

JNAP Development and Implementation in the Pacific: Experiences, lessons and way forward

Padma Narsey Lal
TiriTiri Action Research & Development

June 24, 2013

Executive Summary

Since 2010, Pacific Island Countries (PICS) have made efforts to develop and implement integrated action plan, or Joint National Action Plan (JNAP), for climate change (CC) and disaster risk management (DRM)¹. Tonga is the first country to develop its JNAP and to get government approval in July 2010, with several other PICS following suit. The development of JNAP has been encouraged and facilitated by SPREP and SPC-SOPAC, and other development partners. Countries have also made efforts to systematically implement their JNAPs by accessing domestic resources and financial resources available through bilateral and multilateral Official Development Assistance (ODA) and climate change finances (CCF).

The purpose of this report is to review the JNAP development and implementation process in the Pacific to assess lessons learnt and identify way forward in strengthening the JNAP development and implementation in the region. The review focuses on Tonga and Cook Islands that have made progress in implementing their JNAP strategies. These countries have also successfully obtained support from development partners for the implementation of their JNAP. This review also included Tuvalu that has completed its JNAP with Government endorsement, and countries currently in the process of developing their JNAP - Kiribati, Nauru, Niue and the Republic of Marshall Islands. Reference is also made to other countries such as Solomon Islands, Palau and Vanuatu that chose alternative paths to their integration of DRM & CC.

Review methodology

A mixed methodology comprising review of published and grey literature, country consultations guided by a questionnaire and Skype interviews, as well as country visits to Tonga and Cook Islands. Regional partners too were consulted in person, over Skype and /or using written questionnaire. Two analytical frameworks are used to guide the assessment. A combined risk management and policy cycle based framework was used to assess JNAP development phase (based on OECD 2009; Olhoff and Schaer 2010). A Pillars and Bridges framework was used to assess effectiveness of JNAP implementation in the Cook Islands and Tonga, based on an adapted analytical framework of Lal and Crawford (2012).

Output

Key lessons about factors that contributed towards effective JNAP development and implementation, and key challenges faced during development and implementation, are assessed, identifying areas for strengthening. Detailed assessment of JNAP development and implementation in the Cook Islands and Tonga are provided as Annex 4 and 5. Some reflections on the implication of country-level experiences and lessons for the development and coordination of the proposed Integrated Pacific Regional Strategy for DRM and Climate Change (IPRS-DRM&CC) are also made.

¹ Countries at times use different terms for their JNAP. For example, in Tuvalu it is known as Tuvalu National Strategic Action Plan for CC and DRM, where as in Kiribati this is referred to as Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan (KJIP) for CC and DRM).

Key findings

JNAP is developed as part of a suite of national instruments to support country's national development efforts for sustainable development and resilience. Although it is about three years since the first JNAP was developed, some key lessons can be identified, as well as areas that could be strengthened for efficient and effective integration of DRM and CC in development.

Rationale for JNAP development

Countries (and regional partners) cite similar reasons for developing JNAP, based on their respective practical experiences and challenges in dealing with disasters, climate change issues and development under parallel processes. These include recognising the:

- inextricable link between development and risk management;
- need to minimise duplication of efforts and reduce inefficiency due to a plethora of standalone policies and instruments;
- potential to increase efficiency through cross-agency collaboration, when each agency is adopting similar technical approaches, using similar information, and relying on similar cross-disciplinary expertise; particularly when each agency is constrained by limited human and financial resources;
- ongoing funding imperatives for DRM & CC and development, and the potential win-win outcomes that can be achieved by simultaneously addressing development and risks management using domestic resources as well as Official Development Assistance (ODA) and climate change finances (CCF); and
- nationally endorsed instrument, such as JNAP, can place countries in the 'driver's seat' when engaging with development partners; particularly when the instrument clearly spells out stakeholder-based priorities and programs.

Integration of DRM & CC and JNAP

Three different pathways have been used in the region to facilitate integration of DRM and CC in development.

Many countries have focussed on developing their JNAP linked to their national sustainable development strategies, NSDS, or equivalent. This was the path chosen, for example in Tonga, Cook Islands and Tuvalu, where their JNAPs have formally been endorsed by the Government. Countries, such as Niue, Kiribati, RMI, and Nauru are also currently developing their NSDS-linked JNAPs.

Some countries, such as Vanuatu and Palau, had decided to, in the first instance, focus on developing their governance arrangements to strengthen coordination between the activities of their national disaster management office (NDMO) and the agency/ focal point addressing climate change.

On the other hand, countries such as the Solomon Islands, decided to focus on sectoral level mainstreaming and implementation, instead of proceeding with a national JNAP development process.

JNAP Development and Endorsement: Experiences and Lessons learnt

Development of JNAP can be defined in terms of inclusiveness, efficiency and joint ownership. Successful development and endorsement of JNAPs depends to a large extent on the commitment of government agencies and other stakeholders involved and the process used.

JNAP development process

In all countries that had decided to go down the path of JNAP development, regional intergovernmental agencies, SPREP and SPC-SOPAC, and UNDP, as members of JNAP core team, provided financial resources as well as technical support. This team has, more recently also been joined by other development partners, such as GIZ, EU and Australia.

JNAP development process has largely followed key steps outlined in the *Guide to Developing DRM National Action Plan* ((SOPAC and Partners 2009), a guide that essentially followed a combined risk management framework and policy cycle process. Countries have generally used available sources of information to undertake national and sector- level problem and solution analysis using a broad brush approach, guided by lead and supporting regional partners. Usually broad strategies and generic actions remain the focus of detailed JNAPs, for which general scientific information and experiential knowledge about hazards, trends and impacts summarised in various government review reports under international and associated regional instruments together with country specific climate change and disaster profiles, has usually been sufficient.

JNAP Development: Success factors and key challenges

JNAP development experiences in the region suggest common underlying reasons for success, whereas the reasons for delays in the development and endorsement is diverse and very country specific. The following conclusions are made on the basis of triangulated-stakeholder comments received during in-country consultations, from completed questionnaires received from countries and regional partners, and on-on-one Skype conversations with partners and key country officials. Only those factors (including perceptions) are noted below which were confirmed by at more than one stakeholder group.

Amongst the key factors observed behind efficient JNAP development and joint ownership, included:

- 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 clearly identified

Identify local champions across agencies, get support and commitment from Minister/ Cabinet and establish an interagency JNAP Task Force of committed stakeholders before embarking on the JNAP development process.

lead agency, and supported by committed inter- agency Task Force/ or expert group (e.g. Tuvalu; Tonga; and Kiribati).

Challenges

Countries have faced significant constraints in efficiently completing their JNAP instruments, even in countries that have completed their JNAP. 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. Reasons behind this constraint included the presence of limited number of staff in each agency, with competing demands. Frequent travel to regional and international meetings exacerbated this issue, putting strain on agencies to even meet 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, and they are willing to assist, they too are constrained by their respective modality of engagement; 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 (e.g. Cook Islands).

Countries and partners need to be realistic about the level of time and resources that may be required and factor these in their initial planning and resource allocation before embarking on JNAP development.

Forum Leaders and partners may wish to review funding modalities and secure programmatic support to CROP agencies for their technical backstopping role, ensuring adequate capacity and flexibility to respond to country-calls for assistance

Other reasons cited for delays included:

- JNAP development may have been regarded as partners’ initiative and ‘countries were unable to commit sufficient resources at the time (e.g. RMI, Niue; Nauru);
- difference between the priorities of the government and what stakeholders had identified (e.g. Niue)
- DRM and CC regarded as disaster management and environment issues respectively (eg. Fiji);
- Change in staff (eg in Cook Islands); or change in national governance arrangement responsible for CC and or DRM (e.g. Fiji).

In addition, the relevance of developing a JNAP initially was questioned by government, non-government and development partners when the country already has several other policy instruments, such as NAPs, NAPAs, and /or CC Policy, and countries decided to choose alternative paths for integrating DRM and CC (e.g. Solomon Islands and Vanuatu).

Benefits of JNAP development process

There is a general consensus, across the three countries with government-endorsed JNAP, as well as by countries at various stages of development, that notwithstanding the challenges experienced in the JNAP development phase, the JNAP-development process provides many benefits.

It helps, for example:

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

The JNAP document is used as by countries to guide their development and risk management efforts, particularly for which development partner support is sought. For development partners, too, the presence of a JNAP helps them to justify areas of their support to a country under their ODA as well as CCF. This though could be improved, as discussed below.

Regional level benefits

The JNAP process has helped strengthen relationship between SPREP and SPC and other regional partners, such as UNDP and GIZ to the benefit of countries. The partnership approach has helped improve working relationship between key regional agencies, increasing available resources available, while reducing particularly competition to deliver initiatives on the ground in-country. While personal relationships particularly between agencies have helped improve the JNAP-partnership, dividing responsibilities across agencies, there is scope for further gains in efficiencies and effectiveness; particularly with regards to providing most effective technical backstopping support to the countries.

Ensure core expertise and skills are included in the regional JNAP core team, including appropriate mix of expertise with expertise and experience in DRM, CC, development, as well as strategic planning, Increasing efficiency and effectiveness of regional technical support to countries.

Key CROP agencies, SPREP and SPC-SOPAC (and perhaps also PIFS) have different sets of expertise

and thus can have differential but complementary roles to play in this agenda of DRM and CC integration in development. Efficiency in the use of limited regional-level resources could be improved through a more effective team work and partnership that helps pool resources and bring together an appropriate mix of expertise to ensure robust and technically sound integrated development and risks management planning support is provided to the countries.

Is JNAP for DRM & CC Needed?

Several countries and partners in the region have raised the question if JNAP development is the best pathway to follow in each PIC. That is, can the one size fit all?

There is no simple answer to this question. What is considered to be an appropriate pathway to follow by a country to facilitate DRM and CC integration would no doubt depend on several country-specific conditions. These factors may include, for example:

- Is climate and disaster risks explicitly identified as a challenge by the country and thus is there a specific goal about risk management and resilience reflected in the country's NSDS, or equivalent?
- Is the CC & DRM more than just a political issue? That is, is the Government committed to, and places a high priority, to give effect to this agenda?
- Does the country already have key policy instruments, such as NAP, NAPA, CC Policy, including at the sectoral level, that reflect a 'whole of country' approach to DRM and CC risk management and development?
- Is there a good working relationship between DRM and CC officers in the country and do they already jointly support the implementation of the principles of NAP and NAPAs at the sector level, regardless of the legislative mandate?
- Is there a good understanding across all levels of government and NGOS about the relationship between DRR and CCA, and the relevance of simultaneously addressing risk and development in an integrated manner

It is possible that a country may decide that development of JNAP may not be a critical first step for them. It may instead decide to, for example, strengthen their coordination and governance mechanism for integrated DRM and CC, or develop their integrated DRM and CC policy. This is, for example, the path that Vanuatu, and to some extent by Palau, chose.

Before a country decides to develop their JNAP, it may be prudent to assess if JNAP is the best path to follow at that stage, assessing if a minimal set of conditions are in place to efficiently and cost effectively develop and endorse their JNAP.

JNAP – Integration of DRM, CC and Environment in Development

All three JNAPs reflect recognition, albeit implicitly, of the relationship between development, disaster and climate risks and the role of environment in both development and risk management.

They include strategies aimed at: addressing underlying causes of vulnerability (such as, lack of adequate water and sanitation; the use hard and soft ecosystem-based solutions (like coastal zone management, integrated catchment management, and or mangrove rehabilitation); and disaster management measures (such as early warning system and preparedness and capacity to respond to disaster events). Cook Islands explicitly also recognise the importance of economic development as a strategy for reducing disaster and climate risks. On the other hand, countries such as Tonga, Cook Islands Tuvalu and RMI explicitly recognise the relationship between energy security for reducing risks as well as addressing climate change mitigation goals.

Explicitly consider the inextricable link between development, environment and risk management, and simultaneously consider disaster risk management, climate change and development issues, as well as consider a spectrum of measures that targets sustainable development and resilience goals.

The inclusion of such strategies are emphasised by the respective international and regional instruments. However, the relevance of simultaneous considerations of the whole spectrum of measures, including climate compatible/ climate smart measures is only just emerging.

Thre capacity to effectively address the underlying goal of JNAP, integration of DRM and CC in development for sustainable development and resilience, would be further improved by:

- increasing understanding about the relationship between disasters, environment and climate change and their effects on sustainable development and resilience;
- adopting an integrated development and risk management paradigm which reflects amalgamation of globally accepted paradigms and principles behind, climate and disaster risk management and environmental management and economic and social development;
- recognising relevance of considering response measures across the whole spectrum of development-risk reduction-risk management continuum.

Develop basic understanding amongst all levels of government and NGOs regarding the relationship between disaster, environment and climate change and their effects on sustainable development and resilience.

Guide integration of DRM, CC and development, blending of paradigms, principles and strategies advocated in key international and regional instruments.

JNAP Document – the Structure

The structure of JNAP is similar across the region, largely reflecting the regional frameworks of action for DRR&DM (SOPAC 2005) and/or Climate Change (SPREP 2011). There are though also significant differences.

They all include JNAP matrix of goals/ strategic areas, strategies/ actions and sub actions; Indicative costing under each goal and Governance Arrangement for the coordination of, and reporting on JNAP implementation. All three completed JNAPs make reference to M&E framework and

Communications Strategy to be developed once the JNAP is implemented. Lessons learnt about the efficacy of the JNAP Governance arrangement identified in the JNAP document, M&E systems and Communications strategies are discussed in Section 4 of the report.

Strategic Planning and JNAP Matrix

Basic principles of strategic planning and log frame have guided the formulation of JNAP matrix. All the three countries with completed JNAP use a JNAP matrix similar to a log frame to list their goals, strategies, actions, sub actions, lead agencies and partner agencies. However, they differ in particularly the way in which the high level goals, strategies and actions and sub actions are presented.

Tonga, for example presents their high level 'Goals' followed by 'Actions' and 'Sub actions'; and objectives, rationale and outcomes are listed as explanatory text. Cook Islands on the other hand, talks about overarching Strategic Areas, followed by specific 'Strategies' and then 'Actions' and 'Sub actions'. In most cases specific strategies and actions have some semblance of what are listed in the two regional frameworks of actions, though the exact relationships are at times difficult to identify.

Disconnect between goals, objectives, strategies and actions are not unique to JNAPs. It can also be found in many other strategic instruments, such as DRR&DM NAP and Climate Change Policies in the region (Lal 2012 (October)). It reflects a broader gap in capacity in strategic sector level planning in-country as well as perhaps the mix of expertise available to development partners supporting countries.

Having clarity about the relationship between outcomes, strategies and actions can help;

- countries develop an appropriately sequenced set of activities, identify relevant interagency collaborations, and identify individual and collaborative components of their multiyear agency budgets.
- agencies during negotiations with development partners;
- countries to develop an appropriate M&E system, including SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time bound), for the JNAP coordination and implementation.

Build capacity in strategic planning process, including understanding about the difference between policies, goals/ objectives, strategies in an action/ implementation plan, emphasise outcome- focussed, and prioritised action plan and with an ME& System, including SMART indicators.

All three completed JNAPs make reference to M&E framework and Communications Strategy to be developed once the JNAP is implemented. However, neither Tonga nor the Cook Islands have effectively addressed these, as yet. As noted by OECD, it is important to clearly differentiate between (goals) outcomes, outputs and activities and to have an M&E system with a clear set of M&E indicators and baseline information to compare performance and make changes in responses over time (OECD 2012).

JNAP Implementation- experiences from Cook Islands and Tonga

Although it is just about three years since the development, endorsement and implementation of JNAP, some lessons can be identified from the experiences of the Cook Islands, Tonga and Tuvalu in

the implementation of JNAP. Here lessons drawn from Cook Islands and Tongan are discussed. In Tuvalu, the progress in their implementation has been significantly constrained by competing demands on the limited human resources, particularly because of their regular absence due duty travel.

Recognition of JNAP as a key national guiding instrument

The JNAP instrument in both the countries are intended to be used as a reference document for developing and implementing integrated DRM and CC in development projects. While development partners use the JNAPs in both countries as their guiding document for identifying priority projects to fund, there are key differences in the way JNAP is treated within these two countries.

In Tonga, the JNAP is:

- is widely recognised as the document that summarises the countries priorities regarding disaster risk and climate change management.
- has a high profile within the Government, amongst NGOs and partners. Implementing Ministries and NGOs alike make reference to JNAP in their project proposals, particularly for climate change related projects that has dominated partner support..

In the Cook Islands, on the other hand, JNAP does not have a high profile. In the Cook Islands, JNAP implementation is generally regarded by local stakeholders as ‘too little or slow’. This could be because many projects listed as ‘Actions’ or ‘Sub actions’ in the JNAP were already at various stages of development. Consequently, JNAP implementation is seen by some as ‘not by design’.

One of the key reasons for the difference between Tonga and the Cook Islands in the perceived ownership and profile of JNAP could be the difference in the effectiveness of the JNAP Governance arrangement established to support JNAP implementation in the two countries; particularly in the absence of an agreed Implementation Plan in both the countries.

JNAP Implementation: Effectiveness of governance arrangement and availability of resources

JNAP is an instrument to support sustainable development and resilience outcomes, to generated through activities through the national system of DR and climate change management within national development context. From a function perspective, a national system of DR & CC management comprise integrated development and risk management plans and priorities, finance management and how these are linked together through organisational arrangements and stakeholder-based decision-making processes, as well as the underlying enabling environment of knowledge, capacity and legislative frameworks (summarised as ‘Pillars and Bridges’ above).

Tonga and Cook Islands both identified a two- tier governance arrangement for JNAP governance, But there are also differences in regards to the establishment and operationalisation of the agreed governance arrangements. The experience in these two countries suggest that the robustness of their ‘Pillars and Bridges’ governance system and the availability of dedicated resources to facilitate the cross agency coordination significantly influence the effectiveness of JNAP implementation.

Tongan’s JNAP governance

Tongan JNAP governance comprises:

- a combined forum bringing together National Environment Coordinating Committee (NECC) and National Emergency Management Committee (NEMC) to oversee provide policy and high level coordination for JNAP implementation
- an Interdisciplinary Task Force (commonly referred to as JNAP Technical Committee, JNAP-TC), to monitor and report on the progress of JNAP implementation, funding plan and challenges faced; and report to the Cabinet in consultation with the joint NECC-NEMC about JNAP implementation.

The governance arrangement called for a secretariat, to be provided jointly by MLECNR and NEMO, to support the JNAP Technical Committee (JNAP-TC). During the JNAP Implementation, a JNAP Secretariat was established with financial support from Australia under its bilateral program; a Secretariat with dedicated staff was not identified in the JNAP document.

The establishment of the 3-person JNAP Secretariat provides a focal point for activities identified for JNAP Technical Committee. The establishment of the Secretariat, with dedicated staff, is largely seen to be one of the key contributing factors for the successful implementation of JNAP in Tonga. While the role of the Secretariat was not formally defined at the time of its establishment, it took on various activities as and when a need arose.

Tongan JNAP Secretariat though does face some key challenges, which affects its effectiveness in encouraging integrated DRM & CC issues in development. Its effectiveness can be increased further by:

- formally defining the role and functions of the JNAP-TCS;
- distinguishing the role of JNAP-TCS focus on facilitating both integrated climate change and DRM in development ; JNAP’s activities have largely focussed on climate change issues, with JNAP initiatives considered to be ‘light on DRM issues’;

- JNAP-TCS maintaining a distinct identity as serving integrated CC & DRM related roles, when the head of JNAP-TCS is also the Assistant Director of CC & Environment under the MLECNR;
- including a person with DRM expertise and experience in the JNAP-TCS, together with accessing strategic planning expertise from the Ministry of Finance and Planning; the current Secretariat currently comprises two technical persons with climate change and environment background and a third on finance;
- developing a JNAP Implementation Plan for the JNAP-TCS; and
- developing an M&E system for monitoring and providing consistent reporting on JNAP implementation.

Cook Islands JNAP governance

The Cook Islands JNAP, too, identifies a two –tiered governance arrangement for the JNAP implementation and management:

- The JNAP Project Management Committee (JNAP-PMC);
- The JNAP Platform, with joint CCCI and EMCI serving as the secretariat to the JNAP-PMC and JNAP Platform.

The JNAP-PMC is a subcommittee of National Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Council and reporting to it. The JNAP-PMC role as defined in the JNAP instrument includes to provide operational oversight of implementation and support of JNAP actions into MTBF, and annual work/ business plan and budget; develop and implement M&E framework and capture lessons learnt in on-going implementation of JNAP, and of DRM & CCA activities. It is unclear as to how this will be given effect to, when the JNAP-PMC has not been established, as yet; although CCCI has been established following the Functional review and EMCI has administratively been placed under the Office of the Prime Minister. They are expected to jointly provide secretariat services to the JNAP-PMC, as well as co-chair the JNAP Platform.

The JNAP Platform was established comprising the original Climate Change Country team with an expanded mandate to also include DRM issues. The JNAP Platform includes representatives of key government agencies, NGOs and the private sector.

The coordination of the implementation of JNAP strategies has been limited for several governance related reasons, including the absence of a follow-through in both CCCI and EMCI identifying integration DRM & CC in their respective work plans; only EMCI did. The level of coordination may change from 2013/14, as they both now refer to coordination of JNAP implementation under their respective outputs (Office of the Prime Minister (CI) 2013 (February Final)). However, they each tend to emphasise their respective mandated areas. This may perhaps be a reflection of difficulty in providing appropriate balance between one's own mandated core function and the joint function which has not been clearly articulated; particularly in the absence core M&E system discussed below.

This may be because of resource constraints. Without the presence of a dedicated person, or unit within the OPM with relevant combination of expertise and skills, they seem to face

Identify/ establish a dedicated JNAP coordinating unit/ Secretariat, comprising staff with at least DRM and CC expertise and clearly defined roles to support JNAP coordination and implementation, supported by a clear governance arrangement for monitoring and reporting. In addition, in each ministry identify integration of DRM & CC as part of a person's job description or as part of a person's core function.

some constraints in following through on the intent of one of the strategic development functions under the Business Plan of CCCI and EMCI. on their core functions, and these do not include JNAP implementation.

The importance of a dedicated unit/ secretariat and an appropriate governance arrangement

The two contrasting experiences from Tonga and Cook Islands suggest that to give full effect to the intent of JNAP, and for effective coordination of cross cutting DRM & CC issues within the context of national development, the establishment of dedicated JNAP-coordination unity/ secretariat supporting a fully functioning streamlined governance of JNAP coordination and implementation is required. In such a JNAP governance arrangement, it is equally important to have a clearly defined roles and responsibilities of different levels of JNAP governance and appropriate reporting mechanism. At least one staff in each ministry would need to have integration of DRM & CC as part of their job description or as part of a person's core function.

JNAP Governance - Functional relationship between NSDS, JNAP, Sector Plans, program and projects (Pillar 1 and Bridges 1& 4)

Throughout the region, effort has been made to explicitly link and align JNAP (or their equivalent) with the respective NSDS or equivalent, including in Tonga and Cook Islands. While JNAP is developed to address specific goals of development and risk management, the link is not always strong. Amongst the reasons for this are differences in the durations of each of the linked instruments and the often tenuous relationship between NSDS and sector/ sub national plans and budget processes.

Duration of JNAP and NSDS

The duration of the JNAPs is not always the same as that of the country's medium term NSDS. For example, Tonga's NSPF runs from 2009-14; whereas the JNAP runs from 2010-2015. Having different timeframes would make it difficult to align its review, and changes with the review of NSDS, particularly when such reviews are conducted by different line ministries supported by different arms of the regional intergovernmental agencies. A Peer Review, that reviews national system of development governance, including public finance management and donor engagement is supported by the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat under the Cairns Compact (PIFS 2009), and usually involves Ministry of Planning and Finance. The JNAP (or NAP & NAPA) review processes are support by SPC-SOPAC and SPREP, and are expected to involve mainly the ministry that oversees JNAP (NAP and NAPA) coordination. Such review processes are run independently, and during different times, thus making it is likely to be difficult to provide seamless reconciling of performance across the different levels of governance.

Not only explicitly link NSDS and JNAP, but also align their durations to help reduce pressure and increase efficiency of countries monitor and report on their national development goals as well as on commitments made under regional and international instruments.

NSDS-linked JNAPs and linkages with sectoral and sub national plans

All three completed JNAPS reflect explicit linkages with the respective NSDS; however, the next level of linkages with sub national and sectoral plans and policies is limited.

Some effort, for example, has been made to develop specific sectoral policies/ strategies, under specific externally funded climate change projects, such as PACC and PASAP. However, in these cases while sector level policies were developed after JNAP had been endorsed, JNAP though is not always explicitly referenced.

This could be due to several reasons, including variable level of understanding observed in both Tonga and Cook Islands, as well as elsewhere about:

- the relationship between their sectoral deliverables and risks management,
- the role JNAP could play in supporting sustainable development and building resilience, was observed amongst government agencies and NGOs;
- capacity constraints in programmatic planning as well as in developing multiyear prioritised and appropriately sequenced program of work.

Without having JNAP-linked sector/ Corporate Plans in hand also affects the country's ability to be in the 'driver's seat' and effectively seek development partner assistance, coordinating and harmonising their support towards their own priorities. Strengthening of technical understanding and capacity in strategic planning and outcome focussed and prioritised programming across all sectors was identified as a major need in the region.

Scientific and traditional knowledge system

All countries note difficulties in getting access to baseline scientific and other data and experiential/ traditional information, which are scattered across the government agencies, NGOs and regional partners. Capacity to further manipulate such information is often limited throughout the region. Strengthening of scientific and traditional knowledge system that encourages easy access to baseline data and information, and capacity to further manipulate data and support knowledge- based decisions, is urgently needed throughout the region.

Assist, in partnership with Ministry of Finance and Planning, sectoral line ministries to integrate DRM & CC and develop prioritised rolling sectoral and agency Business Plans, together with a three year budget plans, consistent with MTBF.

Strengthen national Information system, including baseline climate, disaster, socio-economic and sectoral level databases together with traditional knowledge.

Build capacity in integrated knowledge management, as well as in making informed choice using available tools, such as multi-criteria analysis.

Development partner engagement, public finance management and Aid Effectiveness (Bridges 2 and Pillar 2)

Effectiveness of the JNAP implementation has, so far, very much depended on the availability of external funding, development partner engagement and project and finance management system adopted by donors. For JNAP implementation, funding is often sought from bilateral, multilateral and regional ODA and climate change funding sources. For increased access to funding, Tonga, Cook Islands and Tuvalu all have a Financing Strategy identified in their JNAP document.

External funding has though generally been provided on a project-by-project basis, with countries negotiated each project with development partners, occurring through JNAP Secretariat (as in Tonga), or through line ministries (as in Cook Islands and Tonga). The presence of JNAP has somewhat increased the efficiency of their donor interaction, with the development partners taking

cue from JNAP as to the country's priorities. This has not been without challenges particularly in the absence of sector plans. In both Cook Islands and Tonga, the absence of prioritised sector plans, together with a clear articulation of the adoption of integrated development and risk management approach constrain their ability to 'drive' their engagement with development partners.

Public finance management and JNAP Project Finance Management

Management of JNAP related finances varies across the region, even though all countries have their Public Finance Management System in place, including aid management/coordination mechanisms.

While partners are making efforts to use national systems to channel development assistance, including for project-based initiatives, as per Paris and Pacific Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, there are though also cases in the region where partners may set up parallel project accounts to particularly avoid delays in the release of funds.

One of the effects of having such a parallel process is that countries have difficulty in reconciling their development assistance records with those with the development assistance; Tonga for example also reported its difficulty in getting development partners to provide the government with the summary of their total development assistance.

JNAP Financing

To improve their ability to manage development assistance through their Public Finance Management System, PICS have expressed a preference for, for example, direct budget support and the use of National Trust Fund for climate change (and DRM) financing. There are merits and challenges in adopting such financing modalities, as compared with project-by-project funding, as described by PIFS (PIFS 2011).

Some countries, such as Samoa and Cook Islands, continue to pursue National Implementing Entity (NIE) status with the Climate Change Adaptation Fund, despite the first round of application being unsuccessful. CC Trust Fund Approach has also been considered by countries such as Samoa, Tonga and Nauru.

To be sustainable and effective such Climate Change Trust Funds would need to be carefully designed and established, preferably under a national legislation. Key areas for consideration include appropriate governance mechanism is in place to ensure appropriate financial management, transparency and accountability. Furthermore, careful attention also needs to be given to the types of activities that could be supported, reflecting integrated development and risk management approach. Otherwise, like in the case of Tonga, the concept of a National Trust Fund may need to be revisited, where such a Trust Fund is currently narrowly designed.

When developing national climate change (and DRM) Trust Fund or any other such centralised financing mechanism, it is critical that, in addition to meeting the standard finance management conditions of transparency and accountability, the scope of projects and programs to be supported under that Fund covers development and environment management initiatives for reducing vulnerabilities, including climate compatible development, as well as other DRR and CCA, CCM and risk management activities.

Conclusion

In conclusion, countries have been successful to some extent in developing and implementing their JNAPs, and using JNAP-linked to NSDS to secure development partner assistance. The development of a JNAP has served several purposes for countries in the region. The benefits have included encouraging increased understanding across stakeholders about the close relationship between disaster risk management and risks associated with climate change; and the need for a collaborative whole of government and country-based approach to development and risk management. The JNAP linked to NSDS, or equivalent national instrument, serve as a good reference document, one that can be used by to the government and donors to justify the development of specific proposals for development partner support.

However, any system of governance is as effective as its weakest link. There is scope for increased efficiency and effectiveness in JNAP development and implementation in the region. The experience in the region suggests that to improve effectiveness of JNAPs and efficiency in JNAP implementation, including in accessing ODA and CCF, countries could focus on building on their national, sectoral and sub national, including community level, governance system; improving areas that work partially; and focus on areas that can be strengthened in the short term for maximum benefits. Ultimately to strengthen the DRM and CC integration agenda for sustainable development and resilience, with or without producing a JNAP, countries would take a systems view of development needs and risks and collaboratively identify and choose appropriate solutions, supported by robust scientific and experiential knowledge within a linked national and sub national governance system. Further strengthening of regional partnership and JNAP regional core team could also help increase efficiency and effectiveness of particularly regional technical support to countries.

Implication of country experiences for the Regional the IPRS-DRM & CC

In the development and implementation of JNAP in the region, experiences from the counties provide some useful lessons, as regional partners and countries develop an Integrated Pacific Regional Strategy for DRM and CC (IPRS -DRM&CC). These include;

1. Countries and regional partners would mirror, in the development of IPRS the adoption of integrated development and risk management framework to ensure key principles and goals captured in respective international instruments and regional frameworks are appropriately reflected in the IPRS -DRM&CC).. This would include blending of key paradigms underpinning, and principle and strategies included in international and regional instruments and articulating these in the IPRS. Amongst the international and regional instruments that would need to be brought together and 'blended' Include:

- UNFCCC and PIFACC (CCA & CCM);
- HFA and RFA- DRR&DM;
- CBD and Nairobi Plan of Action,
- UNCCD and sustainable land management; sustainable forestry management; and

Use country-level lessons in the development and implementation of the cross-cutting JNAP instrument to guide the development of IPRS-DRM&CC, including the relevance of establishing an appropriately resourced coordinating secretariat. The composition of the coordinating unit/ Secretariat must include core staff with DRM & CC expertise as well as with strategic planning.

- Paris (and Pacific) Declaration of Aid Effectiveness and Forum Cairns Compact on Strengthening development coordination.
2. When assisting countries to identify appropriate response measures, it is equally important regional partners, too, acknowledge the relevance of the whole spectrum of hard and soft options across the development -DRR-DRM-CCA spectrum that countries would need to consider.
- Only through such an approach will they be able to assist countries to seamlessly address their current development needs, disaster risks, and adapting to climate change. In identifying and designing such measures, regional partners may require collaboration across regional agencies to draw inputs from a diverse field of expertise, including climate and other science, social science, behavioural science, economics and financial management.
3. The IPRS must reflect the recognition of a regional-linked national system of actors and stakeholders, comprising regional, national and sub-national governments, private sector, research bodies, and civil society, including community-based organizations, playing differential but complementary roles according to their accepted functions and capacities. Such stakeholders would work in partnership across temporal, spatial, administrative, and social scales, supported by relevant scientific and traditional knowledge.
 4. IPRS to clearly spell out:
 - IPRS matrix with clear line of sight and logic between goals, outcomes strategies and targeted programs that reflect the application of principles underpinning the Joint IPRS;
 - regional governance arrangement for the coordination of the implementation of IPRS, in support of national goals of sustainable development and resilience;
 5. At the regional level, establish a clearly identified and dedicated IPRS Secretariat / unit (located in an appropriate regional organisation), with a clearly spelled out role and functions, including the modality of engagement of other CROP agencies with specific technical comparative advantage in the development and coordination of JNPA implementation. Such a unit/ Secretariat would ideally comprise at least specialists in strategic planning, climate change, and DRM, knowledge management and a financing specialist.
 6. A prioritised Plan of Implementation for the IPRS team/ Secretariat for supporting the coordination of the implementation of IPRS across the region, consistent with country's own priorities articulated in their NSDS-linked JNAP for DRM & CC, or equivalent instrument. Such a plan of implementation will also include:
 - a. A financing strategy and a rolling budget for the JNAP Secretariat to support the coordination of IPRS implementation and
 - b. An M&E system, including SMART indicators for the IPRS unit/ secretariat as well as for monitoring the implementation of IPRS, linked to country-level JNAP M&E system and indicators.

7. Recognising that integrated development and risk management is a new domain and strategic planning capacity within regional organisations is also variable, strengthening regional capacity in strategic planning as well as in the use of consistent and robust methodologies for mainstreaming DRM & CC in development will also be required.

In conclusion, regional partners have an important role to play in supporting PICs to realise their vision and development goal. Such support needs to be based the adoption of an integrated development and risk management framework and technically robust methodologies, while building on the national system of governance that is cognisant of capacity constraints and recognising the need for a team of context-specific mix of technical expertise.