: +679 322 7503
Kevin.petrini@undp.org

University of the South Pacific (USP)

Ms. Sarah Hemstock,
Project Manager
USP-EU GCCA
USP
Private Bag, Laucala Campus,
Suva, Fiji.
+679 323 2897
Sarah.hemstock@usp.ac.fj

Ms. Helene Jacot Des Combes
Lecturer
USP-EU-GCCA
Pacific Centre for Environment and
Sustainable Development (PACE-SD)
+679 323 2129
descombes_h@usp.ac.fj

Ms. Teny Topalian
Pacific Centre for Environment and
Sustainable Development (PACE-SD)
USP
Private Bag, Laucala Campus,
Suva, Fiji.
+679 323 2897

Annex 3: Logframe: Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Islands States project, Version 2 (07.12.12)

Description	Verifiable Indicators	Verification Sources	Assumptions
<p>Overall Objective</p> <p>To support the Governments of Cook Islands, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga and Tuvalu, in their efforts to tackle the adverse effects of climate change</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ten new activities that address country requests for climate change adaptation undertaken in an effective and sustainable manner. • Capacity of a minimum of 40 national sector specialists for integrating climate change adaptation into at least three sectors built from minimal level to moderate level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government documents, project and workshop reports, media reports. • Baseline questionnaires. • Workshop/conference reports and evaluations; presentations and media interviews given by national specialists; changes in national job descriptions. 	
<p>Purpose</p> <p>To promote a long term/strategic approach to adaptation planning and budgets and to pave the way towards more effective and coordinated aid delivery modalities at national and at regional level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one new formal mechanism in SPC to coordinate four different donors/partners engaged in delivery of climate change resilience. • National climate change policy that integrates disaster risk management and includes a budgeted action plan prepared in a minimum of two countries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes, documented evidence of actions being implemented. • Climate change adaptation and DRM plans and policy documents; government documents, mission reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPC continues to integrate climate change throughout the organisation. • Beneficiary governments are committed to integrating CCA and DRM policies, plans and actions.
<p>Key Result Area 1</p> <p>Climate change mainstreamed into national and/or sector response strategies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New/revised sector plans incorporating climate change resilience in at least four countries by 12/ 2014. • National climate change policy in at least one country by 12/ 2014. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government sector documents • Annual reports from government sectors • Reports for short term technical assistance activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiary governments, especially the line ministries selected as focal areas for this project are willing to formulate national and sector specific climate change plans/strategies
<p>Key Results Area 2</p> <p>Well articulated sectoral adaptation strategies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change coordinators in place and contracts signed at least four 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters of Agreement SPC and country, job descriptions for coordinators. • Policies and strategies from 2012 and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministries of Finance and line ministries are willing to address budget support criteria no. 1

Description	Verifiable Indicators	Verification Sources	Assumptions
that address budget support criteria in place.	countries by 12/2013. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sectoral policies/strategies that address budget support criterion 1² in at least 2 countries by 12/2014. • Capacity to apply the Logical Framework Approach to project design built in at least six countries by 12/2014. 	2014. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports for short term technical assistance activities. • Questionnaires. • Design documents for climate change adaptation projects using the logical framework. 	
Key Result Area 3 National climate change adaptation projects implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change adaptation activities implemented in three different sectors by 12/2014. • Lessons learnt about (on-the-ground) climate change adaptation activities compiled, analysed and shared by 12/2014. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project concept notes, design documents and progress reports. • Minutes of regional and Steering Committee meetings; implementation of climate change communications strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments willing to proceed with project implementation and sufficient local resources and skills available to implement and maintain the projects. • Natural and man-made hazards do not adversely affect project implementation.
Key Result Area 4 Streamlined technical assistance that supports national adaptation responses delivered by regional organizations in a collaborative manner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two new regional coordination tools available, by 12/2012. • Minimum of ten national representatives representing a minimum of three countries regularly contributing to the Climate Change Portal by 12/2014 • At least ten regional/sub-regional climate change resilience building activities implemented collaboratively by regional organisations by 12/2014. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matrix of regional and national climate change activities. • Reports from Climate Change Portal training workshops and web statistics. • Reports and evaluations from regional/sub-regional workshops. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiary countries, development partners and other entities are willing to set aside sufficient time to collaborate in joint activities.

² Criterion 1 relates to the existence of national or sector policies or strategies that meet the criteria of relevance and credibility (relevance refers to poverty reduction, sustainable and inclusive growth and democratic governance as well as specific national challenges; and credibility refers to the track record in policy implementation, policy financing, institutional capacity and ownership, and the quality of data and analysis underlying the policy).

Activities	Means	Indicative budget	
<p>1.1 Prepare national climate change profiles that identify how climate change is addressed in each country and revise annually.</p> <p>1.2 Prepare and/or advance detailed national and/or sector specific climate change response strategies and plans in at least four countries.</p> <p>1.3 Develop and implement a climate change communications plan for SPC.</p> <p>1.4 Develop and implement national climate change communications plans for at least four countries.</p> <p>2.1 Enhance national climate change coordination in at least five countries</p> <p>2.2 Review budget support readiness in at least seven countries and share findings regionally.</p> <p>2.3 Prepare national and/or sectoral policies and plans that incorporate climate change and better comply with budget support criterion 1 in at least two countries.</p> <p>2.4 Provide regional training in project proposal preparation and national level training in at least four countries.</p> <p>3.1 Prepare selection criteria and assist with identification of needs and prioritisation of a specific sector for climate change adaptation activities in nine countries.</p> <p>3.2 Assist at least seven countries design adaptation projects in a participatory manner and using the logical framework</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance • Missions to countries • Training workshops • Meetings and conferences • Media involvement • Equipment purchase • Recruitment of national coordinators • Letters of Agreement SPC/countries • National climate change profiles • Reporting and evaluation 	<p>See main project budget</p> <p>Indicative budget</p> <p>1. € 700,000 TA, travel, training, visibility products.</p> <p>2. € 1.22 million: national coordinators, training, TA, travel</p> <p>3. €4,640,000 TA, travel, national staff, small scale infrastructure, equipment, supplies, evaluation missions, regional workshops.</p> <p>4. €940,000 Workshops, TA, training, meetings, grant to SPREP</p>	

Activities	Means	Indicative budget	
<p>approach.</p> <p>3.3 Oversee and guide at least seven countries in the implementation and evaluation of their adaptation projects.</p> <p>3.4 Compile and analyse lessons learnt from the national adaptation activities and disseminate widely at the national and regional level.</p> <p>4.1 Develop a matrix of regional climate change activities and assist with the uptake and development of the Pacific Climate Change Portal to assist countries to identify and formulate appropriate adaptation responses.</p> <p>4.2 Strengthen regional coordination through undertaking country activities jointly with other organisations, utilising cross sectoral framework such as JNAP and contributing to regional planning frameworks such as the PCCR and CROP CEOs Climate Change Subcommittee (WACC).</p> <p>4.3 Enhance coordination especially between SPC and SPREP in the planning and delivery of climate change activities in countries.</p>			

Annex 4 Work Plan for GCCA: PSIS project, Reporting period 2, July 2012-December 2013 v2

(Activity numbers relate to activities in the Project Logframe)

Activity	Indicator	Q3 , 07-09 2012	Q4 , 10-12 2012	Q1, 01- 03 2013	Q2 04- 06 2013	Q3 07-09 2013	Q4 10-12 2013
1. Climate change mainstreamed into national and/or sector response strategies							
1.1 Review and revise Climate Change Profiles for 9 countries.	Version 2 of the Climate Change Profiles available on project website by April 2013						
1.2.1 Advance national climate change response strategy in one country (Palau)	TOR for technical assistance; consultant(s) recruited; consultancy in progress (progress report) for one country						
1.2.2 Sector specific climate change response strategies advanced in two countries (CI, Tonga)	TOR for technical assistance; consultant(s) recruited; consultancy in progress (progress report) for 2 countries						
1.2.3 Requests for technical assistance for mainstreaming received and acted on for up to six countries	List of requests and responses; TORs for technical assistance prepared where appropriate						
1.3.1 Develop a climate change communications plan for SPC	Climate change communications plan prepared.						
1.3.2 Develop a climate change communication plan for GCCA: PSIS	Climate change communications plan prepared.						
1.3.3 Recruit a Climate Change Communications Officer to implement the plan	Climate Change Communications Officer recruited; progress reports relating to implementation of the plan						
1.3.4 Prepare and distribute four national and one regional climate change adaptation videos	5 videos completed and distributed and available through the website.						
1.3.5 Share activities among countries and distribute visibility products	Regular country updates; updated website; visibility products distributed						
1.4 Assess country needs for national climate change communication plans	Responses obtained from at least 5 countries on climate change communication needs; TORs prepared where appropriate.						

2. Well articulated sectoral adaptation strategies that address budget support criteria in place							
2.1.1 Establish agreements with 9 countries for project implementation	Letters of Agreement signed for 9 countries						
2.1.2. Recruit National Climate Change Coordinators in a minimum of 7 countries	Regular progress reports from National Coordinators						
2.2.1 Review budget support readiness in a minimum of 7 countries (especially criterion 1)	TOR, report on the result of the review.						
2.2.2 Hold a regional workshop to discuss budget support and prepare plan of action for national follow-up	Workshop report and plan of action prepared.						
2.4 Conduct national training in project proposal preparation using the logical framework approach in 4 countries	Minimum 50 persons capable of using logical framework approach in project planning						
3. National climate change adaptation projects implemented							
3.1 Select a specific sector for an adaptation project and prepare a concept in 9 countries.	Concept notes prepared for projects in consultation with 9 countries.						
3.2 Prepare detailed project designs in a participatory manner in at least 7 countries	Design documents including scheduling and budgets for 7 countries						
3.3. Start project implementation in at least 5 countries	Progress reports						
3.4 Compile lessons learnt from adaptation projects	Initial compilation of lessons learnt shared with countries						
4. Streamlined adaptation finance and technical assistance that support national adaptation responses delivered by regional organisations							
4.1.1 Develop a matrix of climate change activities by sector for the Pacific region	Matrix available on the website in user friendly format						
4.1.2 Populate the Climate Change Portal with GCCA PSIS and other information	GCCA: PSIS project activities up to date on the Portal						
4.1.3 Provide national training in updating the Climate Change Portal through 2 sub-regional training workshops	Reports on two sub-regional training workshops						

4.2.1 Assist with preparations for the PCCR (July 2013)	Planning Meeting Minutes, Preparatory information uploaded on the Climate Change Portal, minutes GCCA team meetings						
4.2.1 Participate in PCCR and contribute to follow-up in project countries	Report on meeting; implementation of action items						
4.2.2 CROP CEO's Climate Change Sub-Committee - Working Arm on Climate Change (WACC) and Development Partners for Climate Change (DPCC) informed about GCCA: PSIS activities	Minutes from meetings of WACC and DPCC						
4.2.3 Coordinate all donor funded climate change activities implemented through SPC	Minutes of SPC Climate Change Managers group						
4.2.4 Project activities to support the Joint National Adaptations Plans (JNAP) for CCA and DRM conducted in at least six countries	Documentation of activities directly supporting JNAP						
4.3 1 At least 5 joint SPC/SPREP activities conducted.	Documentation relating to joint activities						

Annex 5 Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States Project Risk Management Strategy (18.12.12)

Risk and consequence	Likelihood	Seriousness (Impact)	Mitigation actions	Responsible Person
1. Time constraints				
Insufficient time to complete adaptation projects and other mainstreaming and training activities thereby impacting project delivery.	High	Medium	Regular planning and reporting at bi-monthly, quarterly and annual intervals.	All.
			Review overall progress at least semi-annually to provide sufficient time for request for project extension.	Project Team & Steering Committee.
			Forward planning for ensuring timely delivery of project supplies to a country.	National Coordinator/other national officers.
2. Capacity constraints				
Lack of capacity in country to implement project activities and provide financial reports.	Medium	Medium	Continuous capacity building.	All national and regional partners.
			Sound reporting and adherence to national financial procedures.	National project & financial officers.
High staff turnover in country delays project implementation.	Medium	Medium	Provide incentives for good performance and provide for back-up arrangements for National Coordinators.	National government
Difficulty with retaining staff in remote	Low	Low	Advertise regionally to recruit	National government

Risk and consequence	Likelihood	Seriousness (Impact)	Mitigation actions	Responsible Person
islands impacts implementation.			Pacific Islanders and increase the salary package.	
Insufficient infrastructure and communication resources in country to implement the project e.g. internet connectivity	Low	Low	Plan project implementation within known constraints of utilities' availability.	National government
Delays in reporting on project activities provides an inaccurate picture of project progress.	Low	Low	Regular country visits by Project Team.	Project Team
			Simplify procedures and put in place reporting templates.	Project Team and National Coordinators.
Equipment failure delays outputs.	Low	Low	Invest in reliable technology and capacity building to maintain the technology.	National Coordinators and National Planning and Oversight Committees.
Quality of consultants technical assistance work inadequate or not delivered.	Low	Low	Prepare detailed and clear terms of reference for all consultancies.	Project Team and National Planning and Oversight Committees.
			Support and oversee the consultants' work.	Project Team and National Planning and Oversight Committees.
3. Funding constraints				
Insufficient project funds to implement the best approach and design.	Low	Low	Careful project planning and provide adequate contingencies within the budget.	National Coordinators and National Planning & Oversight Committees.
Exchange fluctuations result in decreased funding available.	Low	Low	Careful investment of project funds.	Project Team Finance Officer.
4. Political support				
Political interference in project activities and appointments results in inadequate outputs.	Low	Low	Ensure appointments follow open and merit-based recruitment processes.	National government.
			Ensure all stakeholders including elected officials are kept informed and updated about the	All.

Risk and consequence	Likelihood	Seriousness (Impact)	Mitigation actions	Responsible Person
			project.	
Lack of commitment and ownership by national governments of the GCCA: PSIS project results in poor delivery.	Low	Low	Ensure key parties sign a letter of agreement setting out roles and responsibilities.	Project Team and national governments.
			Countries to select their own areas of focus for project activities.	National governments.
			Link project closely with existing national initiatives, plans and strategies.	National Planning and Oversight Committees.
Selection of implementation sites and activity focus politically influenced resulting in beneficiaries' dissatisfaction.	Low	Low	Develop transparent criteria for site selection.	Project Team
			Consult with multiple stakeholders.	National Planning and Oversight Committees.
			Collaborate with other partners.	All.
5. Collaboration constraints				
Competing projects in the same sector may adversely impact implementation.	Medium	Low	Effective cooperation and sharing mechanism established among different projects nationally.	National governments
Communities and potential beneficiaries are not receptive to project outputs.	Low	Low	Involve all stakeholders throughout all stages of the project.	All.
Collaboration with other partners results in less visibility for EU/SPC	Low	Low	Apply the EU Visibility guidelines to all project activities.	All.
6. Social unrest and natural hazards				
Risk of social unrest or other events, including natural hazards, limiting capacity of GCCA: PSIS team to work with countries	Medium	Medium	Ensure project activities are approved by Cabinet so they have full knowledge of expectations in the event of social unrest.	National Planning and Oversight Committees.

Risk and consequence	Likelihood	Seriousness (Impact)	Mitigation actions	Responsible Person
			Effective preparation and warning measures relating to natural hazards in place.	National governments.
			Build time buffers into the project to accommodate unforeseen delays.	Project Team and National Planning and Oversight Committees.
7. Sustainability of project activities				
Project activities not sustainable after initial investment thereby limiting climate resilience benefits.	Medium	Medium	Collaborate with other related projects to identify elements of the GCCA: PSIS that can be continued through other projects.	All.
			Collaborate with other GCCA projects in the region and beyond to identify synergies.	Project Team.
			Assist the countries with seeking other funding.	Project Team.
8. National and community expectations				
Country and community priorities for responding to climate variability do not match with longer term climate change projections resulting in misunderstanding about project delivery.	Low	Low	Increasing awareness and understanding about climate variability and climate change.	All.

Annex 6

Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States Project Exit Strategy (19.12.12)

Strategy 1: Mainstreaming

By transferring knowledge and application of climate change adaptation measures to the policies, strategies, and plans of a particular sector, the delivery of the sectors' services will be strengthened and enhanced beyond project life.

The GCCA: PSIS project is working with a particular sector in each country to mainstream climate change adaptation into that sector. Besides representing Key Result Area 1, this is also an important exit strategy.

Strategy 2: Further Funding

Identifying alternative sources of grant funding or loan finance in order to continue a project's activity is a second exit strategy.

The GCCA: PSIS project is working closely with a number of climate change adaptation projects being implemented by SPC, as well as other projects implemented by regional and international organisations. Throughout the course of the project, routes to create synergies with other longer running activities will be pursued and where appropriate, developed.

In addition, opportunities for further funding by the EU and within the potential second round of GCCA funding (2014-2020) will be followed through.

Strategy 3: Private Enterprise

Developing an alternative business and/or operational model, through commercialising aspects of the project, is a third exit strategy.

Within the scope of the GCCA: PSIS project, private sector involvement in climate change adaptation will be encouraged where appropriate. For example incentive programmes relating to the conservation of water and energy and operated by a development bank and/or private operator may be facilitated depending on national support.

Strategy 4: Project Closure

Winding down a project's activities as efficiently and effectively as possible in order not to impact adversely on the project's staff and its stakeholders, and to capture the benefits and any lessons learned is a fourth exit strategy.

The project will work to efficiently wind down the activities as the end date is approached. The compilation, analysis and application of lessons learnt is an ongoing part of the GCCA: PSIS project.