



JOINT PLATFORM FOR DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE ROUNDTABLE MEETING REPORT



**HOLIDAY INN, SUVA, FIJI
4 - 5 OCTOBER 2017**





CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	7
Outcome Statement	8
Executive Summary	10
Introduction	28
Official opening	29
Scene setting and key updates	30
Plenary 1: Regional focus: FRDP and local actors towards Pacific resilience	33
Plenary 2: Effective partnerships for the FRDP: Addressing challenges and maximising opportunities	35
Session 2: Country priorities, lessons learned and challenges	
Session 3.1: Finance for resilience	39
Session 3.2: Science for resilience: How science and technology are changing the game for Pacific early warning systems	45
Session 4.1: Ecosystems-based approaches to resilience building	49
Session 4.2: Local coordination for resilience	52
Session 5.1: Applications of risk modelling and impact tools?	54
Session 5.2: Building resilience using traditional knowledge, culture and arts	55
Session 6.1: Partnerships in action: Emergency preparedness and response capacity	58
Session 6.2: Risk governance	61
Plenary 7: Practical knowledge management and monitoring processes for operationalising the FRDP	63
Session 8: Networking and outcome development	66
Session 8.1: Informal session for feedback on expectations of the PRP	
Closing session: Outcome statement and adoption	67
Annex 1: Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Outcome Statement	68
Annex 2: Agenda	69
Annex 3: Participants List	76

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AF	Adaptation Fund
AFAC	Australasian Fire and Emergency Service Authorities Council
BMUB	German Government Federal Ministry of Environment and Buildings
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCDRM	Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management
CDCRM	Community Disaster and Climate Risk Management Programme
COP	Conference of the Parties
COP21	21st session of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties
COP23	23rd session of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties
COSPPac	Climate and Ocean Services Program in the Pacific
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
CSO	Community Sector Organisation
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EbA	Ecosystem-based Adaptation
EDF	European Development Fund
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ENSO	El Niño–Southern Oscillation
EU	European Union
EU-GCCA	European Union – Global Climate Change Alliance
EWS	Early Warning Systems
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FRDP	Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific
FSM	the Federated States of Micronesia
GCCA: PSIS	Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFCS	Global Framework for Climate Services
GHG	Green House Gas
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IMO	International Maritime Organization
INDC	Intended Nationally Determined Contributions

IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JNAP	Joint National Action Plan
KM	Knowledge Management
KMWG	Knowledge Management Working Group
LDWG	Loss and Damage Working Group
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MECDM	Solomon Islands Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology
MHEWS	Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems
MNRE	Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Marine Spatial Planning
MWG	Mitigation Working Group
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Options
NAPA	National Adaptation Programs of Action
NCCCT	National Climate Change Country Team
NDC	Nationally Determined Contributions
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NEMS	National Environment Management Strategies
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NIE	National Implementing Entity
NIWA	New Zealand Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research
NMS	National Meteorological Service
PACCSAP	Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning
PARTneR	Pacific Risk Tool for Resilience
PCCC	Pacific Climate Change Centre
PCCP	Pacific Climate Change Portal
PCCR	Pacific Climate Change Roundtable
PCCSP	Pacific Climate Change Science Program
PCDF	Partners in Community Development Fiji
PCRAFI	Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative
PDNA	Post Disaster Needs Assessment Sendai Framework Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030
PEBACC	Pacific Ecosystems-based Adaptation to Climate Change
PFM	Public Finance Management
PHP	Pacific Humanitarian Platform
PIANGO	Pacific Island Association of Non-Governmental Organisations
PICAN	Pacific Island Climate Action Network
PICOF	Pacific Islands Climate Outlook Forum
PIEMA	Pacific Islands Emergency Management Alliance
PIFACC	Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change

PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PIGGAREP	Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project
PIPSO	Pacific Island Private Sector Organisation
PMC	Pacific Meteorological Council
PRP	Pacific Resilience Partnership
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
RTSM	Regional Technical Support Mechanism
SAMOA Pathway	SIDS Accelerated Modalities Of Action Pathway
SCOPIIC	Seasonal Climate Outlooks for Pacific Island Countries
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	Small Islands Developing States Environment Programme
SOE	State of Environment
SPC	Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TC	Tropical Cyclone
TSF	Tuvalu Climate Change and Disaster Survival Fund of Tuvalu Survival Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USP	University of the South Pacific
WASH	Water, sanitation and hygiene
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Joint Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and Platform for Disaster Risk Management 2017 was made possible with the collaborative support, coordination and financial assistance of the following key partners:

- The Pacific Humanitarian Team
- The Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management
- Pacific Climate Change Roundtable
- Building Safety and Resilience in the Pacific
- European Union
- ACP
- Federal Republic of Germany Foreign Office
- Government of Australia
- The Pacific Community (SPC)
- The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
- United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR)
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA)

The success of the meeting belongs with the two-hundred participants which represented Pacific island government disaster and climate change focal points, national and sub-national government representatives, key stakeholders including civil society, non-government organisations, private sector and those integrated across cross-cutting sectors involved in resilient development in the region.

OUTCOME STATEMENT



Statement of the Joint Meeting of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable & the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management

WE, the representatives of Pacific Island Countries and Territories and partners attending the Joint Meeting of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable & Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management, in Suva, Fiji, 04-05 October 2017:

ACKNOWLEDGE the regional and global policy and planning frameworks, that complement and support national development policy instruments;

1. WELCOME the decision by Pacific Island Forum Leaders in 2016 and 2017 in addressing the challenges of resilient development approved the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific, an integrated approach to address climate change and disaster risk management for the region and endorsed the establishment of the Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP) for the effective implementation of the FRDP;
2. EMPHASISE that enhanced partnerships at all levels is crucial to enable vertical and horizontal integration and provide resources and capacity for implementation of the FRDP;
3. VALUE the leadership of Pacific Island Countries and Territories and their communities to adopt integrated approaches, where appropriate, and noted that the FRDP will guide and support these approaches including the commitments made by partners to provide support to the FRDP;
4. ACKNOWLEDGE that the existing regional fora (such as the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, Pacific Humanitarian Partnership, the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Meteorological Council) have provided platforms to promote and enable resilient development in the region;
5. RECALL the guiding principles of the FRDP to incorporate risk resilient development across all sectors and UNDERSCORING the importance of participatory people-centred approaches for enhanced preparedness and response, risk reduction and adaptation initiatives.

Records the importance of:

6. ENCOURAGING respective national finance and planning agencies incorporate strategic, inclusive approaches in mainstreaming disaster and climate-related risk into planning, budgetary and decision-making processes;
7. PROMOTING public-private partnerships at all levels.

8. INCLUDING full participation and resourcing of vulnerable and marginalised groups including women, youth, children, persons with disabilities, and the elderly to ensure inclusivity and amplify efforts to build resilience and respond to disasters
9. SUPPORTING meteorological, ocean and geological observations and services, data management, appropriate technologies and the provision of reliable weather, climate, multi-hazard early warning systems services and capacities to underpin disaster risk management and climate change interventions;
10. INCREASING investments by countries and partners to strengthen multi hazard early warning capacity of national entities, response agencies and communities and the particular role of the private sector, taking into consideration traditional knowledge and scientific analysis
11. Regional organisations and partners COLLABORATING and COORDINATING on how to maximise and streamline technical support for national actions
12. ENCOURAGING investments in institutional capacity at the regional, national and subnational levels and communities to access, implement and report on climate change and disaster risk financing
13. PROMOTING integrated national climate change and resilience policies that recognise, protect and restore ecosystem services using sound science and holistic approaches to whole-of-island ecosystems.
14. SUPPORTING the strengthening of capacity for timely, localised and inclusive disaster preparedness and response;
15. RECOGNISING the importance of loss and damage for Pacific Island Countries and Territories and call for support to further efforts to build capacity, enhance understanding, collect and manage data and information on loss and damage in the region, and develop and adapt tools and mechanisms to address needs in the region on loss and damage;
16. SEEKING support for developing the framework for the FRDP's monitoring, evaluation and reporting, ensuring that this does not place additional burdens on countries;
17. WELCOMING the new Pacific Resilience Partnership Meeting as the platform to consolidate the region's input into global reviews of progress against relevant international agreements, including at the biennial Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction.;
18. CONVENING the Pacific Resilience Meeting, noting the Leaders decision on a two year trial period of the PRP which builds on and incorporates the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management as an important technical support to the effective functioning of the Pacific Resilience Partnership, including harmonization of existing regional technical mechanisms and new initiatives;
19. REITERATING the Leaders decision for the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat to support the implementation of the FRDP, and emphasised the need for coordination with Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Pacific Community and other partners to mobilise and support the PRP Task Force and the support unit.

ADOPTED ON: THURSDAY 5 OCTOBER, 2017

4. The concept of resilient development needs to be approached from different levels as communities do not always have the luxury of being able to afford resilience. Transformation is creating space to achieve the results which are inclusive. Civil society may not have been mobilised enough in the past however inclusive participation is critical for successful outcomes. The inclusion of a broader sector of society brings a realisation that civil society is not trying to meddle with decision-making, but represents those who will be affected by decisions.
5. A critical issue for the private sector and other stakeholders is accessing finance and resources, opportunities and the need to simplify processes.
6. The PRP will help with coordination of local stakeholders, including country to country approaches to mapping out available resources and lessons. It was also highlighted the importance of harmonisation and to avoid duplication, ensuring there is collaboration rather than competition. Investment in resilience building is critical.
7. On the Blue Pacific there has to be a collective effort linking climate change, disaster risk management and resilient development. The FRDP and PRP represent an opportunity for informed inclusive efforts, which advocates collective action at the national and regional levels as well as greater returns on investment in terms of disaster preparedness. There is a commitment to achieve these goals, through being more action oriented and resources being directed towards these priorities.

PLENARY 2: EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE FRDP: ADDRESSING CHALLENGES AND MAXIMISING OPPORTUNITIES

8. Palau shared that on a daily basis to examine where the strengths are and maximise on those strengths. This is dependent on which sector is being focused on and understanding where the relevant resources are. Development partners and donors also need to understand the situation in the countries.
9. Projects can unintentionally over-burden communities particularly given the limited capacity in the communities and the different roles coordinators have. Work in communities requires partnerships with other stakeholders, particularly NGOs and CSOs, especially as the chain of command is very clear from the community to the government.
10. With partnerships come mutual accountability and responsibility, it is important to create ownership during projects. Communities need to see that the project is not just assistance, it is given to them to own and maintain for sustainability. If ownership is not promoted, communities will keep coming back for more assistance. There is a need to continue to promote vulnerable groups and to help them to be able to access finance.

11. Panellists shared how young people are being engaged in decision-making. Palau shared that they have an approach for vulnerable groups and these groups are included in the decision-making phase as a result of lessons learnt. It was noted that Kiribati youth are well represented in decision-making but also need to have the capacity to be able to contribute effectively. Palau added climate change is being integrated into the curriculum and scholarships have been provided for students.
12. Partnerships need to be broadened to ensure strengths are maximised and weaknesses minimised. It was acknowledged there will be challenges but it is important that each challenge is addressed based on the context. Partnerships and inclusive planning and decision-making can lead to really good development work that is sustainable, timely and effective.

SESSION 3.1: FINANCE FOR RESILIENCE

13. Key issues and lessons learnt on climate finance:
 - Coordination and strong leadership at national level is critical.
 - A number of partners are looking to engage with Pacific countries.
 - PICs need to be strategic.
 - Engagement of technical ministries; currently climate change departments are accessing financing.
 - Advocating for how to manage those resources.
 - Important to engage planning and ministries of finance, CSOs and private sector in managing the financing accessed.
14. Lessons learnt and future of the Tuvalu Survival Fund:
 - TC Pam sectoral support went directly to Ministries. Difficult to track overall support received by Tuvalu for TC Pam and other disasters. Amount of funds managed by Ministry of Finance is small compared to direct Ministerial support. The TSF best way forward with all funds to go through TSF.
 - Importance of legalising operationalisation and management of the fund. Regulations provide clear standards and procedures for accessing the fund and operation. Enabling environment established for the system to work.
 - Future of TSF to channel all financial support for CCA DRM into the TSF.
 - Encourage partners to use existing national mechanisms with established mechanisms in country and to assist countries in identifying gaps in existing national systems.
 - Strengthening the PFM system in order to establish an appropriate absorption capacity recognising the proliferation of climate change finance.



15. Challenges faced by RMI include:
- Leveraging funds and limited understanding of the World Bank's process and requirements in terms of procurement, social and environmental safeguards.
 - Construction related risks at project level such as sourcing aggregates for sea wall; delays in securing GCF funding.
 - Opportunities noted as regional partnership and strategy with shared regional voice and advocacy at global level.
16. On climate finance there is a need to simplify access procedures as it is a challenge for countries to work with what they have and the regional support mechanisms have been useful in the past in putting together country proposals.
17. SDG 6 Water and Sanitation as contributing to overall sustainable development goals and resilience. 2030 Agenda for SDGs of universal access requires substantial financing. Climate variability and climate change affecting the base challenges toward achieving resilience. National efforts with partners support is essential. Long term maintenance of water infrastructure is also a problem, especially for outer islands. Ensuring the government puts aside maintenance budget for infrastructure. SPC noted that member countries looking at solutions that can withstand disasters and can be maintained locally. Knowledge is key and does not necessarily need maintenance budgets.

18. ADB noted the proposed Pacific Disaster Resilience Program which is to provide disaster contingent financing upon a soft trigger such as the declaration of a disaster. It will support facility management through regional technical assistance and is targeted at the five most vulnerable developing countries of Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.
19. The rationale for contingent financing is addressing risks not covered by national contingent finance, that is not as costly as insurance and enables access to quick financing, post disaster with direct budget support through government systems. The quick disbursement of funds is to reduce economic and social costs. Funds are available when the soft trigger is satisfied.
20. Importance of involving the private sector in investing in resilient development, which needs to happen more at the national level. Development partners need to look at private sector engagement and investment in resilient business and investing in resilient investment for national communities.



SESSION 3.2: SCIENCE FOR RESILIENCE: HOW SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ARE CHANGING THE GAME FOR PACIFIC EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS

21. Dr. David Hirasias from the Solomon Islands presented on linking climate and malaria transmission. The project started in 2004 as a case study and was implemented with the Australia Bureau of Meteorology. Reliable data is a challenge. The approach is to establish if there is a relationship between rainfall and incidence of malaria. There is a lot of research being done in establishing the number of cases and rainfall and are currently conducting a climate based malaria index. There is a link between rainfall and incidence of malaria. When rainfall increases, cases decrease.
22. Using the statistical analysis tool SCOPIC the team generates the likely malaria risk outlook. Feeding the information to the Vector Borne Disease Team informs them of the likely higher risk before the budget period in August and can allocate funds to combat a potential malaria outbreak. The work undertaken under the malaria early warning system, helps sectors to plan their work to minimise risk.
23. Ms. Morika Hunter of Digicel presented on early warnings through communications. Over 70% of mobile users have smart phones. Digicel offer tools to drive awareness of disaster issues in the Pacific. When TC Pam hit, Digicel worked with UNDP and other local organisations to produce a survey to find out what the most urgent needs were. Digicel were able to then provide governments within the same day information about who had access to drinking water and how many days of food were left and this could be done by regions. The government can then direct their support via regions.
24. For TC Winston, Fiji Digicel worked with SPC and UNDP to get communication up and running on the third day. The messages are basic for greater engagement and understanding. It is a great tool to push out awareness, to remote communities. There is a lot Digicel can do with stakeholders and government.
25. Ms. Jennifer DeBrum of RMI provided a country perspective on early warning systems in the Marshall Islands. RMI needs to enhance emergency response at all levels and have locally appropriate warnings. For slow onset hazards, such as drought, RMI gets products and quarterly bulletins from various providers. This information helps with early action and preparedness activities. RMI confirmed a state of emergency due to the slow onset and impacts. The post-disaster needs assessment RMI undertook after the drought captured information on various areas including the impacts on the economy and society.
26. Mr. Herve Damlamian from the Pacific Community presented on Kiritimati Island, PacSAFE and contribution of science to warnings and evidence-based decision making. Decision makers recognise the importance of scientific facts to input into their decision making. There is a clear will to integrate this information as it will lead to sustainable development. Science and

technology need to rise to the occasion and build a model that is based on good data with acceptable uncertainties.

27. There is a critical need to collect accurate data. At SPC there are large sets of tools to set data. SPC have numerous instruments to collect this data and it is important to ensure the model is integrated to satisfactorily reproduce what is happening in reality. Therefore collection of data even in small inundations to validate the model. Local knowledge can help validate what has been happening on that coastline over the past years.
28. SPC have been building these models for planning and assessments. There is a need to move them into inundation focus systems. The issue with these models is that they are high resolution and many processes are needed to be modelled and take a long time. Therefore, what is needed to pre-compute pre-conceived scenarios, which enables a model to be pulled from a database.
29. An inundation map showing what is the level on shore, is a big improvement but it is not the best information that people like NDMO require. Therefore SPC in partnership with NIWA and the World Bank are working together to develop risk tools. There is a regional will to integrate scientific information into decision-making and there needs to be the collection of high resolute and high quality information. It is important to go from global information to local impact in a timely manner.

SESSION 4.1: ECOSYSTEMS-BASED APPROACHES TO RESILIENCE BUILDING

30. The session outlined a practical programmatic framework to guide ecosystem-based approaches to climate change resilience and adaptation in the Pacific islands context. The framework has been developed by SPREP, IUCN and SPC with the intention that it will promote a consistent, principle based and methodological approach to new and emerging investments in resilient development and adaptation. It also highlighted the need for clear and coherent approaches to adaptation to avoid maladaptation. The ecosystem based approach has garnered much support and is a preferred methodology by SPREP in promoting resilience building in the Pacific.
31. Key recommendations:
 - There is a need to implement good national climate change and resilience policies that recognise, protect and restore ecosystem services. Protection needs to be priority as restoration can incur huge costs.
 - Sound science and holistic approaches are required, with long term planning horizons.
 - Non-climate change issues also need to be accounted for, as do land tenure issues as they impact on any EbA interventions and the whole of island and ridge-to-reef approach.
 - Governments and communities need integrated multiscale long term resilience focused scenario planning. This will require a structured process that works effectively across all governance levels, from communities through to national governments.
 - These recommendations have been incorporated as far as possible in the SPREP/SPC/IUCN proposal for a programme to be funded by the GCF, as an EbA intervention at scale.

32. Conclusions of the session:

- There is now increased understanding by participants of the critical linkages between maintaining and restoring ecosystems and their services and enhancing resilience to climate change and disasters.
- There was also increased understanding by participants of the viability of ecosystem restoration as exemplified by implementation of the Louisiana Coastal Management Plan, but bearing in mind that the costs of restoration are much higher than resilience building, but are able to garner long term benefits, albeit at greater costs.
- Furthermore, participants gained a better understanding of the IUCN-SPREP coastal resilience programme proposed for submission to the Green Climate Fund.
- An analogy was used to describe seawalls, noting many seawalls give the few good seawalls a bad reputation.





SESSION 4.2: LOCAL COORDINATION FOR RESILIENCE

33. At the village level, resilience is understood to be the ability of a community to respond to disasters and climate change impacts and the mapping out of strategies to minimise the impact on communities. Following TC Winston, Partners in Community Development Fiji have been working in the Ra Province of Fiji conducting disaster preparedness trainings for communities to become first responders to disasters.
34. The Fiji Ministry of iTaukei Affairs is tasked to look after the wellbeing of the communities through a partnership with NGOs and working through the provincial council. It has allowed an integrated rural approach to tackle the rehabilitation programme issues. Communication structures need to be identified that are active and can be utilised in order to mobilise and disseminate information.
35. The experiences of climate change impacts in Yasawa, Fiji were shared. Women play an active role in food security in Yasawa who are experiencing the impacts of climate change such as sea level rise, and droughts. Post disaster assistance provided included seedlings for crops: watermelon, nine varieties of kumala. In terms of drought time, water supply was sent to Yasawa.
36. Traditional methods of food preservation called “duvuke” and “jila”, are being taught to the younger generation in breadfruit preservation from WWF.

37. It was acknowledged the need to pull together resources and using partnerships to deliver activities to communities post disaster. The importance of engaging local governments otherwise a project will run the risk of not addressing resilience, or identifying what is already working
38. In order to build resilience the discussions concluded the need to build back better and build better in the first place. For the case of the FSM, when states coordinate themselves, it is more effective. As long as countries and governments are moving in the right direction together and learning from experiences along the way, it is working.
39. Key statements on local coordination for resilience.
 - Collaboration and coordination at local level is the nexus for; identifying effective existing structures, capacities and resources inherent in communities; enhancing sustainable practices for preparedness, food security, livelihoods and water security; greater opportunities for partnerships of resilient development actors such as community members, NGOs, CSOs, local government and relevant line ministries.
 - Placing people at the centre of all development allows for a rich harvest of knowing their needs, knowledge, expertise, strengths, and gaps; opens the space for leadership of their preparedness, response, risk reduction and adaptation initiatives to particularly slow onset events and the impacts of climate variability which is a lived daily reality at the household level.
 - Invest efforts in doing things right the first time around.
40. Identified gaps and opportunities:
 - The local community needs to acknowledge and make use of available resources.
 - In the case of North Pacific, coordination and facilitation of assistance to other states and understanding their needs and priorities is always a challenge.
 - There are challenges with different levels of government in terms of resource allocation like fisheries e.g. in FSM.
41. Conclusions of the session:
 - The importance of taking message to the communities and working with existing structures.
 - The importance of using relevant practices such as traditional knowledge and defined roles in communities for men, women and youth.
 - The importance of using local capacity, people, assets (such as churches as evacuation centres) during disasters and post disasters.
 - The importance of pulling together resources and the need for partnerships and working together. The need to be inclusive and involve all groups. Ask people what they need rather than telling people what they need.



SESSION 5.1: APPLICATIONS OF RISK MODELLING AND IMPACT TOOLS?

42. On the needs and challenges associated with risk data collection and management in the Pacific the following was noted:
- Standardisation of data and consistency of vocabulary
 - Still need to demonstrate the importance and need for data
 - Availability and quality of data
 - Collection of data/technology of infrastructure
 - Ownership, licensing and institutional backing on NDMO
 - Social vulnerability
 - Use of data
 - Strengthening disaggregated data in the region
 - Working Group on harmonization of data and tools within context of PRP
43. Opportunities exist for enhancing national and regional risk data management.
- Connecting to PRP including building upon the work of the Knowledge Management working Group from the PCCR.
 - Climate change funding presents an opportunity for impact modelling tools
 - Increased data storage
 - Converting data to electronic forms
 - Future approaches could consider risk perception / attitudes to risk as they are critical to converting knowledge into action. This would need to include local contextual factors, including cultural aspects)

- Risk perception could be considered inside models but also in providing better support in applying them in decision-making
 - Improved visualisation of risk might help communicate the need for action
 - The increased use and coverage of cellular networks is an opportunity for data collection
 - Private sector can play a role and can be important first movers
 - Work with CROP agencies for support to improve data and models.
44. To improve risk modelling tools to support Pacific island countries, it was noted that there is a need for cheap data collection through drones; increased vulnerability models; simple user interface; and increased asset data and field work.
45. The utility and value of risk and impact modelling tools was recognised during the session as were a number of challenges and opportunities. In particular, there is a need to harmonise collection methods, formats and storage of the data required for such tools across the region. This is not a task for a single project and needs to be coordinated regionally. It was suggested that a Working Group on harmonisation of data and tools could support the work of the PRP.
46. The need for the outputs of such tools to be contextualised to local conditions was highlighted including the important role of understanding gender and cultural issues and differing attitudes to risk. Accounting for such factors can support moving from risk model outputs to action on the ground. The importance to ensuring the sustainability of software-based tools was emphasised and the PARTneR Project appears to provide good practice in this regard.

SESSION 5.2: BUILDING RESILIENCE USING TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE, CULTURE AND ARTS

47. Culture and arts play a supportive role in building Pacific resilience to climate change by diffusing knowledge widely in meaningful and accessible ways locally and internationally and promoting Pacific voices and 'changing the narrative'.
48. Documenting traditional knowledge and validating it for use in early warning systems through the SPREP-COSPPac project is serving to strengthen understanding of weather related traditional knowledge in the countries where the project is taking place and as the project continues the information being collected will be communicated back to communities.
49. It is important that DRM/CC frameworks are inclusive of Pacific concerns as illustrated by the biocultural indicator project including a stronger focus on ecosystem services, people's access to natural and cultural heritage and connections to people and place which are essential to wellbeing and resilience. Increasing resilience through reviving, rethinking, revalidating and combining climate traditional knowledge and Science.

50. Presentation was delivered by SPREP Climate and Meteorological Officer, Mr. Salesa Nihmei outlining the SPREP-COSPPac project on Traditional Knowledge with particular reference to Early Warning System – Early Detection, Monitoring and Analysis as a focus. The project is piloted in Samoa, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Niue and Tonga and looks at preserving weather and climate information on Traditional Knowledge and there is growing recognition of local knowledge to complement modern forecasting information.
51. The Pacific 350.org group was established in 2013 and expanded to raising the impacts of climate change on Pacific island countries. Using designated climate warriors across the region, 350.org initiated a range of projects. In the RMI this focused on inter-generational sharing of knowledge through weaving and poetry to capture knowledge from the elders. A series of short videos was shown to provide additional information.
52. Traditional Knowledge is reaffirmed: by making it current in the community by supporting culture and the arts to broadcast and sustainably keep disaster and resilience mechanisms fresh in people's minds; by making culture and the arts sustainable; and by making practitioners of cultures and arts sustainable so they can be active in promoting resilience
53. There is a loss of an elderly generation that have traditional knowledge, therefore the SPREP-COSPPac project piloted in Samoa, Vanuatu, Niue works with communities to collect existing knowledge and to identify how to integrate knowledge and science and the indicators of changes in weather and climate. There is value in having both traditional and modern science. La Niña, El Niño and changing weather patterns have traditional terms that needs to be captured and which is communicated better through different cultural settings.
54. Ms. Alisi Rabukawaqa of 350 Pacific noted the modes of climate activism and movements need to be adjusted to fit Pacific cultures and context. The 350 movement is about changing the narrative of climate activism i.e 'We are not drowning, We are Fighting'. Observing traditional practices and experiences to navigate through new systems and changes. The need to use knowledge spaces to learn about traditional concepts and culture and to use existing traditional structures to communicate with affected communities when responding to disasters. There is also a need to acknowledge role of young people that are aware and interested in traditional knowledge and how it integrates with science. There must also be resources directed towards young people as agents of change.
55. Dr. Stacy Jupiter reiterated the need to allow Pacific voices to define themselves and what it means to be resilient. This is achieved by gathering voices and representatives from across the Pacific to get a consensus on what it means to be resilient. To have a strong place in resilience people need to preserve their cultures, their resources and to be able have access it. It had been identified that there is mismatch between traditional and international views.
56. The project evaluated gaps in the FRDP where there was little covered reflecting the need to help people to adapt through a better understanding of ecosystem services; access to natural and cultural resources and a focus on connectedness to people and place. There is a need to consider indicators that build on local definitions.

57. Ms. Sachiko Soro of VOU noted that in responding to disasters, being a local has a far greater impact when rounding up resources and aid to provide to affected communities. In addition networking with people you know or with people who are well known to the community like a radio personality is also effective. Challenges for artists revolve around funding, and many donor organisations ignoring the value of traditional knowledge and cultures. Using social media in an engaging way, as VOU has done is a very cost effective means to mobilise resources and aid.

SESSION 6.1: PARTNERSHIPS IN ACTION: EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CAPACITY

58. PIEMA is a strategic allegiance formed in 2013 of fire agencies and chief of police with links to the NDMOs to support capacity development for emergency services and NDMO around issues of disaster risk and climate change. SPC acts as the Secretariat for PIEMA. AFAC handed it over to SPC and has taken steps to provide strategic advice and support. In Tonga, recently there was a tip fire and they sought advice from their Twinning agency in South Australia which provided the required support. AFAC is a conduit between DFAT, Emergency Management Australia (EMA) and the Pacific. There are greater opportunities to integrate climate change and DRR into emergency management.
59. Mr. Paula Cirikiyasawa of the Ministry of Economy presented on the support of Fiji to Solomon Islands on early recovery. After the earthquake, Solomon Islands put in a request for assistance from Fiji in the recovery effort. Fiji undertook post disaster assessments and UNDP supported the process. Homes, livelihoods, infrastructure and building resilience were the main priority areas. To ensure inclusiveness, it was important to include people on the ground and those working with the ministries. On monitoring and evaluation the ministries and undersecretaries were involved to ensure national ownership and sustainability for the implementation phase.
60. The outcome of the process was the earthquake recovery plan which was approved by Cabinet in June, 2017. The Plan shows what can be achieved within the means of the Government. Enforcement and regulation of building codes is also important.
61. Mr. Choi Yeeting of Kiribati presented on sustainability and partnerships using a whole of island approach in terms of how to improve sustainable partnerships. This is the integration of climate change and disaster risk management and they are also undergoing activities on the implementation plan in line with the FRDP.
62. Kiribati have a national plan with a whole of island approach to ensure better allocation of resources and finances. Kiribati have had many partners involved moving together in a strategic manner across the country. It is proving to be an effective coordination mechanism and helping to strengthen coordination at the national level. Kiribati tries to ensure climate change and disaster risk reduction activities are sustainable and involve all of the stakeholders in decision-making processes. Decision makers now appreciate the value of combining the two.

63. Lessons learnt include: strengthened island level structure; effective communication between local and national governments; engagement of stakeholders; sustainability of activities and importance of clear communication for climate change science and impacts.

64. Recommendations:

Work through the respective island councils to assist with implementation issues as they have their own processes, needs and requirements. There are strong cultural considerations and island protocols to follow and it can be difficult to do without it.

There is a need to strengthen coordination however what are the skills needed to strengthen coordination. There is a need for human resource and management of information provided through all the sectors to enable stocktaking. The simplest way is for stakeholders to sit around a table and discuss. The skills needed are to coordinate everything at one time.

The resources needed for a whole of island approach to expand and replicate includes IVA which is a process of integrated vulnerability assessment. Technical capacity to conduct the IVAs and assessments on the ground requires technical advice and there is a need for more capacity building for the staff of each sector.

65. Session outcomes:

Partnerships in action is core to the realisation of the FRDP objectives and goals as seen in the examples shared by the Australian Fire and Emergency Services Authorities Council on the PIEMA Model and the Twinning Arrangements; support by Fiji to the Solomon Islands on Early Recovery; and the Sustainable Partnerships for the Whole of Island Approach in Abaiang.

Partnerships in Action serves not only to build the resilience of the Pacific island communities to climate and disaster hazards but also collectively contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals.



SESSION 6.2: RISK GOVERNANCE

66. Panellist Dr. Josefa Koroivueta, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation for the Government of Fiji noted the response needs to be humane. Gender is pivotal in the response. The stories shared on the impacts of disasters are real stories that need to focus on what the Pacific have not been doing well and to keep asking the questions of how things can be done better, beyond expectations.
67. Panellist Ms. Rothina Ilo Noka, from the Department of Women's Affairs, Ministry of Justice and Community Services for the Government of Vanuatu noted the rates of sexual assault on young girls in Vanuatu as an example of gender inequality. Disaster makes the situation worse creating a "secondary disaster" which Vanuatu has now in place a gender cluster.
68. Panellist Mr. Ray Bojczuk, First Secretary of the Australian High Commission noted climate change and disasters affect everyone. Development decisions can be guided by having risk informed development which needs to be considered in advance. Dr. Koroivueta noted that development decisions need to carefully consider risk and look at all aspects of communities. There is a need for men to change their mindsets and make space for women to take part in decision making.
69. The panellists noted the processes and mechanisms to make sure funds trickle down are a challenge, there are never sufficient funds due to increasing disasters and costs associated with relocation and climate proofing. Resilience cannot be measured in terms of money, as people need to also recognise there needs to be behavioural change. If development is not risk informed it will undermine resilience. Money is important, but needed in a timely factor.
70. Invisible risks are women and children becoming more vulnerable. Importance of engagement with all groups during the design phase. Part of disaster risk reduction and risk informed development is to make sure that an event does not become a disaster. At the community level it is important to consider the needs of all groups and this must be done before hand so that during an emergency communities are prepared.
71. Good development should incorporate resilience and needs to build community resilience, not dependence. Most tangible results are those that empower beneficiaries to make decisions and to plan and prepare. Prescriptive projects are not as effective.
72. Conclusions by the moderator of the session:
 - Risk if not managed can potentially exacerbate a disaster.
 - Funds provided for climate change need to be used effectively.
 - Invisible risks are a consequence of not including vulnerable groups.
 - Traditional Knowledge and utilising Traditional Knowledge available can be better utilised to support development.
 - PRP and FRDP platform for better coordination but products and outcomes need to be taken back to community.

73. Outcome statement from session organisers:

- Gender and social risks are often ‘invisible’ and can be neglected in development decisions. These considerations are key to ensuring that development is inclusive and resilient.
- Building resilience is about changing the mindsets of every day development decision makers and community members.
- Disasters and climate change respect no-one. Everyone and everything is impacted.
- The amount of money invested in CCDRM is not nearly as important as how it is programmed. All development investments should consider risk; otherwise, they will not be sustainable.
- It is critical to work from within existing governance structures and to ensure that development actors adopt risk mainstreaming
- A multi-stakeholder approach is crucial for improving resilience.

PLENARY 7: PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING PROCESSES FOR OPERATIONALISING THE FRDP

74. Ms. de Brum presented a map of the RMI JNAP and the interlinked 25 frameworks and plans as well as eight global and seven regional strategies. The purpose is to better coordinate how they use resources in country. RMI are over extended and need more staff. The goal is to initiate M&E coordination within government and establish an M&E system.
75. Mr. Andrew McElroy Representative for the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific presented on the Pacific Roadmap for Sustainable Development approved by the 48th Forum Leaders Meeting. The PRSD has a Task Force with the following key tasks: develop the region’s sustainable development indicators; to strengthen existing regional and national mechanisms with reference to the SAMOA Pathway and Sendai Framework; and identify key elements for implementation of Sendai, Paris Agreement and SDGs.
76. There are currently 132 indicators for the Pacific, 48 indicators already measured by 2018, and 37 indicators have a methodology but are not collected. Samoa is one of 22 countries globally to report against 2030 SDGs in July 2016. The 38 indicators of the SDGs are linked to the Sendai Framework and Paris Agreement. Within region existing and established tools to assist with M&E of loss and damage. Sendai monitor reporting cycle to take place every two years and due in May 2019. Feeding into the FRDP capacity gaps and reporting commitments. On reporting it is important to not over burden countries.
77. Mr. Lepale Aussie Simanu of Samoa, shared the monitoring and evaluation of the disaster risk management and climate change planning aspects in Samoa including discussion of national mechanisms. It was noted that implementation requires resources and flexibility for changing or competing priorities. A critical challenge is the lack of data and the inconsistency in M&E mechanisms.

78. The group work noted the following recommendations:

- Establish an M&E working group committee within FRDP.
- Establish guidelines for countries on how to manage M&E consultants and TORs.
- Develop reporting systems and identify gaps for strengthening and enhancing what has been established.
- Standardised template that combines all three into one reporting framework.
- Simple presentation such as infographic information for decision makers.
- Simplified reporting template for the FRDP.
- Political commitment into the reporting process.
- Reinforcing existing data and information systems, and integration/interoperability.
- Reporting system that that can be accessed online by everyone and is open to all relevant parties with links to regional and global frameworks and strategies with the support of regional organisations like SPC.
- Annual and other reports are deposited and analysed for reporting to FRDP, Sendai and other frameworks.
- Governments could give NGOs a few simple criteria to report on each year to capture more of the community level work happening in countries.
- Training of staff to ensure that there is the expertise when it comes to reporting.
- Consider financial and other reporting for added value.

SESSION 8.1: INFORMAL SESSION FOR FEEDBACK ON EXPECTATIONS OF THE PRP

79. Tonga and Samoa informed the meeting that what is desired is direction on next steps regarding the PRP and where to from here after the Joint Platform including implementation and understanding the operational side of the Framework in terms of how the work of the Platform and the PCCR has been integrated. The Meteorological Services is in the middle of the two communities and their role is important to both.

80. PIFS noted that the CROP is to serve in a technical role with other agencies and partners. The structure of the FRDP and the Resilience Meeting in 2018 brings the two communities and other relevant actors together. The Taskforce represents countries and partners, as well as vast stakeholders to provide guidance on the resilience agenda. Support will also be provided by technical working groups based on the PCCR but to be elaborated on. In December there will be a meeting of the governing council to write a plan and to consider the outcomes of the PCCR and the Joint Platform to inform next steps in the process.

OUTCOME STATEMENT AND ADOPTION

81. The meeting adopted by consensus the Statement of the Joint Meeting of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management.

INTRODUCTION

The Joint Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and Platform for Disaster Risk Management Meeting 2017 served as a landmark meeting that confirmed the region as a global leader of coherent and integrated development. It built upon the Joint Meeting of the Roundtable and Platform in 2013 that launched the regional integration process of their respective policy frameworks. The combined roundtable/platform theme 'Pathways to a Resilient Pacific' focused on the lessons learned and opportunities towards the implementation of the recently endorsed Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2017-2030 (FRDP).

The Pacific Humanitarian Partnership, the Pacific Climate Change Round Table, and the Building Safety and Resilience in the Pacific took place as part of the Pacific Resilience Week and served as a precursor to the new, consolidated Pacific Resilience Meeting, which will convene in 2018 as a biennial forum to support implementation of the FRDP.

The 2017 joint meeting included two-hundred participants which represented Pacific island government disaster and climate change focal points, national and sub-national government representatives, key stakeholders including civil society, non-government organisations, private sector and those integrated across cross-cutting sectors involved in resilient development in the region.

The combined Roundtable and Platform reaffirmed government and stakeholder commitment to an integrated approach to address disaster and climate change risk in support of the FRDP. It enhanced understanding of how existing arrangements, partnerships, and interventions can support the implementation of the FRDP as well as the following key outcomes:

- Increased understanding of the Pacific Resilience Partnership and governance structure for implementation of the FRDP
- A clearer understanding of how the 2017 combined Roundtable and Platform will transition within the Pacific Resilience Partnership in support the implementation of the FRDP
- A shared awareness of the opportunities and challenges of a more integrated approach to address disaster and climate change risk
- A stronger appreciation of how integrated action in the region links to and contributes to the overall 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Sendai Framework for Action
- Lessons learned and best practices on the implementation of resilience activities across climate change and disaster risk management/risk resilience to display best practice and ways forward for countries and the region.

The FRDP combines three of the main pillars of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction; the Paris Agreement on Climate Change; and the Sustainable Development Goals – in a region-specific pathway to resilient development. The 2017 joint meeting helped shape and inform the local and national level implementation and monitoring of the Sendai Framework and Paris Agreement that in turn will deliver on the FRDP but most importantly, move the discussion forward of how all stakeholders will work together towards a more resilient Pacific.

OFFICIAL OPENING

Mr. Howard Politini of PIPSO blessed the meeting with a prayer. Mr. Joshua Wycliffe, Permanent Secretary for the Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Environment officially opened the Joint Platform for Disaster Risk Management and Pacific Climate Change Roundtable on behalf of the Government of Fiji. It was noted the Joint Platform provides a proactive approach to managing natural disasters in the region and raising awareness for building on disaster risk management, early warning systems and climate change. The platform is an opportunity for engagement with the private sector and NGOs as partnerships are critical for sharing awareness that lead to actions within the region. Recognising the challenges of endless procedures for access to funding, the integration of the two communities helps with the mobilising of resources, sharing of information and enhancing partnerships for action.

Dr. Colin Tukuitonga, Director General of the Pacific Community noted the critical challenge for the Joint Platform is for dialogue to lead to action. SPC works in multiple sectors on the priorities of members and works alongside countries to make the region a more resilient and healthy Pacific. The FRDP was endorsed by Pacific Leaders in 2016 and the PRP in September. The PRP brings together communities of practice for disaster risk management and climate change. The key challenge is the way the communities come together to enable action beyond dialogue. Acknowledgement of partners the EU, GIZ, World Bank and others present.



Mr. Roger Cornforth, Deputy Director General of the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) noted the importance of the Pacific as the blue continent bringing together traditional knowledge and science. Resilience is at the core of SPREP work. The PCCR which concluded on Tuesday demonstrated a great commitment to the establishment of the PRP and the two communities coming together, as well as the sharing of lessons learnt at the country level.

Mr. Andrew McElroy, Representative for the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific (UNISDR Pacific) noted the FRDP as the first regional strategy in the world that integrates disaster risk reduction and climate change, as well as sustainable development. It was acknowledged the need to deliver on the FRDP and the Global 2030 Agenda under the Sendai Framework and the Paris Agreement and to enhance the mechanisms for reporting to not burden countries. Disasters and climate risk continue to escalate particularly for cyclones, as well as climate related disasters that have doubled as have non climate hazards as well. The PRP feeds into global mechanisms but primarily enables national and local actions on the ground.

SCENE SETTING AND KEY UPDATES

The main outcomes of the PCCR and the PHP were presented by the Chair of the PCCR and a representative for the PHP.



Mr. Joshua Wycliffe, Chair of the PCCR noted that the climate change community of practice can and should integrate its work under the FRDP and the agreed PRP. It was highlighted that the meeting recognised the value of taking what is under the PCCR and integrating that with the PRP. It was noted that while the thematic area of information and knowledge management is cross cutting of all work, the thematic area of greenhouse gas mitigation may require continued separate treatment; as well as the ongoing and developing work under the theme of loss and damage, which may require some special attention.

The PCCR Chair highlighted the following from the PCCR Outcome Statement:

- o Have gained greater understanding of the new FRDP and its implementation by the PRP.
- o Recognised and acknowledged the role and value that the PCCR has had as a dedicated forum on climate change to support capacity building, awareness, and understanding, and sharing lessons learned.
- o Recognised the ongoing need to build capacity to access climate change finance and exchange knowledge on new initiatives and opportunities, and on emerging issues.
- o Reaffirmed the importance of supporting work under the themes of Adaptation, Mitigation, Information Knowledge Management, Loss and Damage, and Resource Mobilisation, and noted they have a critical role to ensure the FRDP be fully elaborated to reflect alignment to the Paris Agreement.
- o Further noted the opportunity to align the themes of the Disaster Risk Management Community with those above and to consider the inclusion of a Climate and Early Warning Services theme.
- o Reaffirmed the critical importance of ongoing dialogue and support Pacific Island countries in climate change, in support of the PRP.
- o Reaffirmed the role of the PRP in bringing together the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management stakeholders to advance the integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction.

The Chair of the PCCR concluded with acknowledgment of the Government of Germany for its support to the 2017 PCCR.

The PHP key outcomes were presented by Mr. Sevuloni Ratu, of UNOCHA. The representative from PHP presented the outcome statement on behalf of PHP delegates, 14 NDMOs, representatives from key humanitarian agencies, and donor partners. The PHP statement focused on the importance of localising activity where people are the focus of humanitarian action, strengthening local capacity and enabling leadership.

The PHP statement highlighted the following:

- o Focus on building practical solutions for localised preparedness and response.
- o Strong harmonisation of regional and international support provided to countries.
- o All humanitarian issues are embedded in development issues.



- o Need to adapt and adopt to the Pacific context.
- o Recognise women, disabled, and LGBT communities.
- o Strengthen leadership and focus on efficiency of aid and working at the local and community levels.
- o Use NGOs, CSOs, Local Red Cross, Faith-based organisations, and community leaders.
- o Align existing country coordination structures and make international partners aware of these mechanisms.
- o Country, context and coordination should be country specific.
- o Each country has a different approach.
- o Strengthen national government systems to remove reliance on ad hoc international assistance.
- o Local capacity should be used and capitalised on before international assistance and response.
- o Local agencies need to add value to capacity building.
- o NDMOs recognised that intergovernmental agencies can fill gaps.
- o Regional cluster support team play a crucial role.
- o Involvement of the Private Sector with National governments and civil society to ensure they are coordinated and involved.
- o Faith based organisations play an important role.
- o NGOs find it difficult to know their role in communities, Government need to support NGOs.
- o Need to increase funding and support for coordination.
- o Cyclone season is important to prepare for.

PLENARY 1: REGIONAL FOCUS: FRDP AND LOCAL ACTORS TOWARDS PACIFIC RESILIENCE

The Director General of the Pacific Community noted that in the past eight years the region has incurred more than US\$ 2 billion in losses due to natural disasters, highlighting the need for the communities of disaster risk and climate change to pull together to address these challenges. Examples highlighted included catastrophic and slower disasters such as the prolonged drought in the North Pacific. The FRDP provides strategic guidance for climate change and disaster risk and is considered a 'living document' that will evolve. The FRDP is voluntary and it does not replace what countries are planning. The goal as a regional organisation is to support countries in that process working at the intersection of disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, and low carbon development. The key messages are integration of the two communities of practice; mainstreaming community based disaster risk management; and on implementation, it was acknowledged that no one agency can do the work alone and must involve different stakeholders and their respective strengths.

PIANGO Director Ms. Emele Duituturaga provided a civil society perspective on their role in the regional resilient development agenda. It was noted that civil society struggles with getting attention, being heard and being equal at the development table. Resilience development is a good word, but the concept needs to be approached from different levels as communities do not always have the luxury of being able to afford resilience. On implementation, civil society tends to only be included in distribution and the PRP is an opportunity to expand this role.

Mr. Howard Politini of PIPSO informed the meeting of the background and role of the private sector organisation which works to create an enabling environment for business in the Pacific. A key issue is putting ideas into action and the importance of collaboration. PIPSO have a toolkit on building safely in the Pacific called the Disaster Ready toolkit, which addresses the devastating impact on natural resources that can be used by businesses and suppliers. The toolkit is currently deployed in Suva. September 29, 2009 notes the anniversary of the Tsunami in Samoa, which underlies the lessons learnt to address preparedness and peoples' mindsets. A critical issue for the private sector and other stakeholders is accessing finance and resources, and the need to simplify processes.

Mr. Loti Yates, NDMO Director for the Solomon Islands, provided a country perspective on the national disaster management plan, which is aligned to the FRDP. The NDMO brought together disaster risk management and climate change under one ministry. The PRP will help with coordination of local stakeholders, including country to country approaches to mapping out available resources and lessons. It was also highlighted the importance of harmonisation and to avoid duplication, ensuring there is collaboration rather than competition. Investment in resilience building is critical and has been incorporated in the national development strategy, which ensures that the Solomon Islands builds on what has already started at the national and sub-national levels.

Mr. Shiu Raj, of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat noted the FRDP and PRP have an inclusive approach and are committed to working through a collective effort, linking climate change and disaster risk management. The FRDP and PRP also represent a risk informed approach to development guided by the principles of the Framework for Pacific Regionalism.



On addressing the question of concrete actions under the FRDP and what work has been done to date, the Director General emphasised the actions in the FRDP document as a guide for concrete outcomes. The role of the proposed Taskforce is particularly important and will be supported by a support unit and technical working groups. The challenge is translating the FRDP into practical actions and resource mobilisation. In regards to resources there are pledges made for some of the work, but it is not enough. There are potential opportunities for accessing resources, being pursued by many countries and agencies, however there is a need for a systematic approach. As espoused in the FRDP inclusivity is important, however large groups can be hard to operate and the challenge ahead is how stakeholders move together for practical actions that benefit the region.

PIPSO shared their view of how they see the private sector engaging in discussion at the national and regional level. PIPSO acknowledged the importance of being present to provide input into the process and included. It is also important to have responsible leadership, following the many challenges of recent disasters as well as opportunities following these disasters. The private sector has much knowledge and experience to share with other stakeholders including measures of efficiency.

On what is the paradigm shift that PIANGO expects from the FRDP/PRP and what they will bring to the PRP Taskforce, PIANGO responded that transformation is creating space to achieve the results which are inclusive. Civil society may not have been mobilised enough in the past however inclusive participation is critical for successful outcomes. The FRDP provides an opportunity for working with partners, to include key considerations such as gender, cultural inclusivity, human rights. The inclusion of a broader sector of society brings a realisation that civil society are not trying to meddle with decision making, but represent those who will be affected by decisions.

Further elaboration was sought on the 48th Pacific Islands Forum Leaders Meeting communiqué which focused on the Blue Pacific. The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat noted the key message on the Blue Pacific, is that there has to be a collective effort regarding linking climate change, disaster risk management and resilient development. The FRDP and PRP represent an opportunity for informed inclusive efforts, which advocates collective action at the national and regional levels as well as greater returns on investment in terms of disaster preparedness. There is a commitment to achievement of these goals, through being more action oriented and resources being directed towards these priorities.

PLENARY 2: EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIPS FOR THE FRDP: ADDRESSING CHALLENGES AND MAXIMISING OPPORTUNITIES

SESSION 2: COUNTRY PRIORITIES, LESSONS LEARNED AND CHALLENGES

Mr. Erbai Xavier Matsutaro of Palau presented on 'Operationalising the FRDP at the national level in Palau'. It was noted that the Palau climate change policy is mandated by Congress to ensure all government agencies work collaboratively. The policy came into force in 2015. Food security is a major issue so alongside the climate change policy there is an agriculture policy. Some activities have been implemented in line with this policy. There are also activities within other sectors including energy and health. Each state has localised policies and detailed action plans. The key challenges are coordinating the different priorities within each sector; budgets also limit capacity to fulfil priorities; climate change and disaster risk management are still working in silos at the national level; and duplication of work at the national level.

Mr. Andrew Yatilman presented on local action for climate and disaster resilience in the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). The example of the GCCA: PSIS was used. The PSIS implemented a water security project on Fais Island in Yap State. Rainwater harvesting systems were implemented in the community and the community was fully engaged in project implementation. The project also engaged





representatives from the other states, private sector, public utilities and state and national governments. Roles and responsibilities were clearly outlined and understood by all concerned. The project also conducted capacity building for the community. In 2015 drought impacted FSM and a state of national emergency was declared. Fais Island was the only island that did not need water to be carted to them.

Mr. Michael Foon presented on the drought strategy for Kiribati which encompasses climate change adaptation and disaster risk management. The 2011 drought prompted the development of a Drought Plan. The process included the setup of a Drought Management Committee. It was important to understand the technical aspects of droughts before developing the Drought Plan so that the response was timely and effective. There was a need to include other partners who would be able to provide expertise. Funding from donors came through at different stages of the process. Local partners were able to take leadership of aspects of the process thereby promoting a more equal partnership. Development of partnerships needs to be embedded in government first before increasing the number of partnerships. This also helped in managing partners' expectations.

Ms. Asenaca Tuwai presented on building multi-stakeholder partnerships in Fiji to strengthen community resilience. Panellist thanked development partners ADB, WWF for support given especially after TC Winston. Partnerships helped her community to build back better and to become more resilient. The post-cyclone recovery work was very mindful of vulnerable groups within the community and this has

helped as a community to work together and to always include vulnerable groups in everything. When working in communities in Fiji, development partners need to work with the Provincial Office.

Mr. Jovesa Vocea presented on sub-national government partnerships to ensure new developments are resilient in Fiji. At the local/divisional level, soliciting assistance for disaster recovery and development projects from NGOs and the private sector is vital given that Government does not have a lot of resources. After TC Winston, the partnership has continued and the divisional office maintains a regular presence in NGO organised activities. It was emphasised the value of what NGOs can bring with their range of expertise.

On leveraging resources in a timely manner. Palau shared that on a daily basis to examine where the strengths are and maximise on those strengths. This is dependent on which sector is being focused on and understanding where the relevant resources are. FSM noted that internal processes are time consuming such as the approval process and FSM would like to know how other countries are addressing this issue. Development partners and donors also need to understand the situation in the countries.

New Zealand commented on the importance of involving development partners early in the process as they need to know at least one to two years in advance so that these needs can be included in budgets.

On challenges faced when developing partnerships, panellists shared how they overcame these challenges. FSM noted there were challenges in the Fais Island project, one example included the location of the project site. The initial budget project was under budget because it did not include transportation from Yap Island to Fais Island. FSM reduced the number of rainwater harvesting systems to be implemented in order to cater for inter-island transportation. For Ms. Tuwai some families in the community were not very cooperative. Project work was also delayed when there were deaths for example. Another challenge was hosting those who came to work for the project with the associated costs for feeding them, and providing accommodation which required money. Mr. Vocea noted sometimes projects can unintentionally over-burden communities particularly given the limited resources in the communities and the different roles coordinators have. Work in Fiji's communities requires partnerships especially as the chain of command is very clear from the community to the government. In terms of inclusivity, the design phase included input from vulnerable groups for example including people living with disabilities. This has led to more awareness on inclusiveness and how this can be included in project design and implementation.

With partnerships come mutual accountability, the panellists shared how they addressed this when working with the communities. Mr. Vocea noted it is important to create ownership during projects. Communities need to see that the project is not just assistance, it is given to them to own and maintain for sustainability. If ownership is not promoted, communities will keep coming back for more assistance. Palau noted they have a National Emergency Committee which need to give approval before any project can be given to the community. Government officials are very accountable because they have the Government's endorsement for their work.



In terms of succession plans in place that can help build young people's capacity panellists shared how young people are being engaged in decision-making. Palau shared that they have an approach for vulnerable groups and these groups are included in the decision-making phase as a result of lessons learnt. It was noted that Kiribati youth are well represented in decision-making but also need to have the capacity to be able to contribute effectively. In FSM culturally youth do not have a seat at the table but this is slowly changing and efforts are being made for more inclusiveness. Palau added climate change is being integrated into the curriculum and scholarships have been provided for students. At the policy level, UNFCCC provides capacity building opportunities for young adults. There is still a lot of work to be done for more long-term results.

Panellists addressed how women's organisations can access finance through partnerships. FSM noted that women's groups can apply for small grants as long as they are recognised as a legal entity. There is a need to continue to promote vulnerable groups and to help them access finance. The reality is that there are many groups in the communities but they are not legally recognised under strict international financial regulations relating to Money Laundering.

On how panellists are making sure that all new developments include disaster and climate related risks Mr. Voce shared the Government of Fiji has an Integrated Rural Development Approach which screens all new development plans for sustainability. Each division has a CCDRM officer specifically to do the screening.

The key messages from the session were the importance of partnerships which are about clear communication, listening and accountability. Partnerships need to be broadened to ensure strengths are maximised and weaknesses minimised. It was acknowledged there will be challenges but it is important that each challenge is addressed based on the context. Partnerships and inclusive planning and decision-making can lead to really good development work that is sustainable, timely and effective.

SESSION 3.1: FINANCE FOR RESILIENCE

Mr. Exsley Taloiburi, Climate Finance Adviser of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat provided a regional perspective on finance for resilience. Within the two communities of practice on climate and disaster financing there is still some uncertainty on how the work will merge, particularly in the area of finance. The PCCR working group on Resource Mobilisation highlighted finance as a key means for implementation of national sector plans, development strategies as well as SDGs and the SAMOA Pathway i.e. SIDs special circumstances. The FRDP will guide regional support on climate change and disaster risk financing and other complementary sources of financing.

On how much finance is needed globally and at the regional level it was noted that globally NDCs collective global NDC submissions to the Paris Agreement is US\$ 13.5 trillion. In order to meet the global goal of two degrees Celsius, the level of financing is much higher. On regional conditional NDC targets without accessing external support and unconditional financing, it was noted that it may be implemented with existing resources. The World Bank Report Pacific 2020 noted US\$ 220 million per year for the region which will exceed US\$ 1 billion dollars by 2040. The scale of financing is quite significant for the Pacific region.

Complex architecture of funding requires countries to engage and expectations are the same for all developing countries. In terms of accessibility, in 2015 the total of US\$ 390 billion mobilised for global finance was 92% for mitigation, which is a significant portion from private finance. There is a need for more involvement from the private sector and civil society for the Pacific to benefit regionally. From 2010-2014 PICs received US\$ 748 million mostly from bilateral sources which translates as accessing 0.2 % of global funds available.

The GCF is attempting to address the mitigation and adaptation imbalance for the Pacific priorities with a 50: 50 split between adaptation and mitigation. For the GCF eight countries have accessed funding which for PICs is approximately 10% of the global GCF funds.

Key issues and lessons learnt:

- o Coordination and strong leadership at national level is critical.
- o A number of partners are looking to engage with Pacific countries.
- o PICs need to be strategic.
- o Engagement of technical ministries currently climate change departments are accessing financing.

- o Advocating for how to manage those resources.
- o Important to engage planning and ministries of finance, CSOs and private sector in managing the financing accessed.

Ms. Pepetua E. Latasi, Director of Climate Change Policy and Disaster Coordination Unit for the Tuvalu Office of the Prime Minister presented on the Tuvalu Climate Change and Disaster Survival Fund (Tuvalu Survival Fund or TSF). Established in 2015 by the Government of Tuvalu following TC Pam to provide immediate vital services for the people of Tuvalu to respond to future climate change impacts in a coordinated and timely manner. The Tuvalu Survival Fund Act established with operational procedures for accessing the funds, and drawing on experience from the Tuvalu Trust Fund. The annual budget in 2016 of US\$ 5 million; 2017 of US\$ 2 million; and 2018 US\$ 3 million.

The TSF has a Board, Committee and Secretariat established. The Committee grants approval to assessment reports and assesses requests for assistance. The Secretariat is the Office of the Prime Minister under the Climate Change Policy and Disaster Coordination Unit. Under the Act donations for TC Pam and other such funds should be channelled through the TSF. The fund is open for investment but for now only financed by the Government of Tuvalu. In the future it is hoped that donors and investors will contribute. The TSF is utilised for :

- o Response to declaration of emergency.
- o Financial assistance for people of Tuvalu with a list of eligible activities to be paid under the funds.
- o 50% for annual operation
- o The remaining 50% is allocated for: recovery; rehabilitation; adaptation; and adaptation projects have Multi Criteria Analysis (MCA) as tool to rank projects for funding and include policy, social readiness, environment and economic.

Lessons learnt and future of TSF:

- o TC Pam sectoral support went directly to Ministries. Difficult to track overall support received by Tuvalu for TC Pam and other disasters. Amount of funds managed by Ministry of Finance is small compared to direct Ministerial support. The TSF best way forward with all funds to go through TSF.
- o Importance of legalising operationalisation and management of the fund. Regulations provide clear standards and procedures for accessing the fund and operation. Enabling environment established for the system to work.
- o Future of TSF to channel all financial support for CCA DRM into the TSF.
- o Encourage partners to use existing national mechanisms with established mechanisms in country and to assist countries in identifying gaps in existing national systems.
- o Strengthening PFM system in Tuvalu.

Mr. Kino S. Kabua, Deputy Chief Secretary, Office of the Chief Secretary of the Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI) presented on leveraging and co-financing funds from the World Bank and the GCF. RMI approached the World Bank as an accredited entity to the GCF, for building climate resilience aligned



with national development goals and global resilience goals, with the purpose of accessing funds from the GCF through early preparation of proposals.

It was noted that RMI is exposed to recurring droughts, storm surges and coastal inundation and typhoons, though not as frequent. Ebye coastal resilience component of the GCF application to be a model for similar atolls with focus on coastal resilience and protection of the most vulnerable with shoreline protection and immediate and effective response to crisis or emergency. The four components include:

- o Institutional strengthening, EWS and preparedness, NDMO capacity building and PDNAs working closely with SPC.
- o Strengthen coastal resilience planning, coastal vulnerability assessment for Ebye and Majuro.
- o Contingency emergency response following declaration of disaster event complement PCRAFI disaster insurance and strengthen emergency response and preparedness for low and medium scale disasters.
- o Project and programme management for all national implemented activities and providing oversight.

On the World Bank project Pacific Resilience Programme (PREP) Phase 2 the World Bank IDA of US\$ 19.6 million was secured. Counterpart funding of US\$ 25million submitted to the GCF pending review by the GCF board. The World Bank approved the project effective from September 2017. RMI implemented activities have been phased to utilise available funds through IDA pending GCF approval for funding.

Challenges faced by RMI include:

- o Leveraging funds and limited understanding of the banks process and requirements in terms of procurement, social and environmental safe guards.
- o Construction related risks at project level such as sourcing aggregates for sea wall; delays in securing GCF funding.
- o Opportunities noted as regional partnership and strategy with shared regional voice and advocacy at global level.

FAO noted each country has specific finance systems as no one size fits all, because GCF funding is quite large, and many accredited agencies are crossing mandates. Climate departments end up implementing areas i.e agriculture ministries with climate change agencies and hiring consultants. There is a need for emphasis on strengthening sectors apart from climate change departments, as it is important to involve other stakeholders from infrastructure, agriculture, education to be involved and coordinating the financing received at the national level.

Niue congratulated Tuvalu on the establishment of the TSF tailored to the Tuvalu national systems and processes and for the sharing of the experience in developing the TSF.

SPREP sought advice on the simplified access procedures which are needed for countries to comply with stringent regulations. Contrary to what is being said by the GCF Secretariat, the simplified procedures are not actually being simplified and noted the Regional Technical Support Mechanism (RTSM) in this regard as a means for capacity supplementation to enable compliance with the stringent regulations. Clarification was sought on whether GEF/GCF funds will enter the TSF in Tuvalu. Advice was sought on whether RMI would give any consideration to the use of funds for the Micronesia Sub-Regional SPREP office in Majuro.

The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat sought clarification from Tuvalu on sectoral ministries direct funding, noting from the lessons learnt Tuvalu were unable to determine overall funding tracking for TC Pam support. Feedback was also sought on how Tuvalu manages expectations and change through centralising the management of funds.

Tuvalu responded to the questions raised. With respect to centralising funds through the TSF it was noted that funds can come in as direct budget support to be programmed by Tuvalu. There are also project funds that are already programmed. Many post disaster funds were not programmed and could be deposited in the TSF. It was also noted there is not a major issue dealing with ministries as each ministry has finance staff. However it was acknowledged that Tuvalu needs to build on lessons learnt and past experiences. The TSF and regulations do not duplicate the financial procedures, as all payments will go out through Treasury and the TSF Board reports to Cabinet on funds received into the TSF, which are captured in the regulations. On the GCF the TSF has approved some project funds to go into the TSF with conditions, as funds will still go to the ministry implementing the projects/activities.

On climate finance the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat responded that there is a need to simplify access procedures as it is a challenge for countries to work with what they have and the regional support mechanisms have been useful in the past in putting together country proposals. Simplified access procedures for reporting requirements is critical, as well as timely responses from donor funds, noting conditionalities of risk can be passed on to partners. An example of a three week period for private sector proposals to be prepared to access US\$ 500 million funding, where there were no Pacific private sector applications due to time and capacity constraints. It was also agreed that the RTSM should be continued and called for funding to be sourced for its continued operation.

SPC noted that water security, SDG 6 Water and Sanitation as contributing to overall sustainable development goals and resilience. 2030 Agenda for SDGs of universal access requires substantial financing. Climate variability and climate change affecting the base challenges toward achieving resilience. National efforts with partners support is essential to:

- o minimising drought impacts;
- o reducing water wastage;
- o securing safe drinking water;
- o maximising water yields through rainwater harvesting;
- o water security working with countries survey methodology for quantifying investment outcomes for water security; and
- o developing new sources of freshwater through fresh water aquifers.



ADB noted the proposed Pacific Disaster Resilience Program which is to provide disaster contingent financing upon a soft trigger such as the declaration of a disaster. It will support facility management through regional technical assistance and is targeted at the five most vulnerable developing countries of Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

The rationale for contingent financing is addressing risks not covered by national contingent finance, that is not as costly as insurance and enables access to quick financing, post disaster with direct budget support through government systems. The quick disbursement of funds is to reduce economic and social costs. Funds are available when the soft trigger is satisfied. On contingent financing it should be a mix of instruments for addressing low severity and frequent events, most PICs have options but mostly for one in three year events which PCFRAI can cover for more infrequent events. Not all types of disaster can be covered regardless of severity.

ADB shared the Cook Islands has an existing contingent financing facility. Contingent financing fits in bridging the gap between the first humanitarian phase and long term reconstruction phase. The Cook Islands Policy based loan of US\$ 10 million with prior disaster risk policy actions in place that serve as eligibility requirements. Funds drawn on declaration of state of disaster as well as post monitoring framework, which are also part of the programme. Proposed regional financing similar to the Cook Islands with similar requirements such as disaster risk policy actions to enable eligibility for funding. Interim period it will work similar to the Cook Islands, some differences however are the limitations of the concessional financing cycle. It provides benefits of regional approach for sharing of experiences and regionally managed through existing facility such as PCRAFI.

PIPSO sought advice as to the inclusion of the private sector in the national disaster situation. Tuvalu responded that the private sector through the Tuvalu National Private Sector Organisation and Chamber of Commerce role is very minimal at this stage. Based on lessons learned from TC Pam the need for



markets to be up and running to assist affected peoples was crucial. Tuvalu is also in the process of updating the climate change policy and the Disaster Management Act and Plan and have invited private sector on board to work together.

Long term maintenance of water infrastructure is also a problem, especially for outer islands. Ensuring the government puts aside maintenance budget for infrastructure. SPC noted that member countries looking at solutions that can withstand disasters and can be maintained locally. Knowledge is key and does not necessarily need maintenance budgets.

A question was raised from the floor as to whether early triggers for accessing financing such as drought would satisfy post disaster financing including early triggers based on science and whether this could be supported by the facility as pre-disaster financing. ADB responded that forecast based financing using this instrument would be difficult. Regionally need a trigger that would cover all countries and the parametric insurance such as wind speed, disaster would occur but payout would not be triggered. Declaration of disaster is common across all countries in the region and cover most types of disasters however most countries in the Pacific are careful in declaring disasters due to consequences such as for tourism.

The moderator noted the importance of involving the private sector in investing in resilient development, which needs to happen more at the national level. Development partners need to look at private sector engagement and investment in resilient business and investing in resilient investment for national communities.

SESSION 3.2: SCIENCE FOR RESILIENCE: HOW SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY ARE CHANGING THE GAME FOR PACIFIC EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS

The moderator noted the key takeaway for the session is to highlight how science and technology are relevant and are actively contributing to all components of early warning in the Pacific. Multi-hazard early warning systems rely on four key components, namely:

- o Disaster risk knowledge;
- o Detection, monitoring, analysis and forecasting;
- o Warning, dissemination and communication; and
- o Preparedness and response capabilities.

Dr. David Hirasia from Solomon Islands presented on linking climate and malaria transmission. The project started in 2004 as a case study and was implemented with the Australia Bureau of Meteorology. It was noted that access to reliable data is a challenge. The approach is to establish if there is a relationship between rainfall and incidence of malaria. Issues to address included change in habitats and land use as there are no records of mosquitos or numbers of mosquito bites only in recorded malaria cases. Analysis of the data indicated that El Niño and La Niña influenced the area around the Honiara canal. Honiara has low rainfall during El Niño and lower sea levels therefore there are lots of habitats and pools which are for mosquitoes to breed. During la Niña it is the opposite where the rainfall washes all the pools into the rivers. After the draft in 2004 there was a reduction in the cases of



Malaria due to a number of interventions by the Vector Borne Disease unit of the Ministry of Health such as mosquito nets, spraying etc. There is a lot of research being done in establishing the number of cases and rainfall and are currently conducting a climate based malaria index. There is a link between rainfall and incidence of malaria. When rainfall increases, cases decrease.

Using the statistical analysis tool SCOPIC (Seasonal Climate Outlooks for Pacific Island Countries), the team generates the likely malaria risk outlook which should extend to other islands targeting the January to June period. Feeding the information to the Vector Borne Disease Team informs them of the likely higher risk before the budget period in August and can allocate funds to combat a potential malaria outbreak. There is an El Niño and ENSO update and the malaria risk index. The work undertaken under the malaria early warning system, helps sectors to plan their work to minimise risk.

Ms. Morika Hunter of Digicel presented on early warnings through communications noting her previous experience with raising awareness on health, security, risk and targeting women. Over 70% of mobile users have smart phones. Digicel offer tools to drive awareness of disaster issues in the Pacific. When TC Pam hit, Digicel worked with UNDP and other local organisations to produce a 25 questions survey to find out what the most urgent needs were. Digicel were able to then provide governments within the same day information about who had access to drinking water and how many days of food were left and this could be done by regions. The government can then direct their support via regions.

With TC Pam and preparedness Digicel worked with UNDP and GIZ around awareness and it was a push out survey. Digicel can tap into vulnerable and affected areas and can gather back information to assist them post disaster. It is critical to reach both remote island and populated areas. Technology allows Digicel to send them to a landing page for videos or questions and answers. No money is taken from anyone to respond to these surveys. During disasters Digicel stop spam SMS and ensures only messages going out are the correct and relevant information.

For TC Winston, Fiji Digicel worked with SPC and UNDP to get communication up and running on the third day. Examples of text messages such as “go out and get water”, or “boil your drinking water”. The messages are basic for greater engagement and understanding. Digicel pushes out messages by location, gender, age and type of handset. Digicel adapts the message according to the geographic context of the community in terms of language of messages sent. There is always an element of cost however there is a need to work together on how to communicate across the Pacific and gather information very quickly.

In Vanuatu Digicel can push out 15,000 surveys and get almost all responses. In Fiji it may only be a couple of 100 responses. It is a great tool to push out awareness, to remote communities. Tsunamis can strike at any time compared to cyclones where there is time to warn people. Digicel have an auto dialler to assist with the threat, where it will ring until a person picks it up. Therefore it would say “get to higher ground” or “wait” etc. There is a lot Digicel can do with stakeholders and government.

Ms. Jennifer DeBrum of RMI provided a country perspective noting there were no effective early warning systems in the Marshall Islands. RMI needs to enhance emergency response at all levels and have locally appropriate warnings. The communication flow could facilitate early warnings from Meteorological services through NMDOs and Cabinet to all stakeholders who are involved in early warnings. The system is complex. Information is fed down into the MET services at the national level and goes to the NDMO and the responsibility to immediately communicate to stakeholders and media outlets. RMI uses mass text messages out to communities. NDMO play a critical role in alerts and advisories.

RMI is usually affected by drought. For slow onset hazards, such as drought, RMI gets products and quarterly bulletins from various providers. This information helps with early action and preparedness activities. In 2012 RMI started receiving information from various sources during this time and the information was largely ignored as the information was not clear. However in 2013 RMI started getting clearer information and a presentation was made to Cabinet informing them of the threats associated with El Nino. In 2015 NDMO activated the WASH cluster to address the drought situation. The focus was on water and sanitation. RMI have a multi-sectorial team deployed to the various communities in the outer islands to confirm water levels and impact on agriculture. It is a time consuming way of collecting information, the high cost and logistics.

RMI confirmed a state of emergency due to the slow onset and impacts. The post-disaster needs assessment RMI undertook after the drought. With the assistance from SPC, UNDP and EU, RMI conducted a unique multidisciplinary assessment. The global framework for DRR was used and



captured information on various areas including the impacts of the economy and society. It was noted that instant messaging and technology infrastructure needs a major boost to facilitate early warning and information dispersal in RMI.

Mr. Herve Damlamian from the Pacific Community presented on Kiritimati Island, PacSAFE and contribution of science to warnings and evidence-based decision making. It was noted that the SPC goal is to help Pacific island people to respond to challenges they face for present and future generations. It is about support to Pacific island communities to make informed decisions. Decision makers recognise the importance of scientific facts to input into their decision making. There is a clear will to integrate this information as it will lead to sustainable development. Science and technology need to rise to the occasion and build a model that is based on good data with acceptable uncertainties.

MET have global focused models, which are good tools but are not final. Wave data is only accurate to a resolution of 45 km. In January 2016, there was a cyclone generated near the equator which is rare. The waves generated by this cyclone out at sea were 3.5 metres high. However, given limited coastal information in Kiritimati, the potential inundation risk was hard to estimate, making it unreasonable to make decisions based on this data. SPC obtains some data offshore however most of what is happening that induces inundation happened near shore.

There is a critical need to collect accurate data. At SPC there are large sets of tools to set data. SPC have numerous instruments to collect this data and it is important to ensure the model is integrated to satisfactorily reproduce what is happening in reality. To build on inundation models what is required is information on past inundations to model. Therefore collection of data even in small inundations to validate the model. Local knowledge can help validate what has been happening on that coastline over the past years. After having all data collected it can be integrated to impact decision-making.

SPC have been building these models for planning and assessments. There is a need to move them into inundation focus systems. There is a global wave model that feeds into an inner shore model where one can see neighbouring islands and waves wrapping around islands. The issue with these models is that they are high resolution and many processes are needed to be modelled and take a long time. Therefore what is needed to pre-compute pre-conceived scenarios, which enables a model to be pulled from a database.

In conclusion an inundation map showing what is the level on shore, is a big improvement but it is not the best information that people like NDMO require. Therefore SPC in partnership with NIWA and the World Bank are working together to develop risk tools. There is a regional will to integrate scientific information into decision making and there needs to be the collection of high resolute and high quality information. It is important to go from global information to local impact in a timely manner.

SESSION 4.1: ECOSYSTEMS-BASED APPROACHES TO RESILIENCE BUILDING

The rationale for the session was the urgent need for Pacific island countries and territories to strengthen their resilience to climate change impacts. In doing so it is vitally important to focus on the opportunities and resilience provided by protecting and restoring ecosystem services that underpin national development agenda and community livelihoods.

The session outlined a practical programmatic framework to guide ecosystem-based approaches to climate change resilience and adaptation in the Pacific islands context. The framework has been developed by SPREP, IUCN and SPC with the intention that it will promote a consistent, principle based and methodological approach to new and emerging investments in resilient development and adaptation. It also highlighted the need for clear and coherent approaches to adaptation to avoid maladaptation. The ecosystem based approach has garnered much support and is a preferred methodology by SPREP in promoting resilience building in the Pacific.

The establishment of global funding instruments, such as the German International Climate Initiative (IKI) and the Green Climate Fund, provide the opportunity for PICs to develop and implement holistic responses to resilience based on the ecosystem approach. This approach is not new, and it has been applied to varying degrees with mixed success by PICs in programmes and projects in different sectors in recent years. It is referenced in numerous national policy documents and commitments to multilateral environmental conventions; global and regional sustainable development, climate change and disaster reduction commitments, including Forum Leaders' communiqués, the Sustainable Development Goals, Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC, Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030,

Framework for a Pacific Oceanscape, Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific, 2013 Laucala Declaration on Conservation in Oceania, Regional Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas 2014-2020; and sectoral policies, including the Regional Roadmap for Sustainable Pacific Fisheries, and the New Song for Coastal Fisheries - Pathways to Change.

The potential application of large scale funding through global financing mechanisms, availability of regionally based technical expertise, policy commitments of national governments to ecosystem based resilience strategies and climate change adaptation, and the vested interests of communities in viable approaches to protect life and livelihoods, create a nexus of opportunity to establish an effective regional coastal resilience programme in the region.

SPREP has been developing an EbA programme since 2007, with the PEBAACC project being the largest to date. SPREP is in the process of a further project submission on a Blue Carbon project to the German Government. In addition SPREP is discussing with SPC and IUCN on a conceptual framework for EbA in the region for coastal resilience.

In terms of identified gaps and opportunities, it was noted that there are also a whole suite of non-climate issues and factors that need to be addressed. These are as equally important to address as climate change, as Pacific societies are completely dependent on ecosystem services. Rapid urbanisation is also a challenge.

Poor planning and environmental management also require attention. Knowledge on coastal vulnerabilities are not used. Long term environmental issues that further compound and magnify short term disasters.

There are opportunities to link in with the work on health impacts of climate change and to link this with the ecosystem based approach. This could also be linked with the work under the Pacific Islands Climate Outlook Forum (PICOF) on predictions useful to the health sector.

There are also opportunities to work with landowner organisations or collectives where they exist to seek better coordination of efforts.

There is a major role for donor coordination and engagement to reinforce and support the EbA approaches.

SPREP, SPC and IUCN will continue to coordinate preparation of a regional project for submission to the GCF.

PICOF will also continue engagement with the health sector in its predictions work.



Key recommendations:

- o There is a need to implement good national climate change and resilience policies that recognise, protect and restore ecosystem services. Protection needs to be priority as restoration can incur huge costs.
- o Sound science and holistic approaches are required, with long term planning horizons.
- o Non-climate change issues also need to be accounted for, as do land tenure issues as they impact on any EbA interventions and the whole of island approach.
- o Governments and communities need integrated multiscale long term resilience focused scenario planning. This will require a structured process that works effectively across all governance levels, from communities through to national governments.
- o These recommendations have been incorporated as far as possible in the SPREP/SPC/IUCN proposal for a programme to be funded by the GCF, as an EbA intervention at scale.

Conclusions of the session:

- o There is now increased understanding by participants of the critical linkages between maintaining and restoring ecosystems and their services and enhancing resilience to climate change and disasters.

- o There was also increased understanding by participants of the viability of ecosystem restoration as exemplified by implementation of the Louisiana Coastal Management Plan, but bearing in mind that the costs of restoration are much higher than resilience building, but are able to garner long term benefits, albeit at greater costs.
- o Furthermore, participants gained a better understanding of the IUCN-SPREP coastal resilience programme proposed for submission to the Green Climate Fund.
- o An analogy was used to describe seawalls, noting many seawalls give the few good seawalls a bad reputation.

SESSION 4.2: LOCAL COORDINATION FOR RESILIENCE

At the village level, resilience is understood to be the ability of a community to respond to disasters and climate change impacts and the mapping out of strategies to minimise the impact on communities. Following TC Winston, Partners in Community Development Fiji (PCDF) have been working in the Ra Province of Fiji conducting disaster preparedness trainings for communities to become first responders to disasters.

The Fiji Ministry of iTaukei Affairs is tasked to look after the wellbeing of the communities through a partnership with NGOs and working through the provincial council. It has allowed an integrated rural approach to tackle the rehabilitation programme issues. It was identified that there is a need to identify all communication structures that are active and from that identify which communication structure is active enough to be utilised in order to mobilise and disseminate information.

The church has a process in place when trying to reach out to communities i.e communities listen to church elders rather than to village elders. It was noted that there is a need to strengthen the role of the church in promoting resilience at the community level.

The experiences of climate change impacts in Yasawa, Fiji were shared. Women play an active role in food security in Yasawa who are experiencing the impacts of climate change such as sea level rise, and droughts. The partnerships with the Australian Government, USAID, Ministry of Health, and Ministry of Agriculture were acknowledged. Post disaster assistance provided included seedlings for crops: watermelon, nine varieties of kumala. In terms of drought time, water supply was sent to Yasawa. The community uses a culvert to fetch water as a means to overcome water problems on the island.

Use of traditional methods of food preservation called “duvreke” and “jila”, are being taught to the younger generation in breadfruit preservation from WWF. In the Bank Islands in Vanuatu which are vulnerable to cyclones, the traditional method of food preservation is in smoking breadfruit for weeks and which can be preserved for years.

It was acknowledged the need to pull together resources and using partnerships to deliver activities to communities post disaster. The importance of engaging local governments otherwise a project will run the risk of not addressing resilience, or identifying what is already working. The community in the Yasawa groups is now more aware of harvesting seasons.

The presentation acknowledged the capacities that are available at the community level and to build upon it, as well as identifying the weaknesses and the need to strengthen these areas to help communities. For the case of Tonga, church buildings became evacuation centres in times of disasters. These church buildings could be retrofitted according to building codes. It was identified the importance of engaging the community and the government to speak in local languages where people could understand and be fully engaged.

In order to build resilience the discussions concluded the need to build back better and build better in the first place. For the case of the FSM, when states coordinate themselves, it is more effective. As long as countries and governments are moving in the right direction together and learning from experiences along the way, it is working.

Key statements on local coordination for resilience.

- o Collaboration and coordination at local level is the nexus for; identifying effective existing structures, capacities and resources inherent in communities; enhancing sustainable practices for preparedness, food security, livelihoods and water security; greater opportunities for partnerships of resilient development actors such as community members, NGOs, CSOs, local government and relevant line ministries.
- o Placing people at the centre of all development allows for a rich harvest of knowing their needs, knowledge, expertise, strengths, and gaps; opens the space for leadership of their preparedness, response, risk reduction and adaptation initiatives to particularly slow onset events and the impacts of climate variability which is a lived daily reality at the household level.
- o Invest efforts in doing things right the first time around.

Identified gaps and opportunities:

- o The local community needs to acknowledge and make use of available resources.
- o In the case of North Pacific, coordination and facilitation of assistance to other states and understanding their needs and priorities is always a challenge.
- o There are challenges with different levels of government in terms of resource allocation like fisheries e.g. in FSM.

Conclusions of the session:

- o The importance of taking message to the communities and working with existing structures.
- o The importance of using relevant practices such as traditional knowledge and defined roles in communities for men, women and youth.
- o The importance of using local capacity, people, assets (such as churches as evacuation centres) during disasters and post disasters.
- o The importance of pulling together resources and the need for partnerships and working together. The need to be inclusive and involve all groups. Ask people what they need rather than telling people what they need.

SESSION 5.1: APPLICATIONS OF RISK MODELLING AND IMPACT TOOLS?

Presentations were provided by Mr. Titimanu Simi, PARTneR (Pacific Risk Tool for Resilience) Project Coordinator, Samoa DMO and Dr Kate Crowley, PARTneR Project Manager of NIWA. These presentations focused on the PARTneR project, the development and application of the RiskScape risk tool in the Pacific, with particular reference to Samoa and Vanuatu. A detailed online demonstration of the tool was provided by Ms. Juli Ungaro, Climate Scientist, NIWA.

The applications for risk modelling in the Pacific was discussed. A number of suggestions were put forward including: land use planning; flood forecasting; pre-positioning through the example of positioning of supplies and services; planning through the example of distribution routes; and evacuation planning.

On the needs and challenges associated with risk data collection and management in the Pacific the following was noted:

- o Standardisation of data and consistency of vocabulary
- o Still need to demonstrate the importance and need for data
- o Availability and quality of data
- o Collection of data/technology of infrastructure
- o Ownership, licensing and institutional backing on NDMO
- o Social vulnerability
- o Use of data
- o Strengthening disaggregated data in the region
- o Working Group on harmonization of data and tools within context of PRP

Opportunities exist for enhancing national and regional risk data management.

- o Connecting to PRP including building upon the work of the Knowledge Management working Group (PCCR).
- o Climate change funding presents an opportunity for impact modelling tools
- o Increased data storage
- o Converting data to electronic forms
- o Future approaches could consider risk perception / attitudes to risk as they are critical to converting knowledge into action. This would need to include local contextual factors, including cultural aspects)
- o Risk perception could be considered inside models but also in providing better support in applying them in decision-making
- o Improved visualization of risk might help communicate the need for action
- o The increased use and coverage of cellular networks is an opportunity for data collection
- o Private sector can play a role and can be important first movers
- o Work with CROP agencies for support to improve data and models.

To improve risk modelling tools to support Pacific island countries it was noted that there is a need for cheap data collection through drones; increased vulnerability models; simple user interface; and increased asset data and field work.

The moderator concluded the session by noting the utility and value of risk and impact modelling tools was recognised during the session as were a number of challenges and opportunities. In particular, there is a need to harmonize collection methods, formats and storage of the data required for such tools across the region. This is not a task for a single project and needs to be coordinated regionally. It was suggested that a Working Group on harmonization of data and tools could support the work of the PRP.

The need for the outputs of such tools to be contextualised to local conditions was highlighted including the important role of understanding gender and cultural issues and differing attitudes to risk. Accounting for such factors can support moving from risk model outputs to action on the ground. The importance to ensuring the sustainability of software-based tools was emphasised and the PARTner Project appears to provide good practice in this regard.

SESSION 5.2: BUILDING RESILIENCE USING TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE, CULTURE AND ARTS

Culture and arts play a supportive role in building Pacific resilience to climate change by diffusing knowledge widely in meaningful and accessible ways locally and internationally and promoting Pacific voices and 'changing the narrative'. Young people have a special role to play in this as demonstrated by 350.org's activities.

Documenting traditional knowledge and validating it for use in early warning systems through the SPREP-COSPPac project is serving to strengthen understanding of weather related traditional knowledge in the countries where the project is taking place and as the project continues the information being collected will be communicated back to communities. This said there is some loss of traditional knowledge in some communities and they need assistance in reviving methods of disaster recovery.

It is important that DRM/CC frameworks are inclusive of Pacific concerns as illustrated by the biocultural indicator project including a stronger focus on ecosystem services, people's access to natural and cultural heritage and connections to people and place which are essential to wellbeing and resilience.

Increasing resilience through reviving, rethinking, revalidating and combining climate traditional knowledge and Science. Presentation was delivered by SPREP Climate and Meteorological Officer, Mr. Salesa Nihmei outlining the SPREP-COSPPac project on Traditional Knowledge with particular



reference to Early Warning System – Early Detection, Monitoring and Analysis as a focus. The project is piloted in Samoa, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Niue and Tonga and looks at preserving weather and climate information on Traditional Knowledge and there is growing recognition of local knowledge to complement modern forecasting information.

350.org Pacific Climate Warriors – Changing the Narrative 350.org Pacific Climate Warriors is a team of Pacific Island young people campaigning and raising the voice of the Pacific through regional and international activities. The session was presented by Ms. Alisi Rabukawaqa. The Pacific 350.org group was established in 2013 and expanded to raising the impacts of climate change on Pacific island countries. Using designated climate warriors across the region, 350.org initiated a range of projects. In the RMI this focused on inter-generational sharing of knowledge through weaving and poetry to capture knowledge from the elders. A series of short videos was shown to provide additional information.

In introducing the session, the facilitator expressed that there is a general understanding that Traditional Knowledge is reaffirmed: by making it current in the community by supporting culture and the arts to broadcast and sustainably keep disaster and resilience mechanisms fresh in people’s minds; by making culture and the arts sustainable; and by making practitioners of cultures and arts sustainable so they can be active in promoting resilience

The session was aimed at three key lessons on: how broad stakeholders can integrate culture, art and traditional knowledge in innovative and respectful ways that benefit communities and countries.

Mr. Salesa Nihmei of SPREP noted there are traditional mechanisms that have been developed by communities to deal with hazards. There is a loss of an elderly generation that have traditional knowledge, therefore the project piloted in Samoa, Vanuatu, Niue works with communities to collect existing knowledge and to identify how to integrate knowledge and science and the indicators of changes in weather and climate. There is value in having both traditional and modern science. La Niña, El Niño and changing weather patterns have traditional terms that needs to be captured and which is communicated better through different cultural settings.

The project works on validating traditional knowledge by studying the sciences of weather warning systems such as through the flowering patterns of plants; the behaviour of certain insects and animals and other traditional signs. It has contributed to increasing resilience through technical and scientific data and information and the integration and combination of information forecast.

Ms. Alisi Rabukawaqa of 350 Pacific noted the modes of climate activism and movements need to be adjusted to fit Pacific cultures and context. The 350 movement is about changing the narrative of climate activism i.e ‘We are not drowning, We are Fighting’ i.e. using the knowledge and resources that are accessible and the know-how to impact change. One of the approaches to this is through moving forward by looking back. Observing traditional practices and experiences to navigate through new systems and changes.

The need to use knowledge spaces to learn about traditional concepts and culture. The need to use existing traditional structures to communicate with affected communities when responding to disasters, and to be able to find out what is really needed on the ground instead of clothing and water, as was always assumed. There is a need to move away from generalized statements i.e. instead of referring to young people ignoring or not knowing about traditional knowledge, instead there is a need to acknowledge and recognise young people that are aware and are interested in traditional knowledge and how it integrates with science. There must be resources directed towards young people as agents of change.

Dr. Stacy Jupiter reiterated the need to allow Pacific voices to define themselves and what it means to be resilient. This is achieved by gathering voices and representatives from across the Pacific to get a consensus on what it means to be resilient. To have a strong place in resilience people need to preserve their cultures, their resources and to be able to have access. It had been identified that there is a mismatch between traditional and international views.

The project evaluated gaps in the FRDP where there was little covered reflecting the need to help people to adapt through a better understanding of ecosystem services; access to natural and cultural resources and a focus on connectedness to people and place. There is a need to consider indicators that build on local definitions.



Ms. Sachiko Soro of VOU noted that in responding to disasters, being a local has a far greater impact when rounding up resources and aid to provide to affected communities. In addition networking with people you know or with people who are well known to the community like a radio personality is also effective.

Challenges for artists revolve around funding, and many donor organisations ignoring the value of traditional knowledge and cultures. Using social media in an engaging way, as VOU has done is a very cost effective means to mobilise resources and aid. VOU has the second highest number of hits in Fiji on its Facebook page and one of their dance videos has more than 100,000 hits.

SESSION 6.1: PARTNERSHIPS IN ACTION: EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE CAPACITY

Mr. Luke Purcell of the Australian Fire & Emergency Services Authorities Council (AFAC) presented on the PIEMA Model and Twinning Arrangements. AFAC works with a collaboration model, creating synergies across the sector. They are not government but can work on behalf of emergency services in Australia and is a national voice for key agencies in the sector. They represent a workforce of 300,000 people including volunteers. Emergency search and rescue is important for relationships in the Pacific.

AFAC board committed to a continued relationship in the Pacific building on 15 to 20 years of partnerships. There are about 12 twinning relationships done in a spirit of mutual learning. What is provided is gifts in kind which are mostly training and equipment.

PIEMA is a strategic allegiance formed in 2013 of fire agencies and chief of police with links to the NDMOs to support capacity development for emergency services and NDMO around issues of disaster risk and climate change.

SPC acts as the Secretariat for PIEMA. AFAC handed it over to SPC and has taken steps to provide strategic advice and support.

In Tonga, recently there was a tip fire and they sought advice from their Twinning agency in South Australia and they provided the required support.

AFAC is a conduit between DFAT, Emergency Management Australia (EMA) and the Pacific. There are greater opportunities to integrate climate change and DRR into emergency management. People will listen to PIEMA and those who represent it.

Mr. Paula Cirikiyasawa of the Ministry of Economy presented on the support of Fiji to Solomon Islands on early recovery. After the earthquake, Solomon Islands put in a request for assistance from Fiji in the recovery effort. Fiji undertook post disaster assessments and UNDP supported the process.

As part of the process the priorities came out from the committees. Homes, livelihoods, infrastructure and building resilience were the main priority areas. The process included liaising and consultation with the development partners and government officials over a period of six weeks. Tasks had to be completed within a timeframe. It was important that government officials were involved in the design phase to ensure everything was captured and that there was ownership of the project. To ensure inclusiveness, it was important to include people on the ground and those working with the ministries.

On monitoring and evaluation the ministries and undersecretaries were involved to ensure national ownership and sustainability for the implementation phase. The government needed to demonstrate their level of commitment and promote transparency including the showing of financial accountability to donors.

The outcome of the process was the earthquake recovery plan which was approved by Cabinet in June, 2017. The timeline is for two years. There is an earth and sea component which serves as a base to use for further disasters. The Plan shows what can be achieved within the means of the Government. Enforcement and regulation of building codes is also important. Since TC Winston in Fiji they have relooked at building codes. The Solomon Islands noted principles of shelter recovery utilised is to build back better.

Mr. Choi Yeeting of Kiribati presented on sustainability and partnerships using a whole of island approach in terms of how to improve sustainable partnerships. This is the integration of climate change and disaster risk management and they are also undergoing activities on the implementation plan in line with the FRDP.

Kiribati have a national plan with a whole of island approach to ensure better allocation of resources and finances. It includes a multi-stakeholder process. Kiribati have had many partners involved moving together in a strategic manner across the country. Previously activities were scattered. It is proving to be an effective coordination mechanism and helping to strengthen coordination at the national level. Partners are the regional support team and NGOs, CSOs, faith-based organisations are also involved.

Kiribati tries to ensure climate change and disaster risk reduction activities are sustainable and involve all of the stakeholders in decision-making processes. Decision makers now appreciate the value of combining the two.

The elders need to be consulted however the youth are doing a lot of work advocating for the issues their communities are facing. They also sustain these actions.

Lessons learnt include: strengthened island level structure; effective communication between local and national governments; engagement of stakeholders; sustainability of activities and importance of clear communication for climate change science and impacts.

Recommendations:

- o Work through the respective island councils to assist with implementation issues as they have their own processes, needs and requirements. There are strong cultural considerations and island protocols to follow and it can be difficult to do without it.
- o There is a need to strengthen coordination however what are the skills needed to strengthen coordination. There is a need for human resource and management of information provided

through all the sectors to enable stocktaking. The simplest way is for stakeholders to sit around a table and discuss. The skills needed are to coordinate everything at one time.

- o The resources needed for a whole of island approach to expand and replicate includes IVA which is a process of integrated vulnerability assessment. Technical capacity to conduct the IVAs and assessments on the ground requires technical advice and there is a need for more capacity building for the staff of each sector.

Session outcomes:

- o Partnerships in action is core to the realisation of the FRDP objectives and goals as seen in the examples shared by the Australian Fire and Emergency Services Authorities Council on the PIEMA Model and the Twinning Arrangements; support by Fiji to the Solomon Islands on Early Recovery; and the Sustainable Partnerships for the Whole of Island Approach in Abaiang.
- o Partnerships in Action serves not only to build the resilience of the Pacific island communities to climate and disaster hazards but also collectively contribute to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals.



SESSION 6.2: RISK GOVERNANCE

The session entailed an interactive approach to illustrate what impacts disaster and climate change have on various sectors of society and the importance of considering risk. Issues such as leadership, gender equality, disabilities and access to inclusive responses, and preparedness to minimise risk were discussed.

Panellist Dr. Josefa Koroivueta, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation for the Government of Fiji noted the response needs to be humane. Gender is pivotal in the response. Regionally the Pacific are not keeping pace with regards to gender, as no Pacific Island countries have attained equality. The stories shared on the impacts of disasters are real stories that need to focus on what the Pacific have not been doing well and there is a need to keep asking the questions of how can things be done better, beyond expectations.

Panellist Ms. Rothina Ilo Noka, from the Department of Women's Affairs, Ministry of Justice and Community Services for the Government of Vanuatu noted the rates of sexual assault on young girls in Vanuatu as an example of gender inequality. Disaster makes the situation worse creating a "secondary disaster". Vanuatu has moved to putting systems in place, including a gender cluster.

Mr. Ray Bojczuk, First Secretary of the Australian High Commission noted climate change and disasters affect everyone and the importance of understanding what risks are and how to mitigate them. Development decisions can be guided by having risk informed development which needs to be considered in advance. Dr. Koroivueta noted that development decisions need to carefully consider risk and look at all aspects of communities. There is a need for men to change their mindsets and make space for women to take part in decision making.

A question was raised from the floor on the money spent on climate change and disaster risk reduction projects and whether it is enough to enhance resilience? The panellists noted the processes and mechanisms to make sure funds trickle down are a challenge, there are never sufficient funds due to increasing disasters and costs associated with relocation and climate proofing. Resilience cannot be measured in terms of money, as people need to also recognise there needs to be behavioural change. If development is not risk informed it will undermine resilience. Money is important, but needed in a timely factor.

Mr. Bojczuk noted that risks are growing, including new and emerging risks. Key issue is the effectiveness of the money currently being used. Amount is important, but not as important as effectiveness. Small amounts of money can create large change. Planning, engagement and communications are generally most important. Need to make sure there is money and mainstreaming of climate change and disaster

risk reduction into programming. Dr. Koroivueta agreed that not all risks can be solved by money until people are committed to achieving resilience. Ms. Noka agreed that there is a need to change mindsets as the success of a project cannot be determined until you know if all sectors and members of society are benefiting, as need to fully consider social dimensions.

Invisible risks are women and children becoming more vulnerable. Importance of engagement with all groups during the design phase. Dr. Koroivueta noted the solution is all actors in development need to work together and have a risk informed approach to ensure all needs are met. Mr. Bojczuk noted the reason these risks are invisible is that people's voices are not heard. Part of disaster risk reduction and risk informed development is to make sure that an event does not become a disaster. Need to make sure all voices are heard. At the community level it is important to consider the needs of all groups and this must be done before hand so that during an emergency communities are prepared. There is also recognition for support in regards to psycho-social risk such as mental health which is another invisible risk. Some risks that cannot be addressed by development or money, include extreme heat and other environmental factors that will get worse with climate change.

Good development should incorporate resilience and needs to build community resilience, not dependence. Past example from Cyclone Zoe and the importance that traditional knowledge played. Use traditional knowledge first and incorporate into design. A consultant cannot address this on a short visit. Ms. Noka gave the example from the WASH sector, which worked to develop contingency plans and gender training exercises. During recent evacuations the WASH sector lead noted the importance of having evacuation centres being properly designed and to standardise hygiene kits. Mr. Bojczuk noted support to Meteorological Services in regards to the Pacific Sea Level Monitoring Project and climate services in the Solomon Islands with respect to the malaria early warning system. Most tangible results are those that empower beneficiaries to make decisions and to plan and prepare. Prescriptive projects are not as effective. Dr. Koroivueta noted a community relocation project that allowed for inclusion of risk planning in the community design.

The panellists were asked their views on the new governance arrangements to support resilience development and to provide examples. Mr. Bojczuk discussed the FRDP and the PRP as an example which showcases how the region is bringing together the different communities to address these issues. Another example of where it is being done is around climate finance where there is a need for a coordinated approach. Dr. Koroivueta noted the need for communities to take ownership and to have an interactive and informed dialogue. Ms. Noka noted in Vanuatu through the Decentralisation Act there are community development plans that have been developed by the communities and that are inclusive.

Conclusions by the moderator of the session:

- o Risk if not managed can potentially exacerbate a disaster.
- o Funds provided for climate change need to be used effectively.
- o Invisible risks are a consequence of not including vulnerable groups.
- o Traditional Knowledge and utilising Traditional Knowledge available can be better utilised to support development.



- o PRP and FRDP platform for better coordination but products and outcomes need to be taken back to community.

Outcome statement from session organisers:

- o Gender and social risks are often ‘invisible’ and can be neglected in development decisions. These considerations are key to ensuring that development is inclusive and resilient.
- o Building resilience is about changing the mindsets of every day development decision makers and community members.
- o Disasters and climate change respect no-one. Everyone and everything is impacted.
- o The amount of money invested in CCDRM is not nearly as important as how it is programmed. All development investments should consider risk; otherwise, they will not be sustainable.
- o It is critical to work from within existing governance structures and to ensure that development actors adopt risk mainstreaming
- o A multi-stakeholder approach is crucial for improving resilience.

PLENARY 7: PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING PROCESSES FOR OPERATIONALISING THE FRDP

Ms. Jennifer de Brum presented on the Marshall Islands JNAP goals and alignment with the FRDP. It was noted that “enhance” at the local level means to improve efficiency and effectiveness. Ms. de Brum presented a map of their JNAP in relation to other frameworks and plans noting 25 frameworks



and plans plus eight global and seven regional strategies. The purpose is to better coordinate how they use resources in country. The example of the JNAP results matrix was shared as well as the JNAP M&E plan and M&E actions. RMI are overextended and need more staff. The goal is to initiate M&E coordination within government and establish an M&E system.

JNAP M & E objectives is to provide:

- o regular reports for the RMI Government on the progress of JNAP implementation;
- o a mechanism to stimulate discussion and identify new initiatives that may evolve; and
- o a mechanism for feedback and acquittal to donor partners and organisations of the funds used and progress made in relation to JNAP implementation.

Actions in RMI to date include a stocktake and update in collaboration with all stakeholders and partners together and individually; as well as a planned a review. What RMI have not yet done is to hire M&E staff or initiate collaboration and support within government to establish an M&E system.

Mr. Andrew McElroy Representative for the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific (UNISDR Pacific) presented on the Pacific Roadmap for Sustainable

Development recently approved by Pacific Leaders at the 48th Forum Leaders Meeting. It was noted that the PRSD has a Task Force with the following key tasks:

- o develop the region's sustainable development indicators;
- o to strengthen existing regional and national mechanisms with reference to the SAMOA Pathway and Sendai Framework; and
- o identify key elements for implementation of Sendai, Paris Agreement and SDGs.

There are currently 132 indicators for the Pacific, 48 indicators already measured by 2018, and 37 indicators have a methodology but are not collected. By 2022, 85 indicators could be measured. In respect of the region Samoa is one of 22 countries globally to report against 2030 SDGs in July 2016.

On the Paris Agreement countries are expected to formulate national strategies to adapt to climate change. In 2018, Parties will take stock of the collective efforts in relation to progress towards the goal set in the Paris Agreement and to inform the preparation of NDCs. There will also be a global stocktake every five years to assess the collective progress towards achieving the purpose of the Agreement and to inform further individual actions by Parties. Support is needed on countries worldwide for access to finance. SPREP is in forefront to work with member countries in support of implementation of the Paris Agreement.

The 38 indicators of the SDGs are linked to the Sendai Framework and Paris Agreement. Within region existing and established tools to assist with M&E of loss and damage. Sendai monitor reporting cycle to take place every two years and due in May 2019. Feeding into the FRDP capacity gaps and reporting commitments. Utilise existing reporting commitments using Paris Agreement and SDGs as it is important to not over burden countries.

Mr. Lepale Aussie Simanu of Samoa, shared the monitoring and evaluation of the disaster risk management and climate change planning aspects in Samoa including discussion of national mechanisms. It was noted that implementation requires resources and flexibility for changing or competing priorities. A critical challenge is the lack of data and the inconsistency in M&E mechanisms.

The group work noted the following recommendations:

- o Establish an M&E working group committee within FRDP
- o Establish guidelines for countries on how to manage M&E consultants and TORs,
- o Develop reporting systems and identify gaps for strengthening and enhancing what has been established.
- o Standardised template that combines all three into one reporting framework.
- o Simple presentation such as infographic information for decision makers (i.e. traffic light report).
- o Simplified reporting template for the FRDP.
- o Political commitment into the reporting process.
- o Reinforcing existing data and information systems, and integration/interoperability.

- o Reporting system that that can be accessed online by everyone and is open to all relevant parties with links to regional and global frameworks and strategies with the support of regional organisations like SPC.
- o Annual and other reports are deposited and analysed for reporting to FRDP, Sendai and other frameworks.
- o Governments could give NGOs a few simple criteria to report on each year to capture more of the community level work happening in countries.
- o Training of staff to ensure that there is the expertise when it comes to reporting.
- o Consider financial and other reporting for added value.

SESSION 8: NETWORKING AND OUTCOME DEVELOPMENT

Several presentations were made as the drafting team finalised the draft outcome statement.

SESSION 8.1: INFORMAL SESSION FOR FEEDBACK ON EXPECTATIONS OF THE PRP

Australia noted that the key opportunity for the PRP is maximising coordination in the region for disaster risk reduction and climate change and to understand what countries want to come out of the PRP process.

Tonga informed the meeting that what is desired is direction on next steps regarding the PRP and where to from here after the Joint Platform including understanding the operational side of the Framework in terms of how the work of the Platform and the PCCR has been integrated. The Meteorological Services is in the middle of the two communities and their role is important to both. It is also unclear what the working groups will do until the next meeting.

The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat responded that their role is to serve in a technical role with other CROP agencies. In 2012 Pacific Leaders asked for the integration of the climate change and disaster risk processes. The FRDP was endorsed in 2016. The Leaders asked for the FRDP to be elaborated and the governance framework was approved in 2017 for the PRP. A working group was established which involved all of the Forum countries, CROP agencies and Non State Actor representatives as well as development partners. Two meetings were held in the first half of the year in 2017.

What has been completed to date is the development of the policy process and the governance framework. The latter has been endorsed by Leaders in September, 2017 for a two year period on a temporary basis.

The Joint Platform meeting marks the end of the PIFACC and the RFA. The Taskforce, support unit and working groups will enable the process to go forward. In December there will be a meeting of the governing council to write a plan and to listen to what has happened. The issue now is developing a pathway and an indication of deadlines and discrete pieces of work to help decisions going forward.

The next phase is the specific structure going forward. There are many pieces of work that have yet to be developed.

Samoa noted the governance mechanism has been approved for the FRDP however it is not clear the process for implementation in terms of the actual body for coordination of where the work gets carried out.

The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat reiterated the diagram on the structure of the FRDP and the inclusion of the Resilience Meeting in 2018 which brings the two communities together as well as other actors to the meeting. The Taskforce represents countries and partners, as well as vast stakeholders of 15 members to provide guidance for pushing forward the resilience agenda. Support provided by technical working groups based on the working groups from the PCCR which will be elaborated on in terms of processes and mechanisms. The continuity is important for countries input to continue.

IFRC sought clarity on the PHP will that be continued as part of the Resilience Programme.

Tuvalu noted the previous two days were for the PCCR and the parallel PHP. For the Joint Platform it should focus only on the issues discussed at the meeting. Clarification was sought on whether the coordinator had captured key outcomes of the summaries of the Joint Platform.

SPREP responded it is a good entry into the discussion of the outcomes. The outcome statement is the combination of dialogue including participants of the PHP which should be reflected in the statement. Also included are the DRM mandated outcomes as well as the PCCR. The spirit and intent in terms of what is committed to have been captured as each of the respective meetings have detailed outcomes.

Australia noted there is overlap between the disaster risk reduction and the climate change community. The Platform is a disaster risk reduction meeting being held in conjunction with the PCCR. Climate change mitigation will be kept separate and likewise disaster preparedness.

CLOSING SESSION: OUTCOME STATEMENT AND ADOPTION

The meeting reviewed and considered the draft Statement of the Joint Meeting of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management, which with amendments was adopted by consensus.

The meeting closed with remarks shared by the various partners which collectively acknowledged the work and participation of all participants and development partners for the last Joint Meeting.

ANNEX 1: PACIFIC CLIMATE CHANGE ROUNDTABLE OUTCOME STATEMENT

THE PACIFIC CLIMATE CHANGE ROUNDTABLE

OUTCOME STATEMENT

We, the representatives of and participants from countries and territories in the region, civil society organisations; Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP), other regional and international agencies; and development partners attending the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable in Suva, Fiji 02-03 October, 2017:

1. Recognised the importance and significance of the Presidency role of Fiji for COP23 and for the Pacific region.
2. Expressed deep appreciation to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for their support of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable 2017.
3. Met to share lessons learned from climate change and related work in the Pacific region.
4. Built awareness of processes, practices and tools used in successful adaptation and mitigation projects which may be replicated in new activities.
5. Have gained greater understanding of the new Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP) and its implementation by the Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP).
6. Recognised and acknowledged the role and value that the PCCR has had as a dedicated forum on climate change to support capacity building, awareness, and understanding, and sharing of lessons learned.
7. Recognised the ongoing need to build capacity to access climate change finance and exchange knowledge on new initiatives and opportunities, and on emerging issues.
8. Noted the importance of ongoing climate monitoring and observation, climate data management, modelling and application to provide sound scientific evidence, information, and its effective communication, to inform policy, decision making and development.
9. Noted the importance of traditional knowledge in supporting the development of appropriate regional climate change actions and engaging with communities.
10. Acknowledged the important roles of countries and communities in addressing the climate change challenges in the Pacific, as well as the collaboration from development partners.
11. Noted the vast body of knowledge and expertise that exists in the Pacific region which has informed decision making and shaped policy.
12. Reaffirmed the importance of supporting work under the themes of Adaptation, Mitigation, Information Knowledge Management, Loss and Damage, and Resource Mobilisation, and noted they have a critical role to ensure the FRDP be fully elaborated to reflect alignment to the Paris Agreement.

Further noted the opportunity to align the themes of the Disaster Risk Management Community with those above and to consider the inclusion of a Climate and Early Warning Services theme.

13. Reaffirmed the critical importance of ongoing dialogue and support to Pacific island countries in climate change, in support of the PRP.
14. Reaffirmed the role of the PRP in bringing together the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management stakeholders to advance the integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction.
15. Recognised the value of collaborative regional meetings for bringing together climate change stakeholders, particularly Pacific country representatives and acknowledged the support of development partners for these meetings.
16. Reaffirmed the dedication and contribution of Pacific Island countries and territories as well as partners to enhancing climate resilience.

03 OCTOBER 2017

ANNEX 2: AGENDA

Joint Platform for Disaster Risk Management and Pacific Climate Change Roundtable

Holiday Inn, Suva, Fiji
4-5 October 2017

AGENDA

Wednesday 04th October, 2017
Holiday Inn, Suva. Fiji

DAY ONE	
8.00-8.30am	Registration & Participants Seated
<u>8.30am</u>	<i>Opening Address</i> Fiji Government/Chair <i>Opening Statements (3-5 minutes)</i> SPC – Colin Tukuitonga SPC SPREP – Roger Cornforth DDG UNISDR – Andrew McElroy
9.15am	Scene Setting and key updates Pacific Humanitarian Partnership key outcomes and short brief Pacific Climate Change Roundtable key outcomes and short brief



<p>9.45am</p>	<p>Plenary 1: Regional focus of FRDP and local actors towards Pacific Resilience</p> <p><i>Intended Outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased understanding and refresher on the principles of the FRDP and the PRP and how it relates to each stakeholder in the context of their role in its implementation • Motivational discussion on the way forward for implementation as perceived by the different stakeholder interests • Indication from stakeholders how the FRDP and PRP can reduce barriers to inclusive engagement to guide next steps going forward in operationalising the PRP. <p><i>Keynote address</i> 9.45-10am Keynote address Director-General SPC, Colin Tukuitonga</p>
	<p><i>Panel Discussion (10-10.15am)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIANGO Director Emele Duituturaga • PIPSO Howard Politini • Moderation:RMI • Organiser: Teea Tira, Forum Secretariat
<p>10-10.30 COFFEE BREAK /GROUP PHOTO</p>	
<p>11am</p>	<p>Plenary 2: Effective partnerships for the FRDP: addressing challenges and maximising opportunities</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To understand both best practice examples and challenges presented by partnerships and steps to overcome and maximise these for the region. • To understand what constitutes an effective partnership in DRR/CCA broadly focused towards sustainable development and how to create one. <p><i>Speakers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Foon (Kiribati NDMO) • Waymine Towai and Xavier Matsutaro (Palau – on integrated CCDRM Framework and Action Plan) • Andrew Yatliman (FSM, Director of Office of Environment and Emergency Management) • International Federation of the Red Crescent, (IFRC) • Women in Fisheries/Forestry representative - Fiji. <p>Organiser: SPC</p>



1 – 2PM LUNCH		
SESSION 3: Parallel Sessions begin		
2.00pm	<p>Session 3.1: Finance for resilience</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the available opportunities for risk finance mobilisation and cross-sectoral partnerships for risk informed infrastructure in the Pacific? 	<p>Session 3.2: How science and technology is impacting the early warning systems of the pacific.</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highlight bright spots of Pacific scientific and technological innovation to support early warning and improve resilience;



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared knowledge on financing for resilience and why there is a need. • How do the guiding principles of the FRDP effectively integrate with the development of risk resilient infrastructure? • Increased understanding of the different financing products that incorporate the concept of financing for resilience <p><i>Speakers/Panellists</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum Secretariat, climate finance assessment work and overview • Tonga – sustainable financing mechanism • Tuvalu – Tuvalu Survival Fund • RMI – Leveraging and co-financing • SPC – Innovations in water and sanitation infrastructure supporting resilience • Asian Development Bank – Disaster Risk Contingent Facility <p>Moderator: SPREP (Espen Ronneberg) Organiser: Teea Tira, Forum Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased awareness of applications of science and technology at every stage of the early warning system cycle; • Enhanced understanding of potential applications of models, technology, and risk assessment tools for communications, policy and planning purposes; • Identified actions needed to improve and further incorporate modelling, technology and scientific evidence into national DRR, DRM, CCA and land-use planning decision-making. <p><i>Speakers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solomon Islands • Digicel- Morika Hunter on disaster warning communications and technology in the Pacific • RMI- Jennifer DeBrum on RMI drought forecasting, response, and PDNA process in 2016 • SPC- Herve Damlamian on Kiritimati Island, PACSAFE and contribution of science to warnings and evidence-based decision making <p>Moderator: Ravind Kumar, Fiji Meteorological Service Organiser: Molly Powers (SPC) and Salesa Nihmei (SPREP)</p>
--	--	---



SESSION 4 PARALLEL SESSIONS CONTINUE		
<p>4.00pm-5.30PM</p>	<p>Session 4.1: Ecosystems based approaches to resilience building</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased understanding by participants of the critical linkages between maintaining and restoring ecosystems and their services and enhancing resilience to climate change and disasters. • Increased understanding by participants of the viability of ecosystem restoration as exemplified by implementation of the Louisiana Coastal Management Plan. • Understanding by participants of the IUCN-SPREP coastal resilience programme proposed for submission to the Green Climate Fund. <p><i>Speakers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Ecosystem-based Coastal Resilience Framework for the Pacific Islands - Stuart Chape - Director Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management, SPREP • Integrated planning and large scale restoration for coastal resilience: examples from Louisiana, USA, - Tim Carruthers, Water Institute of the Gulf • Working at scale - Coastal and Marine Ecosystem Resilience to Climate Change Programme: IUCN and SPREP proposal to the GCF - Andrew Foran, IUCN <p>Moderator: Herman Timmermans, SPREP PEBACC Project Manager</p>	<p>Session 4.2: Local Coordination for Resilience</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the expectations of local government actors, best ways to engage and the key challenges they face when working towards resilience strategies • 3 takeaways in regards to ‘what we should have known when engaging with communities’ • What are the opportunities and how can local government be better supported nationally and regionally. <p><i>Speakers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tonga from Local Government • Fiji Provincial Representative • Local NGO representative • Integrated representative across DRR/CCA <p>Lead: PIC Country Representative Organiser: OXFAM Pacific and UNDP</p>



THURSDAY 5TH OCTOBER 2017		
SESSION 5 PARALLEL SESSIONS CONTINUE		
8.30-10.00am	<p>Session 5.1: Applications of Risk Modelling and Impact Tools?</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased awareness of risk and impact modelling tools available in the Pacific by national agencies and partners; 2. Update on work undertaken by the PARTneR projects; 3. Enhanced understanding of the applications of risk assessments for policy and planning purposes; 4. Identified actions needed to improve and further incorporate risk models into national DRR, DRM and land-use planning decision. <p><i>Suggested participants</i></p> <p>Country DRM Officers and Managers SPC Geoscience UN Agencies The World Bank ADB</p> <p><i>Session team</i></p> <p>Titimanu Simi, PARTneR Project Coordinator, Samoa DMO. Kate Crowley, PARTneR Project Manager, NIWA Juli Ungaro, Climate Scientist, NIWA</p>	<p>Session 5.2: Building Resilience using traditional knowledge, culture and arts</p> <p><i>Intended outcome</i></p> <p>Three key lessons on how broad stakeholders can integrate culture, arts and traditional knowledge in innovative and respectful ways that benefit communities and countries</p> <p><i>Panellists:</i></p> <p>Salesa Nihmei – COSPPac, SPREP Fenton Lutunatabua- 350.org Sachiko Soro and Navi Fong, VOU Stronger than Winston Stacy Jupiter, (biocultural indicators)</p> <p><i>Moderator:</i> Adi Meretui Ratunabuabua <i>Coordinator:</i> Elise Huffer, SPC</p>
COFFEE BREAK 10AM-10.30AM		



	<p>Session 6.1: Partnerships in Action: Emergency preparedness and response capacity.</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing good practice in Partnership models as well as key considerations to ensure sustainability and ownership • A shared awareness of the opportunities and challenges of a more integrated approach to address disaster and climate change risk • A stronger appreciation of how integrated action in the region links to and contributes to the overall 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Sendai Framework for Action • Lessons learned and best practices on the implementation of resilience activities across climate change and disaster risk management/risk resilience to display best practice and ways forward for countries and the region. <p><i>Speakers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stuart Ellis, CEO AFAC • Speaking on the PIEMA Model and the Twinning Arrangements • Paula Cirikiyasawa, Ministry of Economy • Speaking on the Support by Fiji to the Solomon Islands • National Meteorology Service • Speaking on the CosPPac Project and the BOM Partnership • VMGD, Vanuatu • Speaking on the Pacific/Melanesia Seismic Monitoring Network <p>Organiser: PEIMA, SPC</p>	<p>Session 6.2: Risk Governance</p> <p><i>Intended outcomes for participants:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What motivates development actors to work towards the goals of the FRDP • How to risk inform development ‘from within’ existing development governance • How to embed gender and social inclusion as a core component of risk governance <p><i>Speakers</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natalia Latu, Ministry of Finance and National Planning, Tonga • Jovesa Vocea, Commissioner Northern, Northern Division, Fiji • Rothina Ilo Noka, Department of Women’s Affairs, Ministry of Justice and Community Services, Vanuatu • Doris Susau, Regional Programme Manager, Live and Learn Environmental Education • Ray Bojczuk, First Secretary, Regional Development, Australian High Commission <p>Moderator: Josefa Koroivueta, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation, Fiji</p> <p>Contact/support Rebecca McNaugh UNDP</p>
--	---	--



12 – 1PM LUNCH	
1.00pm-3.00pm	<p>PLENARY 7: Practical knowledge management and monitoring processes for operationalising the FRDP</p> <p><i>This Plenary Session aims to achieve the following outcome:</i> Greater consensus on how the Pacific Resilience Partnership should practically function in support of the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific 2017-2030 (FRDP).</p> <p>Lead: PIC Country Representative Support contact: UNISDR in collaboration with partners</p>
3.00PM-3.30PM AFTERNOON TEA	
3.30-4.15pm	<p>Session 8: Networking and Outcome development</p> <p>Drafting team to develop outcome statement whilst side presentations proposed presented and participants can have sideline-networking meetings.</p>
4.30pm	
	<p>CLOSING SESSION Outcome Statement and Adoption</p> <p>CHAIR: Fiji Session contact: UNISDR, Andrew McElroy and drafting team (SPREP)</p>

ANNEX 3: PARTICIPANTS LIST

Name	Organisation
Adivasu Levu	Femlink Pacific
Adrian Nicolae	EU
Agostinho Cosme Belo	Timor Leste
Aholotu Palu	PIFS
Alanieta Vakatale	PIANGO
Aleyda Valdes	UNOCHA
Alka Ranjani	SPC
Amanda Lamont	AFAC
Amita Prasad	UNOCHA
Ana Tiraa	FAO
Anais Rouveyrol	PIDF
Andrea Stewart	NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Andrew Daka	PPA

Andrew Jones	SPC
Andrew McElroy	UNISDR
Andrew Yatilman	Federated States of Micronesia
Anthony Blake	SPC
Asenaca Rokamanalagi	SPC
Audrey Aumua	SPC
Audrey Brown-Pereira	SPREP
Aussie Simanu	Samoa
Avindra Singh	SPC
Azarel Mariner	SPREP
Bill Ho	Asia Disaster Preparedness Centre
Bismarck Crawley	Samoa
Brett Jones	USAID
Brian Philips	Vanuatu
Celso Dageago	Nauru
Charles Carlson	Cook Islands
Chitralekha Massey	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
Choi Yeeting	Kiribati
Christina Leala Gale	SPTO
Clarence Samuel	Marshall Islands
Clinton Chapman	GIZ
Daniel Gerecke	GIZ
Daniel Lund	British High Commission
Daniell Cowley	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Dave Hebblethwaite	SPC
David Gibson	Vanuatu
David Hiba Hiriasia	Solomon Islands
Dimenski Rewuru	Nauru
Doris Susau	Live & Learn FIJI
Elina Paul	Federated States of Micronesia
Emele Duituturaga	PIANGO
Erbai Xavier Matsutaro	Palau
Eriko Hibi	FAO
Espen Ronneberg	SPREP

Evlyn Mani	SPC
Exsley Taloiburi	PIFS
Felicia Talagi	Niue
Filipe Nainoa	Fiji Red Cross Society
Fumaru Fatiaki	Haus of Khameleon
Gemma Gray	UNOCHA
Geoff Robinson	Act for Peace
Gillian Cambers	SPC
Ginny Rokoua	SPC
Glenn Rose	World Vision
Gordon Chang	Pacific Power Association
Habiba Gitay	World Bank Group
Hanna Uusimaa	ADB
Hans Guttman	Asia Disaster Preparedness Centre
Hiroyuki Sawata	JICA
Howard Rodney Markland	NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Hudson Kauhiona	Solomon Islands
Ilaisaane Ana Patolo	Tonga
Ileana Miritescu	EU
Ilisapeci Vakacegu	Fiji
Ioanna Mokeaki	Kiribati
Iosefa Maiava	UNESCAP
Janet Cousens	Act for Peace
Jean Viliamu	Samoa
Jekope Rabaleinatosia	Fiji Red Cross Society
Jenna Priore	New Zealand Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management
Jennifer DeBrum	Marshall Islands
Jenny Brown	EU
Joe Zenos	United States Agency for International Development USAID
Jonathan Rowe	New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Josaia Tokoni	Rainbow Pride Foundation
Josefa Koroivueta	Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation, Fiji
Jowana Nabuci	Fiji BSRP Coordinator

Julian Wilson	EU
Jutta May	
Kamnayana Kaigabu	Papua New Guinea
Karen Lummis	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Katalaine Duaibe	OXFAM Pacific
Kathryn Clarkson	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Kelera Dimaimuri	SPC
Kilateli Falenga	Tuvalu
Kimberly McGuire	American Samoa
Kino Kabua	Marshall Islands
Kirsi Peltola	Save the Children Fiji
Laura Kong	NOAA
Lavaio Vele	Papua New Guinea
Leanne Moananu	SPREP
Ledua Vakloloma	PIFS
Leon Fajardo	UNICEF
Leonard Chan	Fiji Business Disaster and Resilience Council
Leveni Aho	Tonga
Lisa Kingsberry	SPC
Litea Biukoto	SPC
Loti Yates	Solomon islands
Luisa Taunga	Tonga
Luke Purcell	AFAC
Lydia Sijp	Cook Islands
Makelesi Gonelevu	SPREP
Makereta Konrote	Fiji Ministry of Economy
Manasa Tagicakibau	Fiji Commissioner Western
Manon Brasseur	New Caledonia
Marc Overmars	UNICEF
Masi Latianara	Habitat for Humanity Fiji
Mason Smith	IUCN
Meapelo Maiai	SPREP
Melina Tuiravakai	Cook Islands

Michael Arunga Obare	UNOCHA
Michael Foon	Kiribati
Michael Siebert	GIZ
Michelle Dunn	Emergency Management Australia
Michelle Higelin	Action Aid Australia
Mike Myers	International Committee of the Red Cross
Miriama Brown	PIPSO
Moana Kioa	Tonga
Moortaza Jiwani	UNDP PPRP
Morika Hunter	Digicel and Fiji Business Disaster and Resilience Council
Mosese Sikivou	PIFS
Mulipola Ausetalia Titimaea	Samoa
Naeemah Khan	UN WOMEN
Nanette Woonton	SPREP
Nasir Hassan	WHO
Nicola Glending	UNDP
Nicollette Goulding	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
Noa Tokavou	SPC
Noelene Nabulivou	Diverse Voices and Action for Equality
Noud Leenders	UNDP
Ofa Faanunu	Tonga
Opeta Alefaio	National Archives of Fiji
Osnat Lubrani	UN
Patrick Pringle	Climate Analytics SPREP
Paul Taylor	SPC
Penehuro Lefale	Tokelau
Peni Kotobalavu	SPC
Pepetua Latasi	Tuvalu
Philip Marsden	GIZ
Pratarp Singh	South Pacific Engineers Association
Raijeli Nicole	OXFAM Pacific
Raijeli Taga	Fiji Mineral Resources Department
Raphael Billie	SPC

Rashmi Rita	UNOCHA
Ravind Kumar	Fiji Meteorological Services
Ray Bojczuk	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade Australia
Rebecca McNaught	UNDP
Regan Moses	Nauru
Richard Bontjour	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Rima Moeka'a	Cook Islands
Robert Vivili	Tonga
Roger Cornforth	SPREP
Rothina Ilo-Noka	Department of Women's Affairs Vanuatu
Roy Harris	Nauru
Ruben Vulawalu	SPC
Salesa Nihmei	SPREP
Sally Moyle	Care Australia
Samuelu Teo	Tuvalu
Sarah Whitfield	CARE
Scott Hook	PIFS
Scott Power	Bureau of Meteorology Australia
Sevuloni Rokomatu Ratu	UNOCHA
Shadrack Welegtabit	Vanuatu
Shamima Ali	Fiji Women's Crisis Centre
Shane Bayley	New Zealand Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management
Shimala Kaur	UNISDR
Shirleen Wapna	EU
Shiu Raj	PIFS
Shonal Kumar	UNOCHA
Sidney Lui-Ikiua	Niue
Simione Bula	Pacific Disability Forum
Sitiveni Yanuyanutawa	Fiji National Council for Disabled Persons
Stephen Aumua	Peabody Energy
Stuart Chape	SPREP
Sumeo Silu	Tuvalu
Sune Gudnitz	UNOCHA
Sunia Ratulevu	Fiji

Susan Slattery	Australian Red Cross Society
Susie Jin	UNOCHA
Suzanne Paisley	GNS Science NZ
Sylvie Goyet	SPC
Tagaloa Cooper	SPREP
Taito Nakalevu	SPC
Takena Redern	Kiribati
Tamani Rarama	Pacific Sexual Gender Diversity Network
Teea Tira	PIFS
Terri O'Quinn	UN WOMEN
Tim Westbury	UNESCAP
Timmy Langrine	Marshall Islands
Timo Baur	GIZ
Tommy Moore	SPREP
Viliame Kasanawaqa	PIDF
Vineil Narayan	Fiji
Vini Talai	UNOCHA
Vita Matnimeke	SPC
Waisale Naqiolevu	SPC
Waymine Towai	Palau
Winifereti Nainoca	UNDP
Wulf Killmann	GIZ
Zitu Fernandes	Timor Leste

CONTACT INFORMATION

For any further information or clarification on this report and event please contact the partners and organising committee on the details below.

SPREP

Audrey Brown-Pereira
Executive Officer
audreyp@sprep.org

Espen Ronneberg
Climate Change Adviser
espenr@sprep.org

Tagaloa Cooper-Halo
Climate Change Coordination Adviser
tagaloac@sprep.org

Pacific Community SPC

Lisa Kingsberry
Disaster Risk Communications Advisor
lisak@spc.int

UNISDR

Andrew McElroy
Sub-Regional Coordinator
mcelroy@un.org





