

GCCA +



THE GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE PLUS INITIATIVE



Funded by
the European Union

SCALING UP PACIFIC ADAPTATION (SUPA)

Inception & Planning Meeting
4 – 6 March 2019

Holiday Inn, Suva, Fiji

Final Meeting Report



Table of Contents

List of abbreviations	ii
Executive summary	iii
Background	1
Introduction.....	1
Meeting objectives.....	2
Meeting agenda.....	2
Meeting participants.....	2
Day 1: 4th March 2019: Laying the foundation of the GCCA+ SUPA Action	4
Official opening.....	4
Introduction to the GCCA+ SUPA.....	5
Intra-ACP GCCA+ Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change and Resilience Building (PACRES) project and its linkages to GCCA+ SUPA.....	7
Panel Discussion: Building partnerships for funding future scaling up – Meeting the challenges of direct and indirect access to climate funding.....	8
Day 2: 5th March 2019: Exploring approaches and options for scaling up	11
Exploring a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach.....	11
Marketplace to explore potential scaling up approaches.....	11
Day 3: 6th March 2019: Project planning	13
Defining the criteria for scaling up.....	13
Management and financial arrangements for delivery of Output 3.....	14
Communication and visibility for GCCA+ SUPA project.....	14
Planning the next steps in 2019 for Output 3.....	15
Meeting evaluation.....	15
Annex 1: Agenda.....	17
Annex 2: Participants list.....	20
Annex 3: Guiding notes and discussions on scaling up in Output 3.....	24
Annex 3a: Template: National Approach to Scaling Up.....	26
Annex 4: Template: Planning for 2019.....	28
Annex 5: Summary of the meeting evaluation.....	31

List of Abbreviations

ACP	Africa, Caribbean, Pacific grouping
ACSE	EU-GIZ Adapting to Climate Change and Sustainable Energy
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AF	Adaptation Fund
COP	Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific
EPS	Ecological purification system
EU	European Union
EUR	Euros
FDB	Fiji Development Bank
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
FRDP	Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific
GCCA: PSIS	Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project
GCCA+ SUPA	Global Climate Change Alliance Plus - Scaling Up Pacific Adaptation project
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEM	Geosciences Energy and Maritime Division (SPC)
GESI	Gender equality and social inclusion
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISACC	Institutional Strengthening in Pacific Island Countries to Adaptation to Climate Change project
JNAP	Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project
PACRES	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change and Resilience Building, GCCA+ Intra-ACP Pacific Action
PacTVET	Pacific Technical and Vocational Education and Training
PEFA	Public expenditure and financial accountability
PFM	Public financial management
PICRAFI	Pacific Islands Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PRFRP	Pacific Regional Federation of Pacific Professionals
RENI	EU – North Pacific – Readiness for El Niño project
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
RRRT	Regional Rights Resource Team (SPC)
RTSM	Regional Technical Support Mechanism
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SDP	Social Development Programme, (SPC)
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SODIS	Solar disinfection
SPC	Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USD	United States dollars
USP	University of the South Pacific

Executive Summary

The Global Climate Change Alliance Plus – Scaling Up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA) project is about enhancing Pacific climate change adaptation by (i) assessing the past to build sustainability into strategic planning, (ii) addressing previously-identified capacity gaps and (iii) implementing scaling up through sector focused, on-the-ground measures. The 4.5-year project (2019 – 2023) is funded with EUR14.89 million from the European Union (EU) and implemented by the Pacific Community (SPC) in partnership with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the University of the South Pacific (USP) in collaboration with the governments and peoples of Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, Kiribati, Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga and Tuvalu.

The inception and planning meeting in Suva, Fiji took place from 4 - 6 March 2019 and participants from each project country representing national climate change agencies took part, together with development partners and the GCCA+ SUPA team from SPC, SPREP and USP.

The meeting was successful in achieving all its objectives:

1. Launch and introduce the project to national partners;
2. Discuss the concept of “scaling up” and prepare criteria for scaling up in the project; and
3. Prepare preliminary plans for project activities for 2019.

The implementing partners introduced their respective outputs to the meeting delegates: SPREP introduced Output 1: Strengthen strategic planning at national levels; USP introduced Output 2: Enhance the capacity of sub-national government stakeholders to build resilient communities; and SPC introduced Output 3: Scaling up resilient development measures in specific sectors. Discussions focused on the human resources needed in-country to deliver the three outputs; the kind of assistance countries can expect from the GCCA+ SUPA team with regards to identifying the sector, geographical focus and specific measure to be scaled up; and the knowledge management needs of countries that do not currently have climate change portals or databases. The GCCA+ SUPA Project Management Unit also informed delegates about the management and financial arrangements for the delivery of Output 3.

The participants developed criteria for scaling up. Examples from three sectors: food and water security, and coastal protection were used to guide the discussions. (Other sectors to be considered within the scope of GCCA+ SUPA are human health and marine resources). Apart from the development of criteria for scaling up, country representatives also made preliminary plans for national project activities for Output 3 in 2019. These comprised the steps to hold national consultations; the prioritisation, selection and approval of the sector; and the identification of the geographical focus and the specific measure to be scaled up.

Among the highlights of the meeting was the Marketplace session, which provided an opportunity for national partners to see and discuss a variety of technical tools, practices and examples of scaling up climate change adaptation interventions. Teams from SPC, SPREP and USP participated, and in the case of SPC the Marketplace also provided an opportunity to demonstrate inter-divisional collaboration.

The panel session on “Meeting the challenges of direct and indirect access to climate funding” was another highlight and provided an opportunity for countries and development partners to share their views and experiences on this issue. Partnerships are vital for any significant scaling up of climate change adaptation measures. Overall, the panel discussion concluded that getting national accreditation to the international climate change funds improves a country’s financial management system. The

drawback however, is the amount of time and resources needed to ensure that the country meets the accreditation requirements. The panel also shared their views on the nature of a “bankable” project.

Other important sessions included an introduction to the gender-sensitive and rights-based approach. The project capitalised on expertise available within SPC’s Social Development Programme (SDP) and Regional Rights Resource Team (RRRT) to explain the relevance of applying a human rights and gender lens to the GCCA+ SUPA project and to help participants understand the importance of applying a people-centred approach to all project activities.

The meeting included an introduction to the Intra-ACP GCCA+ Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change and Resilience Building (PACRES) which is led by SPREP. Linkages between the GCCA+ SUPA and Intra-ACP GCCA+ PACRES were highlighted.

Overall, the meeting provided participants with a comprehensive introduction to the GCCA+ SUPA project and an opportunity to plan 2019 activities.

Background



Group photo of Inception and Planning Meeting participants

Introduction

Climate change and natural disasters are among the greatest challenges jeopardising and undermining the ability of all countries, in particular Pacific countries, to achieve the sustainable development goals and reduce poverty. The Global Climate Change Alliance Plus – Scaling Up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA) project falls under the GCCA+ flagship initiative, which has three priorities: (i) mainstreaming climate change issues into poverty reduction and development efforts; (ii) increasing resilience to climate related stresses and shocks; and (iii) Supporting the formulation and implementation of concrete and integrated sector-based climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies.

The GCCA+ SUPA project is about scaling up climate change adaptation measures in specific sectors supported by knowledge management and capacity building. The 4.5-year project (2019 – 2023) is funded with EUR14.89 million from the European Union (EU) and implemented by the Pacific Community (SPC) in partnership with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the University of the South Pacific (USP) in collaboration with the governments and peoples of Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, Kiribati, Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga and Tuvalu.

The overall objective is to enhance climate change adaptation and resilience within ten Pacific Island countries. The specific objective is to strengthen the implementation of sector-based, but integrated, climate change and disaster risk management strategies and plans.

The three key outputs for the GCCA+ SUPA project are:

1. Strengthen strategic planning at national levels
2. Enhance the capacity of sub-national government stakeholders to build resilient communities
3. Scale up resilient development measures in specific sectors

The activities will adopt a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach throughout and will take into account lessons learnt and wise practices from the regional, national, sub-national and community-based projects and programmes implemented over the last decade.

The Action will enhance the capacity of national and sub-national government and civil society stakeholders, and contribute to the *Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP)*, the *Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction*, the *Paris Agreement to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*, and the *Sustainable Development Goals*, particularly SDG 1: end poverty, SDG 2: zero hunger, SDG 3: good health and wellbeing, SDG 5: gender equality, SDG 6: clean water and sanitation, SDG 13: climate action and SDG 14: life below water.



The Inception and Planning Meeting of the GCCA+ SUPA project was held at the Holiday Inn, Suva, Fiji, from 4-6 March 2019.

Meeting objectives

The meeting had the following objectives:

1. Launch and introduce the project to national partners;
2. Discuss the concept of “scaling up” and prepare criteria for scaling up in the project; and
3. Make preliminary plans for project activities in Output 3 for 2019.

Meeting agenda

The meeting agenda is presented as Annex 1. Besides the official inception meeting, participants were also introduced to the application of a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach, the options available for the financial and management arrangements for Output 3, which is led and implemented by SPC, and various ways to communicate the project activities. Countries also started the planning of their 2019 activities which are primarily focused on national consultations to select the sector, geographical focus and specific measure to be scaled up. In an effort to get countries to start thinking of long-term scaling up and the funding that will be required, the meeting agenda included a panel discussion on “Meeting the challenges of direct and indirect access to climate funding”. As “scaling up” is relatively new to the Pacific it was necessary to include a marketplace in the agenda where technical teams from SPC, SPREP and USP were able to discuss with meeting participants ideas for scaling up in different sectors and also showcase technical tools, practices and examples from the different sectors.

Meeting participants

The meeting participants included:

- Government representatives from climate change agencies from nine of the ten project countries and technical agencies.
- Representatives from development partners:
 - European Union (EU)
 - EU-GIZ Adapting to Climate Change and Sustainable Energy (ACSE)
 - GCCA+ SUPA project team
 - Pacific Community (SPC)
 - SPC-Geosciences, Energy and Maritime Division (GEM)
 - SPC-Regional Rights Resource Team (RRRT)
 - SPC-Social Development Programme (SDP)
 - Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)

- Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
- University of the South Pacific (USP)

The list of participants is presented as Annex 2.

Day 1: Monday 4th March 2019
Laying the foundation of the GCCA+ SUPA Action



Opening Ceremony

(From left to right: Titilia Rabuatoka, Adrian Nicolae, Andrew Jones, Nilesch Prakash)

Official Opening

The session was facilitated by Titilia Rabuatoka, Acting Project Implementation Officer, GCCA+ SUPA. She welcomed the participants and started the session with an opening prayer.

Andrew Jones, Director of SPC-GEM Division also welcomed the participants. Recognising the resilience of Pacific Island people, and understanding that they are at the centre of the GCCA+ SUPA project, the biggest challenge is to find Pacific solutions to the challenges and issues being faced. During the first phase of the GCCA, between 2012 and 2016, SPC worked with the smaller Pacific Island countries to trial on-the-ground climate change adaptation measures in several sectors, including food and water security, health, coastal protection and fisheries. Through these activities valuable lessons were learnt and shared with others about the types of measures that work well in our Pacific context, especially for communities living in small, remote outer islands. For example, we learnt that simple low cost measures are often the most successful, such as solar disinfection or SODIS, which uses the ultra violet radiation provided by sunlight to make contaminated well water safe to drink. Other lessons included the importance of maintenance for all infrastructure, whether it is water storage tanks or coastal protection measures. During this new GCCA+ SUPA project, we will firstly listen to the countries to hear what scaling up means in the national context and then build partnerships to assess, select and scale up those past measures which have proven effective. The team selected to manage the GCCA+ SUPA project care deeply about Pacific people and are looking forward to work with the countries.

A video entitled “GCCA timeline: A brief history on GCCA” was shown.

Adrian Nicolae, Team Leader Climate Change, Energy and Circular Economy, Delegation of the European Union for the Pacific, noted that the GCCA was not starting from scratch in the Pacific region, rather there had been two regional initiatives led by SPC and USP between 2010 and 2017. Also Pacific partners had featured at a GCCA+ side event at the Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP 24). The European Union (EU) supports many different, but related, projects relating to climate change, including the GCCA+ SUPA, the Intra-ACP

GCCA+ Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change and Resilience Building (PACRES), and the Climate Services project. At a ceremonial, high-level session in Apia at the end of February 2019, the EU Commissioner for International Cooperation and Development, Mr. Neven Mimica, signed the GCCA+ SUPA agreement, and other agreements. This heralded a new phase of support and cooperation in the Pacific region. The groundwork has been laid to start implementation of scaling up measures which will reach down to the household level. The integration of a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach into the GCCA+ SUPA project opens many new potential opportunities and the EU wishes you a successful meeting and looks forward to hearing the outcomes.

Mr. Nilesh Prakash, Head of Climate Change and Development Cooperation, Government of Fiji, acknowledged the financial support received from the EU. The Paris Agreement supports our efforts to ensure that no one is left behind. He also noted there is a need to translate the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) 1.5°C report to the national level as it represents a timeline for everyone. The Pacific region is the most vulnerable region to climate change but it is also the most resilient region. This was seen in the aftermath of Tropical Cyclone Winston, when it was also apparent that the most disadvantaged people need the most help and social protection. To this end, the Fiji National Adaptation Plan represents a systematic strategic approach which involves all sectors and the GCCA+ SUPA project presents an opportune time to strengthen this plan.

Following the opening ceremony, participants introduced themselves. This was followed by a group photograph.

Introduction to the GCCA+ SUPA

Overview

Gillian Cambers, Project Manager GCCA+ SUPA gave a presentation showing the overall framework of the GCCA+ SUPA project. This included a description of the three key outputs:

- Output 1, delivery led by SPREP: Climate and disaster risk information, knowledge management and strategic planning capacities strengthened at national and regional levels.
- Output 2, delivery led by USP: Planning and decision making capacities to address climate change and disaster risks at sub-national government and community level strengthened, applying participatory, gender-sensitive and rights-based approaches.
- Output 3, delivery led by SPC: Strategic and local interventions for climate change adaptation and mainstreaming scaled up in up to five sectors.

She emphasised that all outputs will be delivered in a collaborative and coordinated manner and that a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach will be adopted throughout. An outline of the meeting agenda was also presented.

Discussion

- It was clarified that the impact assessment to be conducted as part of Output 1 will include activities and lessons learnt from successful projects implemented by the different agencies and not just former projects conducted under the GCCA umbrella.
- There are opportunities for sharing national coordinators across the three outputs.
- There is scope within the project for countries to combine efforts in their scaling up measures for Output 3.

- In response to a question about the EU moving to programmatic funding, it was clarified the EU already adopts a programmatic approach when engaging with countries to provide budget support for certain sectors, including energy, waste management and sanitation. This is seen as a way to support government systems for the sector. GCCA+ SUPA is an example of moving from *ad hoc* activities into a more programmatic and sustainable approach.

Output 1: Strengthen strategic planning at national levels

Espen Ronneberg, Climate Change Adviser, SPREP, gave a presentation on Output 1¹. This output focuses on assessing the impact of past projects. This will facilitate improved project design with sustainability at the forefront. An impact methodology will be developed and tested. Focusing on three countries with existing national climate change portals, past completed climate change adaptation projects will be compiled and analysed using the impact methodology. An impacts database will be developed for each of the three countries and incorporated into their national portals. Training and capacity building throughout the project will assist countries in using the impacts database in their decision-making and prioritisation process.

Discussion

- Some of the country representatives mentioned that compilations of past projects already exist, e.g. in Tonga as part of the Joint National Action Plan (JNAP) for Climate Change and Disaster Management process, stocktakes have been undertaken; and the National Environment Service in Cook Islands has a list of projects.
- The impact analysis is timely in that it may also identify unanticipated impacts, both beneficial and adverse, e.g. the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change 2007 - 2014 (PACC) project in Palau focused on taro, and an indirect impact was an invasion of mud crabs, which proved to be economically beneficial.
- Other projects and development partners may also contribute to the impact analysis. Countries may also contribute e.g. an impact analysis of a water security project in Fais Island, Yap State, FSM that was completed in 2015, is in progress and has already yielded interesting findings.
- Several countries asked about the hiring of project officers/national coordinators. There are provisions for these officers under each output, and the implementing partners will coordinate between themselves and with each country individually to provide the most effective support.
- There was discussion about which countries would be selected for Output 1. It was noted that three countries have national portals, and three more are in the process of developing portals. There is insufficient scope within the GCCA+ SUPA project to establish new portals.

Output 2: Enhance the capacity of sub-national government stakeholders to build resilient communities

Aliti Koroï, GCCA+ SUPA Project Coordinator North, USP gave a presentation on Output 2. This output will build capacity for local area stakeholders at the sub-national, provincial, state and local area levels of government especially in the geographical areas selected by the countries for the scaling up measures in Output 3. Following a diagnostic assessment of training needs, accredited training courses in resilient development will be developed and delivered, tailored to the local context and delivered in local languages. Building local capacity to contribute to the design, implementation and evaluation of local area development plans is another key component.

Discussion

¹ This presentation was given at the beginning of Day 2, but to maintain logical flow, it is recorded here.

- Clarification was provided that the diagnostic training needs assessment will supplement previous assessments such as those conducted by the European Union Pacific Technical and Vocational Education and Training (PacTVET) project.
- Delivery of Output 2 will involve close collaboration with the PacTVET project and the PACRES project.
- There was considerable discussion about the sectors that would be involved in the resilience training. This will depend to some extent on the sectors selected by the countries for Output 3 and the sectors covered by other projects, e.g. the energy sector is covered by the EU-GIZ-ACSE project.
- Similarly, requests to update existing policies will be reviewed in the context of the sector the country has selected for Output 3, and there is provision for such work under Output 3.
- There was a request for monitoring and evaluation to be offered as part of the resilience training.
- Filtering the training to the community level was another discussion area. Reference was made to collaboration with local institutions such as the Kiribati Institute of Technology, which provided a training course in water storage systems, and the UN Capital Development Fund in Tuvalu, which channelled funding to local area governments.

Output 3: Scale up resilient development measures in specific sectors

Titilia Rabuatoka gave a presentation on Output 3. After describing examples and lessons learnt from previous demonstration projects in the food and water security sectors and the coastal protection sector, she described, with examples, four potential approaches to scaling up: (i) enhancement or strengthening, (ii) expansion, (iii) replication and (iv) addition of a complementary approach. Her presentation outlined the specific activities within Output 3 and a timeframe for their delivery.

Discussion

- Guidance will be provided to the governments as they embark on a consultative process to identify sectors and measures to be scaled up. This will depend on each country's needs and requests.

Intra-ACP GCCA+ Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change and Resilience Building (PACRES) and its linkages to GCCA+ SUPA

Martin Sharp, Project Manager PACRES, gave a presentation describing the scope of PACRES. This €12 million project aims to ensure better regional and national adaptation and mitigation responses to climate change challenges faced by the 15 Pacific ACP countries. PACRES is being implemented by SPREP as the lead organisation, in collaboration with PIFS, SPC and USP. It has six key result areas which, in practice will strengthen regional capacity to assist partner countries through:

- Capacity development;
- Strengthening climate change and disaster resilience networks;
- Information and tools for decision-makers;
- Support to implement regional and national climate change strategies and priorities; and
- Scaling up adaptation pilots, with a focus on ecosystem-based adaptation, in Pacific ACP countries not participating in GCCA+ SUPA.

Discussion

- The activities scaling up adaptation pilots will involve Pacific ACP countries not included in GCCA+ SUPA and will focus on ecosystem-based adaptation. This is likely to include working

closely with, and building on activities under, the Pacific Ecosystem-based Adaptation to Climate Change (PEBACC) project.

- Engaging with the private sector will likely involve strengthening strategic engagement with the private sector and increasing opportunities for the private sector to access and share climate change and disaster resilience and best practices.
- PACRES will adopt a regional focus for information sharing and capacity development, which will include a new research programme managed by USP and up-scaling of technical and vocational education and training in resilience.

Panel Discussion: Building partnerships for funding future scaling up - Meeting the challenges of direct and indirect access to climate funding

The panel was moderated by Vuki Buadromo, Project Manager, Institutional Strengthening for Adaptation to Climate Change (ISACC) project. She introduced the panellists:

- Richard Neves, Public Financial Management Advisor, International Monetary Fund (IMF)
- Nafitalai Cakacaka, General Manager Business Risk Services, Fiji Development Bank (FDB)
- Kevin Petrini, Resilience and Sustainable Development Team Leader, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- Susan Sulu, Climate Change Finance & Planning Officer, PIFS

Vuki Buadromo set the scene for the panel discussion by providing a working definition for climate finance, namely any funding directly for climate change adaptation or mitigation projects. Direct access relates to funding received directly from the donor, while indirect access relates to climate finance received by the country through an accredited entity e.g. UNDP, SPC, SPREP and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) which are accredited agencies to the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

Richard Neves, in his introduction described the public financial management (PFM) cycle, and the public expenditure and financial accountability (PEFA) assessments. His focus was on direct access to climate finance and he drew on his past experience as Financial Secretary in the Cook Islands. It took Cook Islands two years of rigorous work to become accredited to the Adaptation Fund (AF). Accreditation to the GCF is even more rigorous. Sometimes the requirements of the large climate funds are beyond the capacity of a small country, and in this case, it may be better to go through a third party.

Kevin Petrini stressed the importance of the SDGs and noted that they were all linked to climate change. PIFS is the lead organisation in the region for the SDGs. He noted that defining climate finance is a difficult task. The particular routes used by a country to access climate finance will depend on their political framework and internal processes and it is important to view climate finance all the way through to the use of the funds for on-the-ground implementation. He also noted that globally we are spending USD1.3 trillion in fuel subsidies.

Susan Sulu described the process for the ongoing climate finance assessments, which have been completed for ten countries. It was noted that often those countries most in need may not have the necessary capacity. There are challenges with vertical and horizontal coordination, and duplication of effort often leading to ineffective use of resources. Some countries have noted long delays in disbursement from the international climate funds. Gender equality and social inclusion (GESI) is one of the key requirements for accessing funds from the international climate funds.

Nafitalai Cakacaka outlined how it took the Fiji Development Bank three years to gain accreditation to the GCF, and even then they could not get the accreditation level for larger projects of up to USD 50

million. Echoing the previous speakers, he noted that one of the biggest challenges was a shortage of institutional capacity. Further it was hard to identify suitable projects at the accredited level that met the requirements of the government and qualify under the criteria for the international fund.

Following the introductions by the panel, participants were divided into small groups and discussed:

- The progress made in their countries to enable more effective indirect/direct access to climate finance.
- Key challenges faced regarding indirect/direct access.

They then prepared questions to pose to the panel members on how to address the challenges of direct and indirect access to climate funding.



*Discussion groups during the climate finance session
(left to right Morgan Wairiu, Charlotte Pihigia, Bipendra Prakash, Pepetua Latasi)*

Discussion

Building capacity

- For a small country such as Niue, a two-step process might help build capacity, e.g. by becoming a delivery partner first and then building up to become an accredited entity.
- Countries have different capacities and are unique in many ways, e.g. a small country might have very little capacity but on the other hand it might have very strong financial systems. There are potential benefits in seeking accreditation such as strengthening a country's financial management processes, and building national ownership of projects. Understanding where your country's funding is coming from is a critical first step since some bilateral partnerships may allow more flexibility than the international climate funds.
- Even after becoming accredited to an international climate fund, the smaller Small Island Developing States (SIDS) may need assistance with maintaining the standards of their systems. Regional organisations are providing some assistance e.g. with climate change finance assessments and climate finance tracking tools. Other accredited institutions may also provide assistance.

Private sector investment

- Private sector mapping and establishment of a database has been undertaken in Samoa and Vanuatu. This is now being used by ministries of climate change to understand the priorities of the private sector and include them in climate change planning.
- Private sector involvement to date has been mainly in the utilities and insurance sectors.
- Blending grants and loans from the GCF has been used for a hydroelectric project in Vanuatu and this project also reduces carbon dioxide emissions.

- Parametric disaster risk insurance is being provided by the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PICRAFI).

Timeframes for funding

- Countries noted that donors often take a long time to respond to a country's submission and this may result in a proposal being overtaken by time.
- Examples were discussed of the reverse case where a country may be given a ridiculously short time to design and implement a project.
- There is a need for a more programmatic, holistic approach among donors, intermediaries and countries.
- It was noted that the GCF has a scheduled four-year cycle with known deadlines and rigid processes.

Bankable projects

- Some donors have responded to countries' requests by asking for bankable projects.
- The term obviously depends on the requirements of the specific donor, but may well include provision of a detailed design and specifications, cost benefit analysis, gender equity and social inclusion analysis, and environmental permits.

Trust funds

- One country, Tonga, has established its own climate change trust fund with a USD 4 million capital endowment and a USD 1 million operational account.
- The question was raised how donors could contribute to the trust fund. It was noted that for some donors this may be a challenge since trust funds have their own systems.

Coordination of climate finance

- A call was made for better coordination and improved information sharing of climate finance that comes into the region through regional projects such as GCCA+ SUPA and Intra-ACP GCCA+ PACRES.
- The Pacific Resilience Partnership could be an opportunity to provide this coordination through their taskforce, and PIFS might be the best organisation to lead this.
- It is important to realise that country leadership is critical.

Closing remarks

- All of the panellists noted the importance of continual information sharing.
- Seeking national accreditation to an international climate fund strengthens a country's systems and processes, which is to the benefit of the country.
- Climate finance is an evolving field and there is still much work to be done at all levels.

Day 2: Tuesday 5th March 2019
Exploring approaches and options for scaling up

The second day was facilitated by Zhiyad Khan, Communication and Liaison Officer, GCCA+ SUPA. He welcomed the participants and Titilia Rabuatoka offered a short prayer.

Exploring a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach



A group working on the “Sinking boat” activity

The session began with an introduction by Kuiniselani Toelupe Tago-Elisara, Director Social Development Programme, SPC. Following the introduction, Martin Child, Senior Human Rights Adviser, SPC delivered an interactive presentation on the elements and principles of a rights-based approach. The three elements are drawn from the United Nations Common Understanding of Rights-based Approach: (i) development should seek to further the realisation of human rights; (ii) human rights standards and principles should guide development implementation; and (iii) development should enhance the capacity of duty-bearers to meet obligations, and of rights-holders to make claims. He also highlighted the differences between needs-based and rights-based approaches. Meeting delegates participated in the “Sinking boat” activity to better understand the meaning of individual human rights.

Joanne Kunatuba, Human Development Officer – Gender Equality, SPC also delivered an interactive presentation on the importance of applying a people-centred approach to the GCCA+ SUPA project. She highlighted the difference between equality and equity. The “Power Walk” activity helped participants to see the importance of understanding the needs, the rights and the vulnerabilities of the different groups that make up a community. The “Cookie” activity reiterated the practical differences between equality and equity. Overall, the meeting delegates gained a preliminary understanding on mainstreaming gender equality, social inclusion and the rights-based approach into the implementation of the GCCA+ SUPA project.

Marketplace to explore potential scaling up approaches

A marketplace was set up on the afternoon of the second day and technical teams from SPC, SPREP and USP were invited to showcase some of their work and provide an opportunity for participants to

explore potential scaling up climate change adaptation approaches in the respective sectors - water security, food security, coastal protection, health and water quality, coastal fisheries, ecosystem-based approaches and capacity building. Positive feedback on the marketplace was received from participants.

“The marketplace is very crucial as it gives opportunities to participants to actually see demonstrations from various sectors. This should be conducted in regional climate change workshops in future.”
(Quote from final evaluation).



Water security team describing the groundwater sensing equipment



Health and water quality team presenting the Ecological Purification System



Capacity building team showcasing the regional Resilience qualifications



Part of the Ecosystem-based approaches stall at the marketplace

Day 3: Wednesday 6th March 2019
Project planning

The final day of the meeting was facilitated by Gillian Cambers who outlined the plans for Day 3 before participants watched a lessons learnt video compiled by the Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Islands States (GCCA: PSIS) project and entitled “*Advancing climate change adaptation in the Pacific: Experiences from the past 5 years*”.

Defining the criteria for scaling up

Following the lessons learnt video, Gillian Cambers gave a presentation to introduce the session on defining the criteria for scaling up in Output 3. Participants were divided into three groups to propose and discuss criteria, prior to sharing with the wider group. The general criteria derived from this session are described below. (More detailed information is provided in Annex 3 – Guiding notes and discussions on scaling up in Output 3).

Sector selection:

- Sector selection to be linked to national priorities.
- Each country to select **one** sector for scaling up.
- Exceptions may be made for smaller, more remote communities where inclusion of a secondary sector may provide added value, e.g. extracting groundwater (primary sector) with a solar-powered pump (secondary sector) or installing a rainwater harvesting system (primary sector) and adding a solar-powered water heater (secondary sector).

Selection of measure to be scaled up:

- Identify a tested and effective previous measure that has elements of sustainability, and can be scaled up in the project timeframe. (It does not have to be any of the previous GCCA projects).
- An effective measure from one country could be scaled up and contextualised in another country, e.g. replication of the use of drought-tolerant crops from country A in country B.
- The selected scaled up measures must have socio-economic benefits for the communities and be implemented using a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach.
- The selected scaled up measure must fit within the scope of the SUPA budget and its timeframe although there are possibilities for partnerships with countries’ national budgets or other projects.
- Recognising that maintenance of government-owned infrastructure is the responsibility of the particular government agency, provisions for maintaining the newly scaled up measure must be included in the GCCA+ SUPA intervention as this is essential for sustainability.

Following the meeting these criteria were developed into a template for use by the countries in their prioritisation and selection processes, see Annex 3a.

Management and financial arrangements for delivery of Output 3 by SPC

Swastika Raju, Finance Officer EU – North Pacific – Readiness for El Niño (RENI) project, gave a presentation on the budget breakdown, reporting currency and the different project implementation and management modes for Output 3. The two main modalities for scaling up on-the-ground measures are a direct grant to the government, or financial management (including procurement and payments) by SPC. For national project officers, similarly the two modalities are a direct grant with the country so the country is responsible for recruitment and payment of the officer, or direct hire by SPC. A country can choose more than one modality.

Discussion

- The total budget for scaling up in Output 3 is EUR 8.09 million. Of this about EUR 5 million is for countries (hire of national project staff and implementation activities) and the remainder is allocated for the inception meeting, steering committee meetings, communications and visibility, and travel.
- Recruitment of national project officers – whether one or two officers – is a national decision but it must be noted that having two officers will reduce the funds available for activities.
- Recognising that there are three outputs, each with national project staff requirements, there are opportunities to share positions between the outputs.
- There is provision for a country to select different financial modalities.
- Recognising that for some countries, several levels of approval may be required, it was confirmed that the selection of the sector and measure(s) to be scaled up is provisionally scheduled to be completed in 2019.

Communications and visibility for the GCCA+ SUPA project

Zhiyad Khan, gave a presentation on communications and visibility for the project and the specific objectives: to convey project information, awareness raising, partner visibility and climate change adaptation education. He also informed the meeting participants about the importance of selecting the most appropriate communication tool as different objectives and target audiences will require different tools.



Examples of communication tools

It was noted that there are plans to produce short videos for the GCCA+ SUPA project. He also shared the key message or boilerplate that should appear on all print and visual media for the project:

The Global Climate Change Alliance Plus Scaling up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA) is about scaling up climate change adaptation measures in specific sectors supported by knowledge management and capacity building. The 4.5 year project (2019-2023) is funded with € 14.89 million from the European Union and implemented by The Pacific Community in partnership with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme and the University of the South Pacific, in collaboration with the governments and peoples of Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga and Tuvalu.

Discussion

- The production of short videos will depend on the roll-out of activities. Capturing footage during the early planning stages of the project is important, as well as throughout the project.

Planning the next steps in 2019 for Output 3

Gillian Cambers introduced the planning session and the national representatives of the implementing countries each completed a 2019 planning template. Participants indicated on the template the type of assistance that they would require from the GCCA+ SUPA team in 2019. (The template is attached as Annex 4). The completed templates have been compiled and will guide the next steps for Output 3. (The completed templates are not included in this report as several participants indicated they were provisional and they would need to take further advice).

The meeting was then concluded by Gillian Cambers who, on behalf of the project, thanked the participants, the EU, implementing partners and other agencies represented at the meeting.

Meeting evaluation

Participants completed individual evaluation forms; these have been compiled in Annex 5. The majority of participants scaled the individual sessions as either a 4 or 5, with 5 being the highest score. The meeting objectives were fully met. Comments given by the participants provided some useful insights.

The climate finance session on Day 1 was well received with some interesting highlights from respondents:

“Experiences of Fiji and the Cook Islands in their journeys to getting accreditation and whether the benefit is worthwhile given the time and effort required.”

“Relative difficulty of working with the Adaptation Fund (AF) compared with the Green Climate Fund (GCF).”

The session on gender-sensitive and rights-based approaches on Day 2 provided valuable information:

“The inclusion of a human rights approach gives us a whole new perspective on this topic especially during the project development phase.”

“The practical exercise was very useful. It helps us understand the influence of status in a society.”

The marketplace encouraged information sharing and networking:

“Learning in a simple and practical way about what each programme is delivering in the region.”

“Demonstrated where CROP technical expertise can support project assessments and inform design.”

Whilst the session on defining the criteria on scaling up was interesting and provided an opportunity for participants to learn from others experiences, there were areas where respondents would like more information:

“How this project could work with other projects.”

“Maintenance and what the project means by this as some countries may have their own interpretation.”

Overall, the meeting provided participants with a comprehensive perspective of the GCCA+ SUPA project.

“Provided a view of the expected project from inception to the final outputs.”

Annex 1: Agenda



Global Climate Change Alliance Plus Scaling Up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA)

Inception and Planning Meeting
4th – 6th March 2019, Holiday Inn, Suva, Fiji

AGENDA

Day 1: 4 th March 2019 LAYING THE FOUNDATION OF GCCA+ SUPA	
	OPENING CEREMONY (<i>Facilitator Titilia Rabuatoka, Acting Project Implementation Officer, SPC</i>)
09.00 – 10.00	Welcome (<i>Andrew Jones, Director Geosciences, Energy and Maritime (GEM) Division, SPC</i>)
	Video: “GCCA timeline: A brief history on GCCA”
	Opening remarks (<i>Adrian Nicolae, Team Leader Climate Change, Energy, Circular Economy, EU Delegation</i>)
	Remarks (<i>Nilesh Prakash, Head of Climate Change & International Cooperation, Fiji</i>)
10.00 – 10.30	Group photo & morning tea
	INTRODUCTION TO GCCA+ SUPA (<i>Facilitator Andrew Jones</i>)
10.30 – 11.00	Overview of GCCA+ SUPA (<i>Gillian Cambers, Project Manager GCCA+ SUPA, SPC</i>)
11.00 – 11.45	Introduction to Output 2 and discussion: Capacity building (<i>Aliti Koroi, Project Coordinator North, University of the South Pacific (USP)</i>)
11.45 – 12.30	Introduction to Output 3 and discussion: Scaling up Pacific Adaptation (<i>Titilia Rabuatoka</i>)
12.30 – 13.00	Introduction to the Intra-ACP GCCA+ Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change and Resilience Building (PACRES) project and its linkages to GCCA+ SUPA (<i>Martin Sharp, Project Manager Intra-ACP GCCA+ PACRES, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)</i>)
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch
	PANEL DISCUSSION: BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS FOR FUNDING FUTURE SCALING UP: Meeting the challenges of direct and indirect access to climate funding

14.00 – 14.45	<p>Panel Moderator: <i>Vuki Buadromo, Project Manager, Institutional Strengthening for Adaptation to Climate Change (ISACC) project</i></p> <p>Introduction to the topic by the Panel members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mr. Richard Neves, International Monetary Fund (IMF) - Mr. Nafitalai Cakacaka (FDB) - Mr. Kevin Petrini, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) - Ms. Susan Sulu, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)
14.45 – 15:30	Small groups discussion
15.30 – 16.30	Panel Q&A
16.30 – 16.45	Wrap-up of Day 1 (<i>Andrew Jones, SPC</i>)
17.00 – 19.00	Networking Reception
<p>Day 2: 5th March 2019 <i>(Facilitator: Zhiyad Khan, Communications Officer, GCCA+ SUPA)</i> EXPLORING APPROACHES AND OPTIONS FOR SCALING UP</p>	
08.45 – 09.30	Introduction to Output 1 and discussion: Knowledge Management (<i>Espen Ronneberg, Climate Change Adviser, SPREP</i>)
	EXPLORING A GENDER-SENSITIVE AND RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH
09.30 – 10.30	Introduction to a gender-sensitive & rights-based approach (<i>Kuiniselani Toelupe Tago-Elisara, Director, and Joanne Kunatuba, Human Development Officer – Gender Equality, Social Development Programme, SPC; and Martin Child, Senior Human Rights Adviser, Regional Rights Resource Team, SPC</i>)
10.30 – 11.00	Morning tea
11.00 – 13.00	Introduction to a gender-sensitive & rights-based approach (continued)
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch
	MARKET PLACE TO EXPLORE POTENTIAL SCALING UP APPROACHES
14.00 – 16.30	<p>Scaling up market place:</p> <p>Market stall 1: Water security (SPC – Geosciences, Energy and Maritime Division (GEM))</p> <p>Market stall 2: Food security (SPC – Land Resources Division (LRD))</p> <p>Market stall 3: Coastal protection (SPC – Geosciences, Energy and Maritime Division (GEM))</p> <p>Market stall 4: Health and water quality (SPC – Geosciences, Energy and Maritime Division (GEM) and Public Health Division (PHD))</p> <p>Market stall 5: Coastal fisheries (SPC – Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Ecosystems (FAME))</p> <p>Market stall 6: Ecosystem-based approaches (SPREP)</p> <p>Market stall 7: Capacity building for resilience (USP)</p>

Day 3: 6th March 2019
(Facilitator: Gillian Cambers, Project Manager, GCCA+ SUPA)
PROJECT PLANNING

08.45 – 09.00	Introduction to Day 3
09.00 – 09.15	Video: “ <i>Advancing climate change adaptation in the Pacific: Experiences from the past 5 years</i> ”
	DEFINING THE CRITERIA FOR SCALING UP FOR OUTPUT 3: Scaling up resilient development measures in specific sectors
09.15 – 10.30	Introduction Group work and sharing session to draft criteria for scaling up Pacific climate change adaptation interventions
10.30 – 11.00	Morning tea
11.00 – 11.15	Management arrangements for GCCA+ SUPA Action (<i>Gillian Cambers, SPC</i>)
11.15 – 12.00	Management and financial arrangements for delivery of Output 3 – Scaling up resilient development measures in specific sectors (<i>Swastika Raju, SPC</i>)
12.00 – 12.30	Communications and visibility for GCCA+ SUPA Action (<i>Zhiyad Khan, SPC</i>)
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch
	PLANNING THE NEXT STEPS IN 2019 FOR OUTPUT 3 AND CLOSE OF MEETING
13.30 – 15.00	Sector and geographical area selection: Country representatives plan their 2019 schedules for selection of sector and site location Sharing of preliminary plans
15.00 – 15.15	Closing & Evaluation
15.15 – 16.00	Bilateral discussions if needed

Annex 2: Participants list

No.	Country	Name	Sex	Min. / Org.	Position	Email
1	Cook Islands	Ms. Celine Dyer	F	Climate Change Cook Islands	Climate Change Coordinator	celine.dyer@cookislands.gov.ck
2	FSM	Ms. Elina Akinaga	F	Department of Environment, Climate and Emergency Management	Assistant Secretary for Emergency	epaul.oem@gmail.com
3	Fiji	Mr. Shivanal Kumar	M	Climate Change & Development Cooperation	Climate Change Adaptation Specialist	shivanal.kumar@economy.gov.fj
4	Fiji	Ms. Ilisapeci Vakacegu	F	Climate Change & Development Cooperation	Climate Change Officer	ilisapeci.vakacegu@economy.gov.fj
5	Fiji	Mr. Bipendra Prakash	M	Fiji Meteorological Service	Principal Scientific Officer	bipen.prakash@met.gov.fj
6	Fiji	Mr. Amit Singh	M	Ministry of Waterways & Environment	Director Policy, Research & Planning	amit.singh02@govnet.gov.fj
7	Fiji	Mr. Nilesh Prakash	M	Climate Change & Development Cooperation	Head of Climate Change & Development Cooperation	Nprakash001@economy.gov.fj
8	Fiji	Mr. Sunia Ratulevu	M	National Disaster Management Office	Principal Officer	sunia.ratulevu@govnet.gov.fj
9	Fiji	Mr. Vishwa Jeet	M	Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport	Engineer	vishwa.jeet@moit.gov.fj
10	Kiribati	Ms. Maryanne Namakin	F	Office of Te Beretitenti	Secretary	maryanne@ob.gov.ki
11	Nauru	Mrs. Berilyn Jeremiah	F	Department of Commerce, Industry & Environment	Secretary for Commerce, Industry & Environment	secretarycienuau@gmail.com ; berilynjeremiah@gmail.com
12	Nauru	Mr. Reagan Moses	M	Department of Climate Change	Director for Climate Change	reagan.moses@gmail.com
13	Niue	Ms. Charlotte Pihigia	F	Department of Environment	Climate Change Officer	charlotte.pihigia@mail.gov.nu
14	Palau	Ms. Lisa Van Tassell	F	Office of Climate Change	Grants Officer	lisav@palaugov.org
15	Tonga	Ms. Luisa Malolo	F	Ministry of Environment, Energy, Climate Change, Disaster Management, Meteorology, Information and Communication	Director of Climate Change	ltuiafitumalolo@gmail.com

No.	Country	Name	Sex	Min. / Org.	Position	Email
16	Tuvalu	Ms. Pepetua Latasi	F	Department of Climate Change & Disaster	Director	pepetua@gmail.com
17		Mr. Adrian Nicolae	M	European Union Delegation to the Pacific	Team Leader Climate Change, Energy, Circular Economy	Adrian.NICOLAE@eeas.europa.eu
18		Ms. Ileana Miritescu	F	European Union Delegation to the Pacific	Development Cooperation Coordinator, Climate Change, Energy, and Circular Economy	Ileana.MIRITESCU@eeas.europa.eu
19		Mr. Adrien Bullier	M	European Union Delegation to the Pacific	Programme Manager	Adrien.BULLIER@eeas.europa.eu
20		Mr. Richard Neves	M	International Monetary Fund	Public Financial Management Advisor	RNeves@imf.org
21		Mr. Nafitalai Cakacaka	M	Fiji Development Bank	General Manager Business Risk Services	Nafitalai.Cakacaka@fdb.com.fj
22		Mr. Kevin Petrini	M	United Nations Development Programme	Resilience and Sustainable Development Team Leader	kevin.petrini@undp.org
23		Ms. Aliti Koroi	F	USP	Regional Coordinator North	aliti.koroi@usp.ac.fj
24		Dr. Morgan Wairiu	M	USP	Deputy Director PaCE-SD	morgan.wairiu@usp.ac.fj
25		Ms. Nirupa Ram-Tokuma	F	USP	Administrative Manager	nirupa.ramtokuma@usp.ac.fj
26		Sainimili Elliot	F	USP	Finance Officer	sainimili.elliott@usp.ac.fj
27		Nasoni Roko	M	USP	Finance Assistant	roko.n@usp.ac.fj
28		Jiaoji Sigavata	M	USP	IT Officer	jiaoji.sigavata@usp.ac.fj
29		Christopher Ward	M	USP	Graphic Designer	ward.c@usp.ac.fj
30		Permal Gaunder	M	USP	Finance & Administrative Assistant - PacTVET	permal.gaunder@usp.ac.fj
31		Leigh-Anne Buliruarua	F	USP	Regional Coordinator - PacTVET	buliruarua_1@usp.ac.fj
32		Julie Tuikubulau	F	USP	Project Assistant - PacTVET	julie.tuikubulau@usp.ac.fj

No.	Country	Name	Sex	Min. / Org.	Position	Email
33		Mr. Espen Ronneberg	M	SPREP	Climate Change Adviser	espenr@sprep.org
34		Dr. Martin Sharp	M	SPREP	Project Manager GCCA+ Intra ACP PACRES	martins@sprep.org
35		Mr. Scott Hook	M	PIFS	Team Leader - Resilience	scotth@forumsec.org
36		Ms. Susan Sulu	F	PIFS	Climate Change Finance & Planning Officer	susans@forumsec.org
37		Mr. Ledua Vakaloloma	M	PIFS	Climate Finance Advisor - DFAT/GIZ Climate Finance Readiness for the Pacific Project	leduav@forumsec.org
38		Mr. Clinton Chapman	M	EU - GIZ ACSE	Technical Adviser	clinton.chapman@giz.de
39		Ms. Litia Kirwin	F	Loving Islands	Founding Director	litia@lovingislands.com
40		Dr. Andrew Jones	M	SPC - GEM	Director	andrewj@spc.int
41		Mr. Peter Sinclair	M	SPC - GEM	Water Resources Monitoring & Assessment Coordinator	peters2@spc.int
42		Mr. Uatea Salesa	M	SPC - GEM	Project Manager, Strengthening Water Security in Vulnerable Island States	uateas@spc.int
43		Mr. Andreas Antoniou	M	SPC - GEM	Hydrogeologist / Groundwater Modeller	andreaa@spc.int
44		Mr. Zulfikar Begg	M	SPC - GEM	Ocean Science Officer	ZulfikarB@spc.int
45		Ms. Evlyn Mani	F	SPC - GEM	Capacity Development and Communications Officer	evlynm@spc.int
46		Mr. Moritz Wandres	M	SPC - GEM	Coastal Numerical Modelling Specialist	moritzw@spc.int
47		Mr. Martin Child	M	SPC - RRRT	Senior Human Rights Adviser	martinch@spc.int
48		Mrs. Kuiniselani Toelupe Tago-Elisara	F	SPC - SDP	Director	Kuiniselanit@spc.int

No.	Country	Name	Sex	Min. / Org.	Position	Email
49		Ms. Joanne Kunatuba	F	SPC - SDP	Human Development Officer – Gender Equality	JoanneK@spc.int
50		Mr. Gibson Susumu	M	SPC - LRD	Programme Leader	GibsonS@spc.int
51		Mr. Jalesi Mateboto	M	SPC - LRD	Natural Resource Management Adviser	JalesiM@spc.int
52		Mr. Simione Tukidia	M	SPC - LRD	LRD Publications Assistant	SimioneT@spc.int
53		Mr. Timothy Pickering	M	SPC - FAME	Inland Aquaculture Adviser	TimP@spc.int
54		Ms. Bulou Vitukawalu	F	SPC - FAME	Laboratory Assistant / Intern	bulouv@spc.int
55		Ms. Vuki Buadromo	F	SPC - ISACC	Project Manager	VukiB@spc.int
56		Ms. Lisa Buggy	F	SPC - ISACC	Climate Change Adviser	lisab@spc.int
57		Ms. Amelia Caucau	F	SPC - ISACC	Technical Officer Climate Change	ameliac@spc.int
58		Mr. Fakasao Tofinga	M	SPC - RENI	Engineer	tofangaf@spc.int
59		Ms. Swastika Raju	F	SPC - RENI	Finance Officer	swastikar@spc.int
60		Dr. Gillian Cambers	F	SPC - SUPA	Project Manager	gillianc@spc.int
61		Mr. Zhiyad Khan	M	SPC - SUPA	Communication & Liaison Officer	zhiyadk@spc.int
62		Mrs. Titilia Rabuatoka	F	SPC - SUPA	Acting Project Implementation Officer	titiar@spc.int

Females – 27

Males – 35

Annex 3: Guiding notes and discussions on scaling up in Output 3

Background

The Pacific region is particularly vulnerable to the adverse impacts of climate change and disasters and all the Pacific Smaller Island States are environmentally fragile and highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change, including rising temperatures, changing rainfall patterns, an increase in extreme events, rising sea levels and ocean acidification. The countries are already experiencing the impacts of climate change.

The Global Climate Change Alliance Plus - Scaling Up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA) addresses climate change adaptation by adopting a “learning by doing” approach i.e. (i) assessing the past to build sustainability into strategic planning (Output 1 led by SPREP), (ii) addressing previously-identified capacity gaps (Output 2 led by USP) and (iii) implementing scaling up through sector focused, on-the-ground measures (Output 3 led by SPC). All the outputs will be implemented in an integrated manner particularly outputs 2 and 3 such that the capacity building for resilience will focus on stakeholders in the geographical areas identified for scaling up.

Scaling up focuses on sectors where adaptation work has successfully taken place and builds on that existing work. Scaling up a sector-focused, on-the-ground measure might mean:

1. **Enhancement** e.g. strengthening a measure to withstand a category 5 cyclone/typhoon;
2. **Expansion** e.g. increasing a measure to protect a longer length of coast;
3. **Replication** e.g. implementing a successful measure in a different location; and
4. **Addition of a complementary approach** such as combining an ecosystem-based approach with an agricultural measure.

General Criteria

Sector selection:

- Sector selection to be linked to national priorities.
- Each country to select **one** sector for scaling up.
- Exceptions may be made for smaller, more remote communities where inclusion of a secondary sector may provide added value, e.g. extracting groundwater (primary sector) with a solar-powered pump (secondary sector) or installing a rainwater harvesting system (primary sector) and adding a solar-powered water heater (secondary sector).²

Selection of measure to be scaled up:

- Identify a tested and effective previous measure that has elements of sustainability, and can be scaled up in the project timeframe. (It does not have to be any of the previous GCCA projects).
- An effective measure from one country could be scaled up and contextualised in another country, e.g. replication of the use of drought-tolerant crops from country A in country B.
- The selected scaled up measures must have socio-economic benefits for the communities and be implemented using a gender-sensitive and rights-based approach.
- The selected scaled up measure must fit within the scope of the SUPA budget and its timeframe although there are possibilities for partnerships with countries’ national budgets or other projects.

² The Delegation Agreement does not include energy as a primary sector as it is usually included under climate change mitigation.

- Recognising that maintenance of government-owned infrastructure is the responsibility of the particular government agency, provisions for maintaining the newly scaled up measure must be included in the GCCA+ SUPA intervention as this is essential for sustainability.

Sector-specific interpretations

Water security:

- All the countries had effective interventions that could be scaled up within the scope of GCCA+ SUPA e.g. rainwater harvesting, groundwater extraction, ecological purification systems, strengthening reticulation systems, installation of septic tanks.
- There are opportunities for building on other projects e.g. ACSE.
- Large-scale reverse osmosis plants, which require specialised technical maintenance skills, are most likely outside the scope of GCCA+ SUPA.
- Designing bankable projects including engineering details e.g. based on a national water master plan could be an option for scaling up.

Food security:

Recognising that long term training and capacity building is critical for scaling up food security measures.

- All the countries had effective interventions that could be scaled up within the scope of GCCA+ SUPA e.g. irrigation support systems, dry piggeries, agroforestry, tropical farming.
- Aquaponics is a new and emerging food security approach and has potential for scaling up.

Coastal protection:

In view of the high cost of engineered coastal protection infrastructure, e.g. engineered seawalls, boulder revetments (riprap), such measures may be beyond the scope of GCCA+ SUPA.

- Creating an enabling environment for coastal protection on an island-wide or national scale e.g. creating a coastal protection plan is a possible option.
- Enhancing existing coastal protection measures (both hard and soft interventions) is within the scope of GCCA+ SUPA, e.g. purchase of heavy equipment, armouring an existing measure with large boulders, and the addition of an ecosystem-based approach

Fisheries and health are additional sectors that can be included within the scope of GCCA+ SUPA.

Annex 3a: National Approach to Scaling Up

Global Climate Change Alliance Plus – Scaling Up Pacific Adaptation

Preamble

Within the framework of the GCCA+ SUPA project, it is envisaged that countries will adopt a three-phase consultative planning process. The results of this process will produce the following documents:

1. Description of the **national approach**: Selection process for deciding on the sector, geographical area and measure(s) to be scaled up. (This document)
2. Preparation of a **Concept Note** providing further details (including approximate budget) on the actual measure(s) to be scaled up.
3. Preparation of a detailed **project design document**.

National Approach to Scaling Up

Date	
Country	
Contact person	
Email address	
Phone number	
Process for selection of sector	
Selected sector	
How does the selection of this sector contribute to your national priorities?	
Outline the consultative process adopted to select the sector.	
Were there any assessments conducted to inform the sector selection? If yes, please list.	
Has there been previous significant effort in climate change adaptation in the selected sector? If yes, please briefly describe.	
Other considerations (if any)	
Process for selection of geographical area	
Geographical area selected	
Outline the consultative process adopted to select the geographical area.	
To what extent have the affected population participated in the selection process?	
Were there any assessments conducted to inform the area selection? If yes, please list.	
Has there been previous significant effort in climate change adaptation in the selected area? If yes, please briefly describe.	
Other considerations (if any)	
Effective measure(s) to be scaled up	
Specific measure(s) to be scaled up	

Why was this measure selected for scaling up? (E.g. does it address community needs? Is it sustainable? Does it need strengthening or finishing?)	
To what extent have the different groups (men, women, children, elderly, persons with disabilities, others) comprising the affected population participated in the selection process?	

Annex 4: Planning for 2019

Background

Following this Inception and Planning meeting and the development of the scaling up criteria, it is envisaged that national consultations will be held, involving all relevant ministries, and civil society to confirm the sector, select measures to be scaled up and the geographical focus.

Once the sector focus, geographical location and specific measure have been identified, tangible on-the-ground scaling up measures that fulfil the scaling up criteria will be designed using a participatory, gender-sensitive and rights-based approach and involving national and sub-national governments, NGOs and communities.

The design process will involve firstly, the preparation of concept notes, outlining the scope of the activities, the rationale and the beneficiaries. Following this, more detailed project design documents will be prepared. These will guide the implementation of the scaled-up measures and will include background, rationale, activities, procurement procedures, schedules, budgets and risk mitigation measures. The preparation of the concept notes and the project design documents may take up to nine months.

Session Structure

- Introduction of the session – 5 minutes
- Outline the scaling up criteria and get agreement and consolidation – 10 minutes
- 2019 planning – 30 minutes
- Country presentations – 40 minutes
- Wrap up & close session – 5 minutes

2019 Planning Template

Country Name: _____

Name of person completing this planning template: _____

No.	Item	Comment
1.	Which agency / ministry / department will be coordinating the process in your country?	
2.	List down the stakeholders / ministries / NGOs / Cabinet to consult.	
3.	What steps are needed to decide a sector?	

No.	Item	Comment
4.	What steps would then be needed to select the geographical area and the adaptation measure to be scaled up?	

5. Estimate how long the process would take including determining the sector, geographical area and specific adaptation measure. Please tick.
- 6 months 1 year
- 9 months Other

If Other, please specify.

What sort of assistance?

Annex 5: Summary of the meeting evaluation

GCCA+ SUPA Inception & Planning Meeting

17 participants completed the evaluation form, 7 male, 9 female (1 participant did not indicate gender); not all participants answered every question.

1. SESSION ON CLIMATE FINANCE	Mean rating
On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, how useful was the session on climate finance?	4.3
<p>Highlights that the participants found especially interesting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relative difficulty of working with the Adaptation Fund (AF) compared with the Green Climate Fund (GCF). • Assessing the capacity of smaller PICs to seek accreditation under GCF. • Experiences of Fiji and the Cook Islands in their journeys to getting accreditation and whether the benefit is worthwhile given the time and effort required. • Sustainability of climate finance as this is one of the areas being discussed at the national level. • Need for assistance to be given to SIDS to expedite access to climate funds, especially GCF, given the complexity of the process and the long duration. • Comparison of funding of fossil fuel subsidies versus climate finance. • What makes a bankable project? • There is room for improvement in regional coordination and partners need to coordinate their support to countries. • Even when accredited, there are still conditions to be fulfilled. 	
2. SESSIONS ON GENDER-SENSITIVE / RIGHTS-BASED APPROACHES	Mean rating
On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, how useful was the session on gender-sensitive / rights-based approaches?	4.2
<p>Highlights that the participants found especially interesting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a background in gender and human rights issues, nothing new really emerged. But it was a good session and I think raised awareness, especially the walk to identify vulnerability. • The inclusion of a human rights approach gives us a whole new perspective on this topic especially during the project development phase. • The human rights approach is usually used but very rarely understood. The session helped me understand the concept fully and how it can be used in shaping projects and policies • Definition of human rights in practical terms. • Rights based approach – three elements and 6 principles, PLANET. • To include gender planning. • Difference between equity and equitable e.g. the shoe concept. • I wasn't too aware of the human rights angle in climate change. This session helped me to understand. • The practical exercise was very useful. It helps us understand the influence of status in a society. 	
3. MARKETPLACE	Mean rating

On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, how useful was the marketplace in providing you with ideas for potential scaling up approaches?	4.8
---	-----

Comments and highlights about the overall marketplace:

- Overall, a great initiative.
- Market place gives an opportunity for participants to actually see the demonstrations from various sectors. They should be conducted in climate change workshops in the future.
- Opportunity to engage with CROP agencies on potential projects.
- Learning in a simple and practical way about what each programme is delivering in the region.
- Data and information availability at regional organisations for countries to use.
- Networking and better understanding.
- All the market places are highlights.
- Demonstrated where CROP technical expertise can support project assessments and inform design.
- The published materials and knowledge products.

Comments relating to specific market displays

Agriculture display:

- It was interesting to learn more about what programmes are available under SPC regarding sustainable land management and trainings.

Aquaponics display:

- The concept of aquaponics and the incorporation of two food production methods into a single system for food security.
- Great idea to create ponds inland for fish farming.
- New and interesting initiative – it can be applied to my country; it is cost effective, can be replicated and is very relevant to communities.
- Interesting concept to utilise tilapia waste for agricultural purposes.

Coastal protection:

- Useful high-tech tools that can be used for assessment of coastal erosion/inundation in my country.
- The ocean monitoring system is very important for small isolated islands.

Groundwater display:

- I found the groundwater sensing project interesting, largely because it provides a cost attractive alternative to drilling and can cover large areas relatively quickly.

Water filtration display:

- The SODIS project and the initiative to transform water into drinkable water for communities in Kiribati – interesting because this is a simple method and such initiatives can be replicated to all communities across the region.
- The ecological purification system (EPS) – cheap and efficient.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EPS system especially because no chemicals are involved. • The water filtration display was good and showed it could be used in a variety of settings, e.g. volcanic islands and atolls. 	
4. DEFINING CRITERIA ON SCALING UP	Mean rating
On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, please rate whether the group work has helped you with your understanding of scaling up.	4.2
<p>Are there areas where you would like more information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance and what the project means by this as some countries may have their own interpretation. • I felt we got caught in the language. I would like more ideas about other countries' successful projects. • Different ways of coastal protection. • How this project could work with other projects. • Finalised criteria to be discussed at the meeting • Output 1: creation of the impacts database • Useful discussion and SPC flexibility to listen to countries' views. • Education and awareness. • Ownership and sustainability by governments. 	
5. SESSIONS ON FINANCING ASPECTS FOR OUTPUTS 1 & 3	Mean rating
On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, how useful was the session on financing aspects for your future planning?	4.0
6. WORK PLANNING IN GROUPS	Mean rating
On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, please rate whether the group work has helped you with the planning and budgeting of project activities.	4.0
7. OVERALL STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING	Mean rating
On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest and 1 the lowest, how useful was the entire Inception & Planning Meeting to your work at the national level	4.6
<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On Question 5: the financing session: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appreciated that more than one type of modality can be used for this project. - Understanding the breakdown of funds. - The budget breakdown of the total project could be better disseminated to clearly identify flow of funds. • On Question 7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look forward to more correspondence with the team and elevating the SUPA activities at the ground level. - More time allocation for group work discussion and Q&A session after presentations. 	

- I learned a lot, the interaction of other countries has been helpful. I learned so much from others. I feel clear about Output 3. Thank you for this meeting.
- The overall workshop was useful to learn from other countries' experiences.
- Provided a view of the expected project from inception to the final outputs.
- Well planned and conducted, delivered well.
- Need 2 days for these sessions (5 & 6)
- The meeting was really good in the way it was organised. It was very informative and not at all boring.
- All countries engaged in the discussion.
- Very interactive, inclusive and informative.
- For me personally this was a great opportunity to meet the country representatives and key stakeholders as a criteria to the selection of sites.
- Approach was not too prescriptive which allowed for lateral thinking and relying on country driven approaches.

8. ANY OTHER GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT THE MEETING

Comments:

- Useful for aligning/enhancing regional efforts.
- Would like to see coordination between all outputs and key stakeholders as a criteria to the selection of sites.
- Where will the next meeting be held?
- Well organised meeting. Enjoyed the practical exercises including the market place.
- A 3-day workshop is ideal, a presentation on coastal management would have been good to learn about the different hard and soft options.
- Still not clear on how we will work with USP. Are they going to have their own meeting like SPREP?
- Meeting well planned and executed. Thank you also to the facilitation of logistics prior to the meeting.
- Good visibility of other projects; provided a good overview of SUPA; nice lead in to the session on adaptation projects.