

Twenty Fourth SPREP Meeting

17th -19th September 2013
Apia, Samoa

AGENDA ITEM 9.2.4: Join National Action Plan (JNAP) Review

Purpose

1. To inform Members of the objectives and findings of the JNAP Review.

Background

2. JNAP refers to Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management, which refers to the process of integration of these functions in Pacific countries. For the purpose of this paper refers to both the process and the output, which is the plan itself at the national level. The process is facilitated by SPREP and regional partners.
3. SPREP and SOPAC Division of SPC started this process in 2009 to support countries in the integration of climate change and disaster risk management. By 2013, the 'JNAP partnership' has expanded to include regional UN agencies and the Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science Adaptation Planning program (PACCSAP).
4. In 2011, SPREP requested financial assistance from the Australian funded Pacific Adaptation Strategic Assistant Programme (PASAP) for Secretariat JNAP support. In 2012, PACCSAP took over components of the PASAP project which included the Secretariat's JNAP project.
5. One of the outputs of the JNAP project funded by PACCSAP is to conduct a review of the JNAP process, thus the review was commissioned in April 2013.
6. The objective of the review is to identify lessons learned from the JNAP process in view of improving the process.

SPREP Role

7. SPREP's role in mainstreaming and integration of climate change into national and sector planning, and budgetary processes and applications, is in direct response to SPREP's Strategic Goal 2.4.1¹ and the Pacific Islands Framework for Adaptation on Climate Change (PIFACC 2nd edition), in addition to directions from various SPREP Meetings decisions.

¹ Pacific Regional Environment Programme Strategic Plan 2011-2015 "By 2015, Goal 2.4.1 "all Members will have strengthened capacity to respond to climate change through policy improvement, implementation of practical adaptation measures, enhancing ecosystem resilience to the impacts of climate change, and implementing initiatives aimed at achieving low-carbon development"

8. SPREP is involved in 12 countries² JNAP and mainstreaming processes. Up scaling of this in PICs based on SPREP's skills and expertise will be further supported by the PPCR regional track (SM Paper 9.2.5.2).

9. The Review came out with the following success factors and key challenges:

- Presence of "champions" with interest and commitment to DRM & CC integration (e.g. Tonga; Tuvalu)
- Ministerial and or Cabinet level endorsement for the JNAP concept (e.g. Tonga);
- high-level Ministry support and engagement in the JNAP development (e.g. Tonga and Kiribati); and
- Establishment of a 'formal' JNAP development governance arrangement, with a clearly identified lead agency, and supported by a committed inter- agency Task Force/ or expert group (e.g. Tuvalu; Tonga; and Kiribati).

Challenges

10. Countries have faced significant constraints in effectively completing their JNAPs.. Some common challenges are found, even though specific details of challenges are unique to the social and political conditions in-country. These include:

- ability of in-country partners to commit time and resources over an extended development period, as, for example noted by Kiribati, RMI and Cook Islands. The reasons include limited staff in each agency, with competing demands. Frequent travel to regional and international meetings , place additional strain on agencies to carry out their core functions, let alone engage in new initiatives such as JNAP development, which is seen to be outside their core function.
- expectations on regional partners to provide greater 'hands-on' support, than already expected. Despite the presence of several regional and international partners with programs on DRM and CC mainstreaming, who are willing to assist, they too are constrained by their respective modality of engagement for project-based funding. The availability of the staff to commit to the extra work does not always match the timing when countries have been able to organise their internal partners and internal support (e.g. Nauru).
- JNAP development itself may not always be seen as a high priority of the government and/ or different arms of the Government, causing delays in its development as well as affecting the extent of joint ownership across the Government.

Benefits of a JNAP

11. It helps, for example:

- Increases understanding across stakeholders about the close relationship between disaster risk management and risks associated with climate change and its flow on effects across climate sensitive sectors;
- Increases understanding of the importance of development planning with climate and disaster risks in mind;

² Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Palau, Republic of Marshall Islands, and Vanuatu

- Increases understanding about the relevance, and the existence of different types of information and data maintained by different arms of the Government;
- Encourages close engagement and collaboration between NDMO and CC units, and line ministries, NGOs and civil society groups;
- Increases inter-agency dialogue and rapport with like-minded people across agencies;
- Brings together stakeholders at national and community (and regional) levels to share expertise, information, knowledge and resources; and
- Develops institutional capacity to systematically consider current hazards as well as climate change trends in an integrated manner, recognising traditional governance and decision-making processes.

12. The Executive summary of the review is attached for information.

Recommendation

13. The meeting is invited to:

- **note** the findings of the JNAP review
-

8 August, 2013