

# ANNUAL REPORT

## PACIFIC ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Building Resilience to Climate Change in Pacific Communities



Water Reservoir in Majuro, Marshall Islands



WITH SUPPORT FROM UNITAR C3D+ PROGRAM

REPORTING PERIOD: JULY 2010 – JULY 2011  
REGIONAL PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT, SPREP  
JULY 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENT

|  |    |
|--|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....   | 4  |
| I. INTRODUCTION .....  | 8  |
| II. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT .....   | 8  |
| III. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS .....  | 8  |
| 1. Outcome One – Mainstreaming.....  | 8  |
| 1.1 Mainstreaming activities progressing (regional and national) .....         | 8  |
| 1.2 Socioeconomic Guide developed and training carried out .....               | 9  |
| 2. Outcome Two – Pilot Project Demonstration .....                             | 10 |
| 2.1 Demo pilot actions progressing .....                                       | 10 |
| 3. Outcome Three - Capacity to plan for and respond to changes in climate..... | 11 |
| 3.1 PACC+ Support.....   | 11 |
| 3.2 Communication Support to Countries.....                                    | 12 |
| 4. Outcome 4: Operational and Administration.....                              | 13 |
| 4.1 Project Management Units operational .....                                 | 13 |
| 4.2 Rolling out of administrative and financial support (RPMU).....            | 13 |
| 4.3 Revision of the project Strategic Result Framework (SRF) .....             | 13 |
| 4.4 Multipartite Review Meeting.....   | 14 |
| 4. Partner support .....   | 14 |
| 5. Project Board.....  | 15 |
| IV. ANNUAL WORK PLAN 2011 .....  | 15 |
| V. RISKS AND ISSUES.....   | 16 |
| 1. Organizational .....  | 16 |
| a. Capacity of Coordinators at the national level .....                        | 16 |
| b. Quarterly reporting.....  | 16 |
| c. Increase in reporting workload and rationale.....                           | 17 |
| 2. Financial.....  | 17 |
| a. Funding transfers (UNDP to SPREP and Countries) .....                       | 17 |
| 3. Political .....   | 18 |
| a. Political situation at country level .....                                  | 18 |
| VI. FUNDING AND EXPENDITURE .....  | 18 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| VII. LESSONS LEARNT .....                                      | 19 |
| VIII. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS.....                                 | 21 |
| ANNEX 1: Update on PACC Outputs .....                          | 22 |
| ANNEX 2: PACC Logical Framework.....                           | 27 |
| ANNEX 3: 2010 MPR Issues and proposed solutions .....          | 30 |
| ANNEX 4: Policy Mainstreaming Outputs (8 PACC Countries) ..... | 36 |
| ANNEX 5 LIST OF COUNTRY SUPPORT MISSIONS.....                  | 37 |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A strategic focus for the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) project in 2010 was to enhance project implementation capacity at all levels from the regional to the country level in particular delivering on the three main components<sup>1</sup> of the project and overall project management. Such a direction was given to the SPREP Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) and UNDP by the PACC Project Board at its August 2010 meeting.

As a result, an overall Multi Year Work Plan (MYWP) for the project was developed jointly SPREP-PACC RPMU and UNDP. This document provided overall guidance on how the three components of the project would be implemented with timing of activity roll-out and budget, and allowed to further specify some nationally and regionally implemented outputs and activities. Further support was provided to the countries to establish country specific national MYWPs, as a basis for their annual and quarterly work planning and reporting processes. A series of regional meetings and in-country missions were also carried out by SPREP and UNDP to support related operational and technical capacities of national project teams. Based on the MYWP, and on the occasion of the Project Implementation Review (PIR) as per GEF and UNDP reporting requirements, indicators and related baselines and targets of the project have been revised at the objective and outcome levels. The revision was aimed at enhancing the consistency of the project Strategic Result Framework to facilitate related monitoring and reporting processes. The total project budget and timeline have also been adjusted in light of the above work planning process, and in order to reflect the actual project start in 2009 and its 5-year duration. An operational specialist was engaged co-financed by the PACC project and UNDP HQ, in order to develop an operational manual and support capacity building. A regional operational workshop took place in October 2010, and in the follow up an enhanced Quarterly Progress Report format has been introduced and a draft operational manual prepared.

At the project management level, all Project Management Units and reporting processes have been established and all Coordinators recruited. Recruiting qualified individuals to coordinate a complex project like PACC at the national level was challenging, but despite that, all national coordinators are on-board and work is being progressed at all levels. The “one-on-one” mentoring approach adopted by the RPMU team of working with countries to guide the Coordinators and their Core Teams through the "how to" develop or carry out MYWP, AWP and QWP etc has enabled them to improve on the quality and timeliness of their reporting. In the process of logically sequencing support, learning and appreciating processes is witnessed. It has also given the RPMU the opportunity to better understand the challenges that Coordinators face at the national level from the

---

<sup>1</sup> Outcome 1 – Mainstreaming; Outcome 2: Pilot Demonstration and Outcome 3: Lessons Learnt and Communication and technical backstopping support and Outcome 4 – Project Management.

administrative, financial and technical and to find solutions with the Coordinators to address the issues.

At the regional technical level, a draft Mainstreaming Guide was developed and disseminated to assist countries in their mainstreaming efforts. Countries are now putting in place policy interventions that would strengthen governments' efforts (institutional/political) to better respond to the adaptation needs of their people. Niue, Marshall Islands and Solomon Islands are in the final stages of their climate change policy development processes which will help their internal machinery better coordinate climate change activities at the national level. A Socioeconomic Assessment Guideline for the project was also developed and three sub-regional training workshops on the Socioeconomic Assessment for the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (SEA-PACC) project were carried out for the three PACC sectors (Coastal, Food Security and Water). The Coastal Sector training was carried out in Kosrae in the Federated States of Micronesia and it was attended by Cook Islands, Samoa and the FSM. The Food Security Sector training was carried out in Koror, Palau and it was attended by Fiji, Solomon Islands and Palau. The third training was for the Water Sector and it was carried out in the Marshall Islands and it was attended by Tonga, Tuvalu, Niue, Nauru and RMI. The SEA-PACC guide and the subsequent training workshops provided guidance to the countries on how they could better carry out their pilot demonstrations. These covered the process from assessments, evaluation of adaptation options to planning and actual implementation.

Additional funding resources were secured from AusAID under an initiative called the PACC plus ('PACC +') to build on the existing project delivery mechanisms and national capacities established through the PACC project. The PACC+ will focus on replicating and scaling-up practical adaptation measures at the community level currently carried out under Outcome 2 of the PACC and strengthen overall implementation of the project through increasing assistance for programme support and knowledge management activities under Outcome 3. The PACC+ brings on board Tokelau as the 14th country to benefit from the PACC intervention. PACC+ represents a pilot model for donors and development partners to move away from individual project based support to a programmatic approach both at the national and regional levels.

Further funding support was received from UNITAR under the C3D+ project in 2010 for communication support. Ms Setaita Tavanabola took up the position of PACC Communication Coordinator in September 2010 and the associated challenges that came with supporting countries in their communication activities as well as collating and communicating project stories to a global audience.

The University of the South Pacific's (USP) Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development (PACE) also sponsored several PACC Coordinators to attend a two weeks climate change workshop in Suva, Fiji (22Nov - 3 Dec 2010). This was part of an understanding between the PACC and USP-PACE to assist in building the PACC

Coordinator's capacity in the area of climate change from the science to identifying impacts, assessing vulnerability and applying learning-by-doing approaches to community based adaptation.

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (Northern Office) based in Phonpei, in the FSM also provided hands-on assistance to the PACC Coordinators in the Micronesian region (Palau, RMI and FSM). Several meetings were carried out between the SPC, Palau Agriculture officials and the PACC RPMU team on how SPC could also assist in the development of Palau's Agriculture Policy. SPC Phonpei Office also assisted the Micronesian PACC team to present a paper at the Micronesian Chief Executives forum held in Phonpei (July 2011) and carry out a successful PACC side-event.

The SPC-SOPAC and the National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) are currently undertaking a detail vulnerability and adaptation assessment of Mangaia harbor (Cook Islands) with the view to recommend adaptation options to be implemented. NIWA and Partners are also assisting Fiji to develop better drainage guidelines and systems that take into account the additional pressures that are brought about by extreme rainfall events and sea-level change caused by climate change.

A number of lessons were learned during the year in particular the "one-on-one" mentoring approach of working with countries has enabled the RPMU team to take the Coordinators and their Core Teams through the "how to" develop or carry out MYWP, AWP and QWP etc. In the process of logically sequencing support, learning and appreciating processes is witnessed. It has also given the RPMU the opportunity to better understand the difficulties that Coordinators have in particular with financial processes at the national level and to find ways with the Coordinators to address the issue. The involvement of the Finance personals in the PACC training on project operational, financial and administration training has improved the quality of reporting. And this has also improved for some countries the turn around time for their report submission to the RPMU on the dates requested.

As a result of the progress made and lessons learnt, the following support actions are therefore recommended for 2011-2012:

- Regional training on project management and administration to be followed up either at the regional or national level. Finance personals involved with PACC at the national level to be key participants for the training;
- Project monitoring and evaluation support to countries to be carried out by the Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) supported by UNDP to provide additional support on the ground to the Coordinators and to also use the opportunities during national visits to review and make recommendations on ways to improve technical, financial and reporting arrangements;

- Countries need to systematically progress their adaptation evaluation and planning of adaptation options prior to demonstration. Tools such as cost-benefit analysis, to be used to help in the decision making process;
- Quality assurance of some of the technical components of the project needs to be looked at thoroughly;
- There is a need to put more effort on community engagement and awareness. Smart partnerships are important to delivering quality project outputs;
- There is a need to start working on Knowledge Management products particularly documenting lessons learnt thus far; and
- Mainstreaming guide need to be reviewed to take on a more Pacific focus.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This 2010 PACC Annual report summarizes the achievements and challenges faced by the PACC project from January to December 2010. It also documents progress that has been achieved in meeting the project's 2010 Annual Work Plan (AWP). An attempt is also made by the PACC Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) to report project outcomes and outputs as per the project logical framework and this is annexed as part of this report. Challenges faced at the national and regional level have also been documented and ways of mitigating the problem proposed to ensure that delivery of the project for the 2011 year improves.

## II. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The PACC project is a regional climate change adaptation project to enhance the resilience of a number of key development sectors (food production and food security, water resources management and coastal zone management) in 13 Pacific Island countries to the adverse effects of climate change.

As per the 2010 Annual Work Plan, activities were focused on mainstreaming efforts at the national level such as climate change policy development and or integrating climate change into sectoral plans and policies. At the regional level, a Mainstreaming Guide and a Socioeconomic Guide will be developed to assist the countries in their mainstreaming efforts. There was also a need for some countries to further define their mainstreaming activities under the PACC project. Most countries also planned to start their vulnerability and adaptation assessments and planning in 2010, while some of them already started implementation of adaptation actions. Communication support in the form of regional and in-country support training was also part of the activities to be carried out during the year. Operational and administrative supports were also provided to countries for the improvement of their planning and reporting processes in order to meet reporting requirements.

## III. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS

In this section of the report, key achievements for 2010 for the Project will be discussed. The discussions will be presented in the context of the three main project outcomes and project management; Component 1-Mainstreaming, Component 2-Pilot Project Demonstration, Lessons Learnt and Communications, and Project Management.

### ***1. Outcome One – Mainstreaming***

#### **1.1 Mainstreaming activities progressing (regional and national)**



Mainstreaming support to the PACC countries was provided through a partnership approach between SPREP, SOPAC, with background support from UNDP and the Pacific Adaptation Strategic Assistance Programme (PASAP). As a result of this support, two countries now have national Climate Change Policies (Marshall Islands and Niue) and Tonga is now progressing towards developing a detail Action Plan for Water in the Hihifo district. Solomon Islands has also carried out its own consultation on the Climate Change Policy with support from the RPMU, but in this reporting period it was limited to finessing of the Terms of Reference to be used in the development of the policy by a national Consultant.

A PACC Mainstreaming Guide was developed during the year and parts of the guide are currently being operationalized through the mainstreaming support provided by the RPMU and Partners to countries. The Guide will be further reviewed by the SPREP, UNDP and countries to take on more Pacific examples before it is published in 2011. Also, as part of the support provided by the RPMU, eight PACC countries that did not have clear outputs for Outcome One have managed to identify and define more clearly the national and/or sectoral policy frameworks to be developed or revised to integrate CC risks, as their country-specific mainstreaming outputs (see **Annex 1 for further details**).

An increase in regional collaboration was also witnessed amongst PACC partners. The SPREP regional PMU, SPC-SOPAC, UNDP and the AusAID PASAP had several consultative meetings to devise a plan on how to roll out the mainstreaming programme that will serve the interest of the countries. The partnership was not without challenges with timing and availability (when needed by the countries) becoming an issue. Different partners have different commitments and synchronizing activities was a challenge. Joint planning and rolling out of programmes will ensure that there is no un-necessary duplication and ensure maximizing of resources available but the modality will still need to be improved. In terms of future collaboration, perhaps a small core group representing these partner agencies could be the main team spearheading support to countries whilst others 'fit-in' when their schedules allow.

## **1.2 Socioeconomic Guide developed and training carried out**

A Socioeconomic Assessment Guideline for the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (SEA-PACC) was developed during the year. The goal of this guideline is to help the PACC team to successfully collect socioeconomic data for vulnerability assessments and adaptations planning that are useful for better preparing the community for current and anticipated climate impacts.

As a follow-up to the guideline development, three sub-regional training workshops on the SEA-PACC were carried out for the three PACC sectors. The Coastal Sector training was carried out in Kosrae in the Federated States of Micronesia and it was attended by

Cook Islands, Samoa and the FSM. Vanuatu was not able to attend due to visa issues. The Food Security Sector training was carried out in Koror, Palau and it was attended by Fiji, Solomon Islands and Palau, PNG was not able to attend also due to visa issues. The third training was for the Water Sector and it was carried out in the Marshall Islands and it was attended by Tonga, Tuvalu, Niue, Nauru and RMI. These sub-regional trainings were specifically targeted towards technical agencies of PACC countries providing them with an additional tool to enhance data collection and ensure better monitoring of project interventions and to better monitor how the project interventions have improved (or otherwise) the vulnerability situation of their target groups.



SEA-PACC Training, Water Sector, RMI

## ***2. Outcome Two – Pilot Project Demonstration***

### **2.1 Demo pilot actions progressing**

Various modalities were being used during the year to progress the pilot demonstration work at the pilot site level in-country.

The SEA-PACC training as discussed in section 1.2 assisted the PACC Teams at the national level to better understand how to carry out a vulnerability and adaptation assessment that can be later monitored and evaluated to determine whether it had increased or otherwise people's resilience to climate change.

Project Partners were mobilized to assist in the assessment work at the country level. The South Pacific Geosciences Commission (SPC-SOPAC) assisted Samoa to carry out the mapping of their demonstration (coastal) areas. SPC-SOPAC and the National Institute for Atmospheric Research (NIWA) are also carrying out the vulnerability and adaptation assessments for Mangaia Harbor in the Cook Islands, the PACC pilot site. This was possible with the assistance provided by the RPMU to carry out tender support to the PACC Cook Islands. The RPMU also assisted Fiji to develop a detail terms of reference on the very specific assessment needs required to in the development of the new drainage criteria that would take current and future changes in rainfall and sea level change into consideration.

The Kosrae-FSM project worked on revisiting and “ground-truthing” a climate change study that was carried out under an Asian Development Bank Study (ADB) which will be a baseline for their demonstration work. Other countries have formed Core Teams that are now spearheading assessments and adaptation planning activities at the demo sites level. Tonga carried out several village level consultations in Hihifo the PACC pilot site, and initiated the digging of water-quality monitoring boreholes. Village committees were set-up to assist in the assessment and implementation programme. In Nauru, a detailed house-to-house water assessment was carried out and results analyzed. For Niue, pilot sites were further reviewed to take into consideration activities carried out by the GEF funded Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and other water activities carried out by the Public Works Department. Palau mobilized its PACC Core Team which involved government and non-government organizations to plan and carry out their vulnerability and adaptation assessments.

Samoa carried out actual implementation of their integrated coastal resilience programme in 2010 after further consultation and “ground-truthing”. The assessment of their pilot sites were carried out under a programme called the Coastal Integrated Management Plans (CIM Plans) funded by the World Bank. Coastal defenses were put in place in the following villages; Lalomalava, Lefagao’lii’ and Tafitoala.

Further details of progress per country against outputs are annexed as part of this document (**Annex 1**).

### ***3. Outcome Three - Capacity to plan for and respond to changes in climate-related risks improved***

#### **3.1 PACC+ Support**

Additional funding resources were secured from AusAID under an initiative called the PACC plus (‘PACC +’) to build on the existing project delivery mechanisms and national

capacities established through the PACC project. The PACC+ will focus on replicating and scaling-up practical adaptation measures at the community level currently carried out under Outcome 2 of the PACC and strengthen overall implementation of the project through increasing assistance for programme support and knowledge management activities under Outcome 3. The PACC+ brings on board Tokelau as the 14th country to benefit from the PACC intervention. PACC+ represents a pilot model for donors and development partners to move away from individual project based support to a programmatic approach both at the national and regional levels.

Australia made an overall contribution to the PACC project of AUD7,348,242, (USD 7,859,082.35 ) with allocations to specific countries complemented by multi-country and regional allocations. Australia's contribution was made in June 2011 with implementation progressing until the PACC project end date of 31 December 2013.

### **3.2 Communication Support to Countries**

Communications support from the RPMU to the countries began with the drafting of countries' National Communications Plans alongside the review of the Regional Communications Strategy. A number of activities under the two objectives drafted in the plans were attained.

*Objective: Visibility of the Project at national and international level.*

These were the development of awareness materials targeted at communities, media, stakeholders, etc. Materials developed included the 2011 PACC Calendars and PACC USB Wristbands. Countries began plans to develop posters, billboards, pens, bags and tee shirts that were distributed early the following year. These materials proved very popular as demand by stakeholders to use in other events were great.

*Objective: Communication of PACC outcomes and achievements.*

Assistance were provided to countries in terms of setting of up a channel via facebook to share pictures, stories, discussion topics that were uploaded on to the PACC website. Keeping the site accurate and up to date with PACC news and country information. Countries were assisted with newsletter and story formats to produce their quarterly newsletters targeted to donors, government and non-government organizations, researchers, etc. Plans for radio talk shows and poster competition are underway for some countries for 2011. Photo-video stories were developed by RPMU following the site visit to Kivori Community in PNG. A collective presentation of PACC achievements was made during a special PACC event at the Niue Pacific CC Roundtable in April, with the participation of 7 PACC National Coordinators. Various PACC communication and KM products (including the calendar, Kivori Video and Niue presentations have been uploaded to the Adaptation Learning Mechanism website by UNDP, while PACC news have been included in the UNDP Asia-Pacific E-newsletters and Adaptation Update.

## ***4. Outcome 4: Operational and Administration***

### **4.1 Project Management Units operational**

All the PACC countries are making progress in achieving the project outcomes and outputs. Project Management Units are in place, steering committees and core technical teams are now operating to provide technical and policy oversight to the project. Countries are being assisted by the RPMU to carry out their pilot site vulnerability and adaptation (including socioeconomics) assessments and planning. Further details of RPMU support are annexed as part of this document (**Annex 5**).

### **4.2 Rolling out of administrative and financial support (RPMU)**

Several activities were carried out under operational and administration support in 2010. These include the development of an overall Multi Year Work Plan (MYWP) for the project by SPREP and UNDP, and helping countries to develop their national MYWPs. The Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) and UNDP assisted the countries to develop their national specific MYWPs. By the end of December 2010, all countries had developed their MYWP. Training was also carried out through organizing a regional workshop and country-missions for the 13 countries to address the issue of project annual and quarterly work planning, the Itemized Cost List (ICE) and filling in of the Face Forms (financial). As a result of that support, all the 13 PACC countries now have MYWPs which are used as the basis for annual and quarterly work planning across the project. Further administrative and financial training was carried out in the following countries Cook Islands, Nauru, RMI, FSM, Palau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Fiji when the RPMU team carried out their planning support visits in these countries.

Overall, the operational and administration support was greatly appreciated by the National Coordinators and their national Core Support teams and this was expressed in their quarterly reports or when the RPMU team visited them. National Coordinators through verbal discussions indicated that they are now in a better position to address timeliness, quality of reporting and have a better grasp of which reports should be provided by whom at what time. Coordinators also have a stronger sense of confidence that they will be able to utilize their funds better, as a direct result of enhanced understanding of these project reporting processes. More of their time and effort can now focus on other aspects of the project such as technical and policy components.

### **4.3 Revision of the project Strategic Result Framework (SRF)**

This was carried out when the project filled out the Project Implementation Review (PIR) template of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Project indicators and related baselines and targets were revised at the objective and outcome levels. The revision was aimed at improving the project results framework to facilitate related monitoring reporting processes. The project timeline was also adjusted to reflect the actual project

start in January 2009 and its 5-year duration to December 2013. The revised objective and outcome-level SRF is included in Annex 2

#### **4.4 Multipartite Review Meeting**

The first PACC Multipartite Review was carried at the end of June and beginning of July (2010). It was attended by representatives from the thirteen (13) PICs who are participating in the PACC (Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu). The UNDP Multi-Country Offices in the Pacific (Fiji and Samoa), the Secretariat of the Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission (SOPAC), the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and representatives from the Australia Pacific Adaptation Strategy Assistance Programme (PASAP). A number of administrative challenges were raised particularly the recruitment of qualified and experienced Coordinators in country. Financial issues were also discussed, particularly the lack of movements in expenditure due to bottlenecks faced (administrative, political etc) at the national level. A detail issues table identified and actions developed is annexed for further information (Annex 3).

#### ***4. Partner support***

The University of the South Pacific's (USP) Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development (PACE) sponsored several PACC Coordinators to attend a two weeks climate change workshop in Suva, Fiji in September 2010. This was part of an understanding between the PACC and USP-PACE to assist in building the PACC Coordinator's capacity to increase their understanding of the climate change science and progress in international negotiations and its impact on adaptation funding etc.

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community Northern Office based in Phonpei, in the FSM is also assisting the PACC Coordinators in the north. Several meetings were carried out between the SPC, Palau Agriculture officials and the PACC RPMU team on how SPC could also assist in the development of Palau's Agriculture Policy.

The National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) and SPC-SOPAC are currently undertaking a detail vulnerability and adaptation assessment of Mangaia's harbor area with the view to recommend adaptation options to be implemented. They are also assisting Fiji in deriving their new drainage guidelines by conducting 5 key assessments from climate change, hydrology, hydraulics, cost-benefit assessments, and vulnerability assessments. Results from these assessments would help inform the new drainage guideline for Fiji.

The PACC project also provided financial support to the IWRM Project Manager (Mr. Marc Wilson) and the Palau IWRM Coordinator (Ms Lina) to also attend the SEA-PACC training that was carried out in the Marshall Islands for the PACC water sector countries.

Further support in the communication area was also realized through funding of a PACC Communication Coordinator position by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research's (UNITAR) Capacity Development for Adaptation to Climate Change and GHG Mitigation in Non Annex 1 Countries (C3D+ project). Ms Setaita Tavanabola took up the position in September 2010 and the associated challenges that came with collecting and trying to communicate project stories beyond SPREP and the countries to a global audience.

## **5. Project Board**

Three PACC Project Board<sup>2</sup> meetings were carried out during the year. The Board agreed on important decisions for the project in terms of defining a way forward to address the administrative and operational bottlenecks faced by the countries. A key decision was made by the Board at its August 2010 meeting - for the RPMU, with assistance from UNDP, to increase its regional support services to the national project management units within the remaining six months of the year. The Board recognized that if these operational issues can be addressed then implementation of the project can increase substantially in 2011.

In the last meeting of the Board in December 2010, the PB was informed on changes made in the project, including the development of a Multi Year Work Plan and budget, the specification of policy mainstreaming outputs for 8 countries, and the revision of the SRF. Financial and administrative reporting training was carried out in all countries which have resulted in improved national reporting.

## **IV. ANNUAL WORK PLAN 2011**

As part of the in-country and regional planning of the project, a preliminary 2011 budget was developed with the countries. This budget was submitted to the 3<sup>rd</sup> PACC Board Meeting held on the 9<sup>th</sup> of December 2010 for their consideration and endorsement.

Below is a summary of the total budget for the AWP 2011 for countries, articulated into each of the 4 components of the project. Table 1.0 provides more detail.

|                                  |   |             |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------|
| 1. Component One – Mainstreaming | - | USD 409,301 |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------|

---

<sup>2</sup> Board Members:

UNDP – Ms Nileema Noble, Mr. Gabor Vereczi; SPREP – Mr. Kosi Latu; Micronesia – Mr. Robert Jackson; Polynesia – Mr. Sauni Tongatule; Melanesia – Mr John Harunari – Solomon Islands; Secretary – Taito Nakalevu

|   |   |               |
|---|---|---------------|
| 2. Component Two – Pilot Demonstration                    | - | USD 2,534,034 |
| 3. Component Three – Technical Support and Lessons Learnt | - | USD 971,879   |
| 4. Component Four - Project Management                    | - | USD 528,990   |
| Total -----   | - | USD 4,444,205 |

## V. RISKS AND ISSUES

The project risks and issues in the year ranged from organizational to financial and political. Political risks were limited to PNG, as a result of the government’s decision to close the Office of Climate Change Environment and Sustainability (OCCES). Most of the project risks were successfully addressed over this reporting period whilst more time and support was required for PACC PNG.

### 1. Organizational

#### a. Capacity of Coordinators at the national level

The PACC project aimed to attract senior and experienced officers at the national level to coordinate the project, however in many instances it was not the case for most countries. The RPMU is working enthusiastically with the current batch of Coordinators who are recent university graduates to build their capacity in the areas of project administration and management, climate change, vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning to communication and sharing of lessons learnt.

The regional PMU has also put emphasis on slower progressing countries particularly assisting them in very specific activities such as the development of Terms of References for assessments to be outsourced and other aspects of the projects in particular project management and reporting. Advice has also been provided to the Coordinators to seek technical support from institutions such as SPC and SOPAC and other international partners such as the National Institution for Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) and others.

#### b. Quarterly reporting

The timely preparation of financial and narrative reporting was a challenge throughout the year. Coordinators had to familiarize with the various templates rolled out by the RPMU as per advice from UNDP. As a result, it was always a challenge to meet the submission dates in all the quarters as required by UNDP. The delays in some countries to submit their reports on time impacted adversely on the RPMU’s effort to collate and submit the consolidated reports to UNDP.



Several training exercises were carried out particularly the filling-in of Face Forms and the development of work plans and the ICE. There was a regional training that focused primarily on that and other aspects of project management and administration. Finance Officers were also invited to attend the regional operational training with the PACC Coordinators. There is now a need for the regional PMU to travel in-country to provide additional support on the ground to the PACC Coordinator and the Finance people and to analyze financial and reporting arrangements and determine with the countries the best approach and way forward, to avoid any further delays.

On a positive note, Niue has reported that the change in currency reporting from USD to their local currency (NZD) has reduced the time they have to spend in working out exchange rates, banking fees etc.

### **c. Increase in reporting workload and rationale**

The additional reporting requirements requested by UNDP in quarter two from the regional PMU and the countries have significantly increased the work load particularly of the regional PMU. The additional reports required to be submitted quarterly (apart from the narrative reports and Face Forms) included the quarterly work plans and the Itemized Cost Estimate, in order to enhance the quality of work planning processes and facilitate monitoring procedures in all levels. Trainings had to be carried out by the RPMU with support from UNDP on the new reporting templates prior to their being rolled out to countries. After the roll-out to countries, further hand-holding support was provided until the end of the year. Further reports that were developed during the year were the Multi Year Work Plans, Inventory Lists and Communication Plans. While these procedures were necessary to introduce in order to enhance work planning, reporting and monitoring processes, it affected the delivery of technical support, given the limited RPMU capacity.

## ***2. Financial***

### **a. Funding transfers (UNDP to SPREP and Countries)**

It was identified during the year that there is a need to shorten the time frame and further streamline the quarterly reporting, advance request and fund transfer procedures between countries, SPREP and UNDP. In 2010, it took an average of two months for that transfer to occur and it leaves only a month for the funds to be used before the next reporting cycle commences. Reasons for delays have occurred at all levels, including delay in reports received by the RPMU, delay in consolidation from the RPMU and delays in reviews and fund clearance from UNDP. RPMU and UNDP has established a standard step-by-step timeline for each quarter, and met in each quarter to systematically analyze the process, problems occurred and solutions to overcome. All

project parties (Countries, SPREP and UNDP) have a role to play and any default in meeting project requirements along the way by either party will seriously compromise the whole process.

Improving communication channels through the funding transfer check points (UNDP-SPREP-local banks-Ministry of Finance and Implementing Agency) will ensure information for the transfer and receipt of funds are fully communicated and accounted and reported.

### **3. Political**

#### **a. Political situation at country level**

A political decision in PNG to disband the Office of Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability (OCCES) has seriously affected PACC implementation. PACC funds in the OCCES account has been frozen as a result and cannot be accessed by the Implementing Partner, the Department of Agriculture and Livestock.

UNDP Samoa had written to UNDP Papua New Guinea requesting assistance in taking the matter on board and facilitate in addressing the issues of the PACC project with the PNG government. The letter was dated 10 December 2010. SPREP in its official communication to Mr. Wari Iamo as the SPREP Chair raised the issues facing PNG PACC and the need to progress the project.

Three other countries are in the alert stage at present due to landscape changes in the political arena. These are Cook Islands, Palau and Vanuatu. The RPMU will continue to monitor the developments in these three countries and inform the Project Board if proactive actions need to be undertaken.

## **VI. FUNDING AND EXPENDITURE**

The Approved 2010 Annual Work Plan of USD2,068,566 is made up of USD1,628,566 (79%) allocation for the Countries and USD440,000 for the RPMU (21%).

The 2010 Annual Work Plan was revised down to USD1,635,500, so as to take into account the following issues :

- 1) The 2010 AWP allocations for countries still utilising the 2009 funds be balanced
- 2) The allocations for Niue and Samoa, be revised downwards to a realistic delivery level; and
- 3) The Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) allocation to be increased substantially to accommodate the unplanned activities such as the sub-regional workshops and the regional workshop on the PACC Operational and Financial Training, which have come about due to country requests, and as a result of the increased project reporting requirements.

The table below sets out the reported expenditure for 2010:

|              | Exp. by Countries<br><br>USD | Exp. by Regional<br>Project<br>Management<br>Unit (RPMU)<br><br>USD | Total Expenditure<br><br>USD |
|--------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Quarter 1    | 0                            | 78,642  | 78,642                       |
| Quarter 2    | 67,270                       | 130,545   | 197,815                      |
| Quarter 3    | 135,267                      | 252,065   | 387,332                      |
| Quarter 4    | 175,399                      | 355,377   | 530,776                      |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>377,936</b>               | <b>816,629</b>  | <b>1,194,565</b>             |

The total reported expenditure for 2010 was at a 73% of the revised 2010 Annual Work Plan.

Throughout the year, the RPMU continued to work closely with the countries to resolve bottlenecks on funding issues and financial reporting requirements.

## VII. LESSONS LEARNT

Working with the countries at a sub-regional setting in the coastal, food security and water SEA-PACC trainings provided a platform for countries dealing with the same thematic area to share experiences and processes they are using at the national and community level to progress their projects. Information shared by individual coordinators was enriched and added-on during collaborative discussions. A lot of information exchanges transpired during and after the training events, which had the additional benefit of fostering team building between the RPMU and project countries. Project teams also developed various ways of exchanging ideas, project plans and processes that would “help them help each other” for the duration of the project.

The **support provided by the RPMU** to countries has yielded positive results and countries have indicated their appreciation during field visits or in email exchanges. The **“one-on-one” mentoring approach of working with countries has enabled the RPMU team to take the Coordinators and their Core Teams through the “how to” develop or carry out MYWP, AWP and QWP etc.** In the process of logically sequencing support, learning and appreciating processes is witnessed. It has also given the RPMU the opportunity to better understand the difficulties that Coordinators have in particular with financial processes at the national level and to find ways with the Coordinators to address the issue.

The missions by the RPMU to countries have confirmed that the quarterly reports received thus far had been accurate and where there are issues on reporting then they are dealt with on the spot. Networking has also strengthened through the country visits by the RPMU when one knows the 'person' behind the name particularly the finance support in-country.

Partnership is strategic and crucial to success in the Pacific region. As the region, is vast in terms of space and costs, a good partnership would help progress project activities on a shared mutual basis. And this has been demonstrated in some good results observed in countries where the SPREP RPMU and Partners<sup>3</sup> support were provided. Key stakeholders such as senior policy makers, government ministries, and technical resource people participated in the training sessions provided by the RPMU at the national level. A significant number of national NGOs and Civil Society organizations were also involved and contributed to the climate change policy and action plan development work in country.

The involvement of the Finance personals in the PACC training on project operational, financial and administration training has improved the quality of reporting. And this has also improved for some countries the turn around time for their report submission to the RPMU on the dates requested.

---

<sup>3</sup> SPC-South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission, UNDP, SPC, NIWA, NGOs etc.

## VIII. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

- Regional training on project management and administration to be followed up in 2011 either at the regional or national level. Finance personals involved with PACC at the national level to be key participants for the training;
- Project monitoring and evaluation support to countries to be carried out by the Regional Project Management Unit (RPMU) supported by UNDP to provide additional support on the ground to the Coordinators and to also use the opportunities during national visits to review and make recommendations on ways to improve technical, financial and reporting arrangements;
- Countries need to systematically progress their adaptation evaluation and planning of adaptation options prior to demonstration. Tools such as cost-benefit analysis, to be used to help in the decision making process;
- Quality assurance of some of the technical components of the project needs to be looked at thoroughly;
- There is a need to put more effort on community engagement and awareness. Smart partnerships are important to delivering quality project outputs;
- There is a need to start working on Knowledge Management products particularly documenting lessons learnt thus far; and
- Mainstreaming guide need to be reviewed to take on a more Pacific focus.

## ANNEX 1: Update on PACC Outputs

| COUNTRIES                              | Policy mainstreaming  | Adaptation measures   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>PACC sector: Coastal management</b> |   |   |
| 1. Cook Islands                        | <p>Output 1.1 Integrated coastal management policy framework (ICMPF) developed that will incorporate climate change risk and resilience.</p> <p>The development of a climate-resilient ICMPF has been initiated through engaging the national climate change country team (NCCCT), in order to enhance the enabling environment for implementation and replication of coastal adaptation interventions being developed by PACC at the demo site. A review of related policies is being carried out by the Cook Islands PACC national team for of the framework.</p>                           | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines on climate resilient and integrated coastal zone management and harbour facility development.</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating climate resilient and integrated coastal zone management and harbour facility development on Mangaia Island.</p> <p>A comprehensive assessment is being carried out by SOPAC and NIWA, including bathymetry, topography, oceanography surveys, extreme events and wave climate analysis, coordinated by the Public Works Department, Ministry of Infrastructure and Planning which is the Implementing Agency for the PACC.</p> <p>Specific activities will focus on strengthening the coastal protection systems around the Mangaia harbour. Activities are being design based on the ongoing NIWA and SOPAC – supported assessments.</p>   |
| 2. FSM                                 | <p>Output 1.2 Climate Change risks incorporated into the Kosrae State Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and related regulatory processes for specific development purposes.</p> <p>PACC FSM is supporting the preparation of a bill that will require the Department of Transportation and Infrastructure (or its successor) to include climate change into designs criteria of public infrastructure. The Bill will also authorise the Kosrae Island Resources Management Authority (KIRMA) to ensure that adaptation measures adopted for any climate change project undertake EIA.</p> | <p>Output 2.1 Kosrae State Road Building Guideline Incorporating Climate Change risks developed using the results and lessons learnt from the PACC Pilot Site – Tafunsak</p> <p>Output 2.1: Guidelines to integrate climate risks (e.g. intense rainfall and storm surges) into coastal road designs.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Demonstrating integration of climate change risks in road designs in Walung community, Kosrae Island</p> <p>Collation of baseline data (Hazard zone mapping, GIS mapping, topographic analysis) and interpretation into coastal road designs is ongoing. This is coupled by delineation of watershed survey, cross section road surveys, beach profiling surveys, socio-economic surveys that will inform the development of the guidelines. Community consultation is an on-going process. Preparations are on the way for a SEA-PACC survey to be carried out.</p> <p>Initial clearing of the road is already undertaken by the Public Works as part of the demo implementation.</p> |
| 3. Samoa                               | <p>Output 1.1 Coastal Strategy for Climate Change Adaptation developed</p> <p>Output 1.2 An integrated community bi-law for managing water and coastal resources developed taking climate risks</p>   | <p>Output 2.1: Guidelines to incorporate climate risks into an integrated community based coastal management model.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Demonstrating climate change risk reduction through community interventions in Vaa o Fonoti to</p>   |

|                                 |   |   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
|                                 | <p>into consideration.</p> <p>Currently carrying out consultation on using Community Bi-laws as a means of strengthening coastal resources from climate risks. The coastal strategy will be developed after the development of the Guidelines (2.1)</p>   | <p>Gagaifomauga districts</p> <p>Consultations completed with the Core Team, and SEA-PACC assessment carried out. Currently awaiting final feedback on TOR for consultant to carry out the development of the Guidelines.</p> <p>Protective coastal seawalls have been built at 2 pilot villages, which will be complemented through riverside protection measures and coastal vegetation planting.</p>   |
| 4. Vanuatu                      | <p>Output 1.1 Incorporating CC risks and resilience into the Ministry of Infrastructure and Public Utilities (MIPU) Sectoral Policy and Corporate Plan.</p> <p>Not started yet</p>  | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines that incorporate multi-stakeholder decision-making in the redesign and relocation of roads due to the impacts of climate change</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating integration of climate change risk reduction in road design in Epi, Shefa Province</p> <p>Initial vulnerability and adaptation assessment carried out in mid – February 2011. Specific activities to be implemented will include the relocation of roads destroyed by storm surges and improving drainage structures to minimize in-land flood damages.</p>  |
| <b>PACC sector: Agriculture</b> |   |   |
| 5. Fiji                         | <p>Output 1.1 National Climate Change Policy developed</p> <p>PACC supported the establishment of a National Climate Change Country Team, which coordinates the development of this policy. Consultations are under way at the sector level with relevant government and NGO stakeholders.</p> <p>Output 1.2 Reviewed Drainage Act to create an integrated and climate-sensitive regulatory framework</p> <p>Assessment TOR completed after consultations carried out by the PACC Team with the Department of Land and Water Resources Senior Drainage Engineers. Further consultations ongoing for the review of the Act by Country Divisions.</p> | <p>Output 2.1: Guidelines for design of drains and drainage networks to adapt to future rainfall regimes.</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating integration of climate change risk reduction in drains and drainage networks in Tailevu/Rewa and Serua Namosi Province</p> <p>Assessment TOR completed, currently being finalised by SPREP for tender submission.</p> <p>Demarcation and clearing of pilot site drainage works carried out in preparation for the assessments.</p> <p>In September 2010 a national launch workshop was held for PACC demo project involving national and community stakeholders and regional development partners. Village Community awareness consultations of the project ongoing at all village communities to strengthen project ownership and awareness. Specific activities will include the development and implementation of a new drainage design, and the establishment of community procedures for the maintenance and use of the drainage network at two pilot sites in the Nausori area.</p> |
| 6. Palau                        | <p>Output 1.1 Integration of climate change into Agriculture Sector Policies.</p> <p>Yet to be developed but discussions had been held with SPC Land Resources Division to assist.</p> <p>Informal consultations have been</p>  | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines to improve resilience of coastal food production systems to the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Not started.</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating integration of climate change risk reduction in coastal food production systems in</p>  |

|                    |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|
|                    | <p>conducted with the Congressman, State Government officials together with the village communities.</p> <p>A need for a National Climate Change Policy – tailored to 16 state policies has been identified. Consultations for a joint-action on the development of the policy ongoing with the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) project.</p> | <p>Ngatpang State/Communities</p> <p>Community consultations already carried out and work on testing for salt water tolerant taro varieties being carried out. Mapping works of the pilot site also being undertaken by the Palau Geographical Information System. Drafting of the guide will be initiated following the collation of information from the assessments and consultations. TOR to be developed and finalized by the Core Team</p> <p>Specific activities to be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Different techniques of climate-resilient taro production using enhanced landuse and farming techniques such as bunding, terracing etc.</li> <li>- Water management support to help in flushing of saline water and its associated infrastructure</li> <li>- Supply of planting materials</li> </ul>   |
| 7. PNG             | <p>Output 1.1: Climate change adaptation strategy for drought prone areas developed</p> <p>Yet to be developed.</p>  | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines for design of underground irrigation networks to adapt to future rainfall regimes.</p> <p>Output 2.2: Demonstrating integration of climate change risk reduction through irrigation networks in Kivori Poe, Kairuku district, Central Province</p> <p>SEA-PACC survey already carried out and data currently being analysed for reporting purposes.</p> <p>Community engagement initiated through consultations with four village PACC Committees to be set-up. Activities to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate-resilient techniques of climate-resilient taro production support using enhanced farming practices such as bunding, terracing etc.</li> <li>- Water management support to help in flushing of saline water and its associated infrastructure</li> <li>- Supply of planting materials and shipping costs</li> </ul> |
| 8. Solomon Islands | <p>Output 1.1 National Climate Change Policy developed</p> <p>A comprehensive stakeholder consultation had been carried out and a report prepared identifying key issues to be part of the climate change policy.</p> <p>Output 1.2. Integration of climate risks into agriculture sector policies</p> <p>Yet to be completed.</p>             | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines for reducing vulnerability of small isolated island communities’ to the effects of climate change in the food production and food security sector.</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating community based management of climate change risks in agriculture in Ontong Java Island.</p> <p>Vulnerability assessment TOR developed and planning for field visit currently ongoing, taking into consideration remoteness of pilot site and the transportation and communication costs.</p> <p>Specific activities to be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate-resilient techniques of climate-resilient taro production support using enhanced</li> </ul>   |



|                           |  |   |
|---------------------------|--|---|
|                           |  | <p>farming practices such as bunding, terracing etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Water management support to help in flushing of saline water and its associated infrastructure</li> <li>- Supply of planting materials and shipping costs</li> </ul>  |
| <b>PACC sector: Water</b> |  |   |
| 9. Marshall Islands       | <p>Output 1.1 National Climate Change Policy developed</p> <p>Output 1.2 Joint Action Plan on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Risk Management developed.</p> <p>A Climate change policy has been developed, and based on this the formulation of the Joint Action will be initiated during 2011.</p>   | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines for improving water retention through redesign and retrofit of existing water capture and storage system</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating climate change risk management in water capture and storage facility in Majuro town.</p> <p>Specific activities include:</p> <p>Assessing evaporation rate of the Majuro Reservoir;</p> <p>Provision of an evaporation cover to reduce water loss from evaporation and leakage.</p>   |
| 10. Nauru                 | <p>Output 1.1 Incorporating climate change into the Nauru Water and Sanitation Policy Framework.</p> <p>Output 1.2 Adaptation Action Plan for the Nauru Water and Sanitation Policy developed</p> <p>PACC is collaborating with IWRM on this, process to be initiated during in 2011.</p>  | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines for design of hybrid water supply systems to enhance resilience to drought events.</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating a hybrid water supply system in Anabar district.</p> <p>Vulnerability and adaptation assessments and socioeconomic survey carried out at the Anabar district and data analyzed. Specific activities to be implemented include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of water tanks and guttering;</li> <li>- Solar water purifiers to clean water from tanks and underground water.</li> <li>- GIS water database support</li> <li>- Three main saltwater tanks revamped with a pump and pipelines to give alternative water for sanitary purposes for the Denig district.</li> </ul>                                       |
| 11. Niue                  | <p>Output 1.1 National Climate Change Policy developed.</p> <p>Output 1.1 Joint Action Plan on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Risk Management developed.</p> <p>Climate Change Policy already developed and endorsed by the Niue Government. The development of the Joint National Action Plan has been initiated in March 2011 with PACC RPMU and SPREP support.</p> | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines for design of water storage systems on a raised atoll island to enhance resilience to drought events.</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating a water storage system that will overcome water pressures during drought periods in Liku to Avatele district.</p> <p>Vulnerability and adaptation assessments and adaptation planning being carried out for villages in the central part of the island (upper terrace) most stricken by water shortage. Public Works engineers are supporting the PACC project team in the design of water harvesting and storage systems at households. Detailed calculations have been carried out considering rainfall data and water capture characteristics of houses in order to design the most effective system. The technical</p> |

|            |   |  |
|------------|---|--|
|            |   | <p>planning work is coupled with community consultations and awareness raising actions.</p> <p>Rainwater capture and storage systems (including guttering, pipes, tanks, pumps, etc.) will be established in about 200 households.</p>   |
| 12. Tonga  | <p>Output 1.1 Incorporate climate change risks into water resource management legislation, policies and plans.</p> <p>Consultations being completed. Reviews to start on WRM legislation, policies and plans.</p> <p>Output 1.2 Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan for Water Resource Management developed.</p> <p>Terms of Reference for the Action Plan currently being developed.</p> | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines for water resource use and management response to increased ENSO frequency</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating climate change risk management practices for water in Hihifo district</p> <p>Vulnerability and adaptation assessments and community engagement consultation completed and reports developed. Underground water assessment currently being carried out in collaboration with the Tonga Water Board. A video has been prepared on the pilot villages and related technical work. Specific activities that will be implemented under the PACC project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A reservoir/water tanks for the 6 villages;</li> <li>- Water production pumps (diesel/solar)</li> <li>- Water quality equipment installed</li> <li>- Metering for all households to be installed</li> <li>- Road side access to the bore holes and pumps</li> </ul> |
| 13. Tuvalu | <p>Output 1.1 Water sector policy revised to incorporate climate change risk and resilience aspects.</p> <p>Yet to start.</p> <p>Output 1.2 National Climate Change Policy developed.</p> <p>TOR currently being developed and to be discussed by the National Climate Change Country Team.</p>   | <p>Output 2.1 Guidelines for climate proofing integrated water management plans.</p> <p>Output 2.2 Demonstrating the application of a integrated water management plan in Fogafale village</p> <p>Vulnerability and adaptation assessments completed and Benefit-Cost Analysis to be carried out in collaboration with IUCN and SPC/SOPAC.</p> <p>Community awareness activities carried out in close collaboration with IWRM, including a road show to promote alternative systems, such as composting toilets. Specific activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provision of water harvesting support to Funafuti which will include water tanks and roofing/guttering support.</li> </ul>  |

## ANNEX 2: PACC Logical Framework

| Project Strategy  | Indicator*   | Baseline value  | Target and benchmarks   | Sources of verification   | Risks and Assumptions   |
|---|--|---|---|---------------------------|---|
| <b>Goal: To reduce vulnerability and to increase adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change in key Development Sectors identified by 13 participating countries in the Pacific.</b> |  |   |   |                           |   |
| <b>Objective: To enhance the capacity of the participating countries to adapt to climate change, including variability, in selected key development sectors.</b>                                    | Number of references to vulnerability of the coastal, crop production and water sector to climate risks in policies, plans and projects.   | Climate change risks in the coastal, crop production and water sector are not acknowledged in relevant policies, plans and projects both at the national and local level.   | By the end of the project, 100% of national and regional relevant plans in all participating countries include climate change risk considerations for the coastal, crop production and water sector.  | Surveys/interviews /plans | There is political willingness to integrate climate change related risks into coastal, crop production and water sector management plans, policies and strategies |
| <b>Outcome 1: Policy changes to deliver immediate vulnerability-reduction benefits in context of emerging climate risks defined in all 13 PACC countries.</b>                                       | 1.1.3 Number of sectoral polices and plans that integrate climate change risk issues related to coastal, crop production and water sector management.<br><br>1.1.3 Number of national policies revised or developed to integrate climate change. | Relevant development and risk management plans, both at the national and the local level, do not address climate change risk in the coastal, crop production and water sector.<br><br>No climate change policy developed. | By the end of the project, all 13 project countries integrate climate change risk resilience in the corresponding national and sub-national policies or plans of their target sector (coastal, crop production or water sector)<br><br>By the end of the project, at least 3 countries have reviewed or developed national policies that integrates climate risk and resilience | Policy documents          | Relevant experts are available.<br><br>Opposition from other government line ministries.  |
| <b>Output 1.1: Methodology and tools developed to</b>   | 1.1.1 Availability of guidelines and methods   | Climate change mainstreaming  | By the 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of the project initial guidelines and methods and related   | Feedback reports          | Core PACC Teams are competent in using the tools.   |

| Project Strategy   | Indicator*  | Baseline value   | Target and benchmarks   | Sources of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p><b>assist Pacific Island countries mainstream climate change into their sectoral and national policies and development plans.</b></p> | <p>on climate change mainstreaming tailored to the Pacific and PACC sectors</p> <p>1.1.1 Number of instances where the guidelines and methods on climate change mainstreaming have been applied in national and sub-national policies and coastal, crop production and water sector related plans and programmes.</p> | <p>processes in countries are ad-hoc, does not follow systematic processes and methods, in lack of Pacific tailored mainstreaming methods and tools.</p> <p>Relevant development and risk management plans, both at the national and the local level, do not address climate change risk in the coastal, crop production and water sector.</p> | <p>training tools are available to assist PACC countries in their mainstreaming efforts, and by the end of the project a revised mainstreaming guideline is prepared capturing experience and lessons learned from the national mainstreaming processes</p> <p>By the end of the project, all 13 project countries will be using the PACC Mainstreaming Guide to integrate climate change risk resilience in the corresponding national and sub-national policies or plans of their target sector (coastal, crop production or water sector).</p> | <p>by Coordinators and Core groups using the methodology.</p> <p>Survey and review of revised relevant national policies and plans.</p> <p>Policy documents</p> | <p>Regional organizations are collaborative in providing input related to sector-specific tools and their applications</p> <p>Political will and receptiveness of governments to provide input for the development, testing and application of mainstreaming methods throughout the life of the project.</p> <p>There is adequate coordination and common agreement between the relevant government line ministries involved in order to collaborate in the development and application of tools</p> |
| <p><b>Output 1.2</b> Climate change economic and socioeconomic tools for evaluation of adaptation options developed and utilized.</p>    | <p>1.2.1 Availability of socio-economic tools to support vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning</p> <p>1.2.2 The number of</p>  | <p>Currently, no such models exist.</p>  | <p>By the end of the project, at least 5 countries have used socio-economic assessment and planning tools at their</p>  | <p>Evaluation reports</p>   | <p>Relevant experts are available.</p>   |

| Project Strategy   | Indicator*  | Baseline value   | Target and benchmarks  | Sources of verification | Risks and Assumptions   |
|--|---|--|--|-------------------------|---|
|  | countries that apply socio-economic tools in their adaptation demos |  | pilot sites.   |                         |   |
| <p><b>Output 1.3</b> Sectoral or national policies revised to incorporate climate change risk and resilience aspects (nationally executed activities).</p> | <p>DETAILS TO BE ANNEXED – COUNTRY SPECIFIC (See Annex 4)</p>       | <p>Relevant development and risk management plans, both at the national and the local level, do not address climate change risk in the coastal, crop production and water sector.</p> <p>No climate change policy developed.</p> | <p>By the end of the project, all 13 project countries integrate climate change risk resilience in the corresponding national and sub-national policies or plans of their target sector (coastal, crop production or water sector)</p> <p>By the end of the project, at least 3 countries have reviewed or developed national policies that integrates climate risk and resilience</p> | <p>Policy documents</p> | <p>Relevant experts are available.</p> <p>Opposition from other government line ministries.</p> |

### ANNEX 3: 2010 MPR Issues and proposed solutions

| Issues                                 | Details  | Proposed solutions/ way forward   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Operational/<br/>Administrative</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delays in PMU establishment including staff recruitment</li> <li>• Lack of human resources for national projects execution as identified by most coordinators</li> <br/> <li>• Non-compliance with monitoring &amp; evaluation in particular quarterly progress reporting and annual work plan development</li> <br/> <li>• Lack of coordination between PACC and similar projects (eg SLM, SNC and IWRM)</li> <li>• Shifting priorities due to competing demands from related projects (PACC, IWRM, FAO)</li> <br/> <li>• Difficulty in accessing demonstration sites due to absence of dedicated and cost-effective transportation method.</li> <br/> <li>• Draft PACC Administrative Procedures as at 25 June 2009 be adopted (Annex II).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPREP and UNDP Country Offices to undertake direct recruitment as and when required by countries for foreseen staff turn-over.</li> <li>• PACC project Coordinators to develop TOR and identify budget for an additional support staff as appropriate.</li> <br/> <li>• SPREP and UNDP Country Offices to roll-out simplified quarterly narrative reporting format (harmonized with national-level) and reporting-mode (online-reporting form: web-based, email).</li> <li>• SPREP and UNDP Country Offices to directly assist with administrative issues as and when requested.</li> <br/> <li>• Countries to streamline committees and advisory boards including timing and frequency of meetings as well as discussion items with necessary budgetary support provided from respective projects. SPREP and UNDP to assist as and when required.</li> <br/> <li>• UNDP to clarify GEF policies regarding vehicle purchase using GEF funds.</li> <br/> <li>• MPR 2010 resolves and confirms the Administrative Procedures and the National Execution Modality or NEX be made available to all PACC Coordinators.</li> <br/> <li>• MPR to appoint a rapporteur at the next MPR meeting in</li> </ul> |

|                         |   |  |
|-------------------------|---|--|
|                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verbatim Records of meetings recorded and recommendations made to the PEG for adoption of key findings.</li> </ul>   | <p>December 2011 for a verbatim recording of the MPR Proceedings.</p>  |
| <p><b>Financial</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delays in release of funds from SPREP, banks and internal financial system</li> <li>• Non-compliance with quarterly financial reporting and lack of clarity on exchange rates at the national level when funds are transferred from the recipient Banks to the PACC accounts.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPREP to ensure timely release of advances including communication to countries. UNDP to assist with strengthening of national financial systems to ease funding release and monitoring.</li> <li>• SPREP and UNDP to provide refresher training on financial reporting and AWP development as and when required including during country missions. Financial forms (FACE) to be reported in local currency.</li> <li>• Funding for countries that have not submitted their quarterly narrative and financial reports should be withheld until necessary reports are produced.</li> <li>• Bilateral financial arrangements will be facilitated for countries that are progressive.</li> <li>• SPREP to transfer funds in local currencies with countries to report in their local currencies AND SPREP to convert in USD and advise countries accordingly in a timely and effective manner.</li> <li>• SPREP to provide countries with Project Acquittal Summary of Expenditures within the SPREP system aligned with Country Allocations.</li> </ul> |

|               |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|
|               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PACC Project Promotion and Awareness Monetary Grants and Awards Articulated</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPREP to establish a finance hotline desk' where countries could quickly ask questions and receive feedback.</li> <li>• SPREP and UNDP to clarify position on Monetary Grants and Awards for PACC Project Promotional and Awareness Activities as prize money.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Policy</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of political support</li> <li>• Lack of expertise to mainstream Climate Change at national and sectoral levels</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PACC National Steering Committees to link and regularly inform higher level policy bodies (e.g. preparing regular Cabinet updates and papers)</li> <li>• Awareness-raising at forum leaders level through a possible Climate Change programme based on best practices of "Pacific Parliamentarian Assembly on Population &amp; Development", funded by AusAID, UNFPA and implemented by SPC</li> <li>• Development of targeted national awareness programme for political leaders as part of national communication strategy.</li> <li>• SPREP and UNDP senior management and technical staff to include PACC issues in country missions.</li> <li>• Consider resources and expertise within SPREP, UNDP, other CROP agencies and relevant regional initiatives (like ICCAI-PASAP) and UNDP to provide/support on PACC mainstreaming objectives.</li> <li>• SPREP to organize PACC training on CC mainstreaming based on the guide currently under preparation</li> <li>• CROP and/or peer-support through south-south co-operation (e.g. especially between countries addressing the same sector ; coastal, water, agriculture) regarding CC mainstreaming processes</li> </ul> |



|                  |   |   |
|------------------|---|---|
|                  |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link PACC with mainstreaming in other national processes (like SNC, NAPA projects, NSCA, IWRM, SLM, etc.). E.g. in PACC countries addressing water sector, the sector strategies being developed through IWRM can be climate-proofed through PACC</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Technical</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of national expertise to provide technical support to various project outcomes and activities</li> </ul>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPREP to set up a Regional Expert Advisory Group in order to develop and roll-out “PACC Technical Support Mechanism” in partnership with SOPAC, SPC, USP, etc. to technically support various project outcomes. SPREP to establish a roster of experts with contact details for countries to consult on specific technical issues and inform countries accordingly.</li> <li>• SPREP and to facilitate identification and recruitment of international technical consultants as and when required.</li> <li>• National PACC Steering Committee to form a core technical support team to assist the PACC PMU at the pilot site level.</li> <li>• Harness IWRM expertise and support to PACC countries addressing water sector adaptation (country teams and steering committees of respective projects to collaborate more closely, SOPAC to provide tech support on need basis).</li> <li>• National PACC Focal Points/Coordinators attend joint meetings with IWRM or other thematic processes as appropriate and when resources permit.</li> </ul> |
|                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of national expertise and capacity on communications, knowledge management, networking and awareness-raising</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countries to establish national communication action plans, and include specific communication activities in AWP and QWP, following PACC Communication Strategy provided by SPREP and discussed at the annual meeting.</li> <li>• SPREP Communications Team to provide support as and when required</li> <li>• National Coordinators to more systematically record, document</li> </ul>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  |   | <p>and report activities, lessons learnt and good practices (policy mainstreaming, technical adaptation aspects, community engagement, etc.), as well as communication actions, collecting audio-visual materials (photos, videos, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Coordinators to regularly feed information to SPREP for PACC project website, and use the website for their own dissemination purposes (e.g. linking from national websites)</li> <li>• National Coordinators to register in Adaptation Learning Mechanism website (<a href="http://www.adaptationlearning.net">www.adaptationlearning.net</a>) as users, in order contribute from PACC experience and use ALM to disseminate project results, lessons learnt and information. ALM has user-friendly features.</li> <li>• Explore further opportunities of PACC networking, including via establishing an e-network for PACC National Coordinators and teams, or through exchange site visits (i.e. to be carried out in later stages when demo projects are more advanced) – example of IWRM and PIGGAREP exchange between technical teams</li> </ul> |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of capacity to apply consistent climate and weather information tailored to PACC sectors</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involve Met Services in country core technical teams and steering committees, in order to enhance climate early warning systems, seasonal weather forecast and other information services tailored to PACC sectors.</li> <li>• National Coordinators to closely liaise with Second National Communication Coordinators and SNC Adaptation Working Groups to exchange on climate information, policy and technical aspects</li> <li>• Harness regional support activities and programmes, such as the AusAid PCCSP to enhance climate information and continue PACC training activities in this field to support sectoral</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | applications of climate and weather info. |
|--|--|---|

## ANNEX 4: Policy Mainstreaming Outputs (8 PACC Countries)

| COUNTRIES           | SPECIFIC OUTPUTS  |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. Cook Islands     | Output 1.1 Integrated coastal management policy framework developed that will incorporate climate change risk and resilience.                                   |
| 2. Fiji             | Output 1.1 National Climate Change Policy developed   |
|                     | Output 1.2 Review of the Drainage Act to create an integrated framework that also incorporated climate change issues.   |
| 3. FSM              | Output 1.1 Kosrae State Road Building Guideline Incorporating Climate Change developed using the results and lessons learnt from the PACC Pilot Site - Tafunsak |
|                     | Output 1.2 Climate Change scenarios incorporated into the Kosrae State EIA process for specific development purposes.   |
| 4. Marshall Islands | Output 1.1 RMI Climate Change Policy developed.   |
|                     | Output 1.2 Joint Action Plan on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Risk Management developed.  |
| 5. Nauru            | Output 1.1 Incorporating climate change into the Nauru Water and Sanitation Policy Framework.   |
|                     | Output 1.2 Adaptation Action Plan for the Nauru Water and Sanitation Policy developed.  |
| 6. Samoa            | Output 1.1 Coastal Strategy for Climate Change Adaptation developed   |
|                     | Output 1.2 An integrated community bi-law for managing water and coastal resources developed taking climate risks into consideration.                           |
| 7. Tonga            | Output 1.1 Incorporate climate change risks into water resource management legislation, policies and plans.   |
|                     | Output 1.2 Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan for Water Resource Management developed.   |
|                     | Output 1.3 Water & Sanitation Policy developed.   |
| 8. Tuvalu           | Output 1.1 Water sector policy revised to incorporate climate change risk and resilience aspects.   |
|                     | Output 1.2 National Climate Change Policy developed.  |

**ANNEX 5 LIST OF COUNTRY SUPPORT MISSIONS  
AUGUST 2010 – JULY 2011**

| COUNTRY VISITED  | SUPPORT PROVIDED   | DATE           |
|------------------|--|----------------|
| Cook Islands     | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training.            | August 2010    |
| Fiji             | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training.            | September 2010 |
| FSM              | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training.            | September 2010 |
| Marshall Islands | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training.            | September 2010 |
| Nauru            | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training.            | August 2010    |
| Niue             | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training.            | March 2011     |
| Palau            | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, Administration and project management, communication                         | November 2010  |
| Papua New Guinea | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training. | February 2011  |
| Samoa            | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, and SEA-PACC training  | July 2010      |
| Solomon Islands  | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training. | June 2011      |
| Tonga            | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training. | June 2010      |
| Tuvalu           | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training. | May 2011       |
| Vanuatu          | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, Administration and project management, communication, and SEA-PACC training. | June 2011      |
| Tokelau          | MYWP, AWP, QWP, ICE, Face Form, and SEA-PACC training.   | July 2011      |