
OWNING ADAPTATION IN THE PACIFIC

Strengthening governance of climate
adaptation finance

NIC MACLELLAN

Independent Researcher

SARAH MEADS, BARRY COATES

Oxfam New Zealand

Pacific Island nations need more finance to adapt to the adverse effects of global warming, but they also need to manage the funds effectively, to benefit their most vulnerable communities. This report looks at three countries – Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu and Tonga – to understand their experience of managing climate finance. The challenges they face include: improved coordination by donors; strengthened management across departments and with local governments; and better engagement with civil society. The report calls for a focus on building capacity across government and non-state actors; strengthened partnerships and coordination; better information, communication and transparency; fostering a culture of learning and improving direct access to climate funding. Most importantly, civil society and vulnerable communities must be able to hold governments accountable for the use of adaptation finance, and governments must play a leadership and coordinating role to mobilise a broad response across Pacific societies based on a common aim to build resilience.

oxfam.org.nz
oxfam.org.au



OXFAM
Australia



OXFAM
New Zealand

Owning Adaptation in the Pacific

Strengthening governance of climate adaptation finance

Published: Oxfam New Zealand and Oxfam Australia; August 2012

Level 1, 14 West Street, Newton, Auckland New Zealand 1145

© Oxfam New Zealand, August 2012. All rights reserved

Website: oxfam.org.nz

Email: oxfam@oxfam.org.nz

Telephone: +64 9 355 6500

Lead researcher: Nic Maclellan

Authors: Nic Maclellan, Sarah Meads, Barry Coates

Commissioning Manager: Sarah Meads, Oxfam New Zealand

Editors: Lynda Brendish, Ewan Kingston

Acknowledgements: Oxfam New Zealand acknowledges the generous financial support of the British High Commission in New Zealand that enabled this independent research, and the support of British High Commission staff in Wellington, Suva and Port Moresby.

With thanks to: Siotame Drew Havea and Vanessa Lolohea (Tonga National Youth Congress); Emeline Siale Ilolahia (Civil Society Forum of Tonga); Dennis Uba (Oxfam Papua New Guinea); Alex Mathieson and Nelly Willy (Oxfam Vanuatu); the Director, Asipeli Palaki, and staff of the Ministry of Environment of the Government of Tonga; the Director, Jotham Napat, and staff of the Vanuatu Meteorology and Geohazards Department (VMGD); the Acting Director Varigini Badira and staff of the Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) of Papua New Guinea; Tony Clemson (British High Commission, Wellington, New Zealand); Jillian Battersby (British High Commission, Port Moresby); Kelly Dent and Annette Salkeld (Oxfam Australia); Ross Sinclair (World Conservation Service); and the dozens of interviewees from Vanuatu, Tonga, Fiji, Samoa, Papua New Guinea and other countries who shared their insights.

Oxfam Research Reports are written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development and humanitarian policy and practice. They do not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

Cover photo: Rodney Dekker/Oxfam Australia. Tawaa Tebungang (46) at Tanikabaai Village, Tabontebike, Abaiang. This land was inundated with water following a king tide in 2004. Many crops were lost as a result including pawpaw, pandanus, banana, taro and figs amongst others; the soil is now too saline to grow food.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	6
Acronyms	10
Introduction	12
Chapter 1: Enhancing national capacity	15
National-level approaches to strengthen climate adaptation	16
The JNAP process in Tonga	16
Papua New Guinea’s Office of Climate Change and Development	17
From NACCC to NAB in Vanuatu	18
Lessons and challenges	19
Educating decision makers	19
Boosting resources for action	20
Inclusive technical working groups	20
Strengthening capacity in outer islands and remote areas	21
Building capacity for non-state actors	21
Prioritising capacity development for women, men and children	22
Summary	22
Chapter 2: Strengthening partnerships and coordination	24
Addressing problems of donor flexibility and coordination	24
Improving coordination across departments	26
Linking governments and civil society	27
Strengthening coordination within and amongst non-state actors	28

Case study: Creating a civil society climate network in Vanuatu	28
Summary	30
Chapter 3: Better information, communication and transparency	31
Improving transparency	32
Using the internet and social media to share information	33
Case study: Developing climate portals	33
Development of culturally appropriate information	34
Extending participatory and evidence-based research	36
Case study: Research for the future in Lifuka	37
Integrating gender and the rights of the vulnerable	38
Summary	39
Chapter 4: Fostering a culture of learning	41
Empowering communities through effective participation	41
Case study: Consulting the provinces in Papua New Guinea	42
Respecting traditional knowledge for adaptation	44
Case study: Using traditional knowledge for adaptation	44
Strategic understanding for politicians and decision-makers	45
Enabling peer-to-peer knowledge sharing	46
Case study: Enabling peer-to-peer knowledge sharing	47
Summary	47
Chapter 5: Improving direct access to climate financing	49
Strengthening Pacific representation in global negotiations	50
Updating regional frameworks	50
Gaining accreditation to the Adaptation Fund	51
Accessing the Global Environment Facility	51

	5
Monitoring the multilateral development banks	52
Case study: Designing a programme for climate resilience	52
Blending resources in National Climate Trust Funds	54
Case study: Conservation Trust Fund	54
Supporting smaller states through a Pacific Regional Climate Change Fund	55
Implementing direct budget support	55
Summary	56
Chapter 6: Recommendations	57
Table 1: List of recommendations to improve efficient use of climate resources by stakeholder groups	58
ENDNOTES	73

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pacific Island peoples are already feeling the effects of climate change. Their food supply, nutrition, health, education, livelihoods and social cohesion all suffer from extreme weather events and long-term changes to land and ocean environments. Some Pacific governments and communities are beginning to address cases of climate displacement, with the long-term potential for resettlement within and beyond island nations. Living in one of the world's most vulnerable regions to climate impacts, Pacific communities face no option but to adapt if they are to build a resilient future.

But adaptation poses different challenges from aid programmes and the delivery of public services. Although climate change is a global issue, its risks and impacts are felt locally, across all levels of society and all sectors. This means new resources are urgently needed to support Pacific governments to lead a multi-sector response that includes accountability at all levels, bottom-up approaches and integration of traditional understanding of environmental change.

Recent global climate negotiations have seen pledges of climate financing by developed nations of US\$100 billion a year by 2020. However accessing this climate finance poses major challenges for Pacific countries. Finance providers must address the complex array of funding mechanisms and their lack of coordination. Furthermore, climate finance needs to be additional to the 0.7 per cent of GNI already pledged for official development assistance (ODA) identified as necessary to meet the Millennium Development Goals.

Along with other developing countries, Pacific leaders have questioned the scale and accessibility of global climate funds, which have been pledged by industrialised nations whose historic emissions have caused most problems of global warming to date. Conversely, international finance providers want to see good practice in the effective use of existing resources before they guarantee further significant funds, including contributions to the newly created Green Climate Fund.

But the ability to attract significant levels of global funding will not just depend on Pacific countries asserting their vulnerability and poverty, but rather on demonstrating their own performance and in-country capacity to implement and manage activities and use funds effectively and transparently.

This research aims to contribute to the ongoing debate among Pacific Island countries, and the international community more generally, on ways to strengthen national governance of the funding used for adaptation in the Pacific region. It discusses the factors that are limiting or enhancing national-level responses to strengthen governance of climate adaptation finance, and highlights the need to improve access to adaptation funding and to build an enabling environment so that climate resources reach those most in need.

Most importantly, civil society and members of vulnerable communities, particularly women, must be able to participate meaningfully and hold governments accountable for the way adaptation finance is used. Otherwise, a lack of accountability, monitoring and poor civil society engagement will prevent funds from reaching those most in need.

The report is based on lessons learnt from case studies in three Pacific countries – Tonga, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea. It draws on the outcomes of two workshops held in Tonga and Vanuatu (involving government officials, donors, non-government, church and community organisations), as well as an extensive literature review on adaptation and climate financing in the region. Advice was sought from key representatives from the focal country governments, civil society organisations, inter-governmental agencies, international donors, and members of the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP). Particular attention was given to how Pacific countries overcome

serious adaptation challenges compared with other regions due to their comparative smallness, remoteness and archipelagic character.

This report found that, to date, a major focus of government officials is accountability *up* to climate fund donors, rather than *across* all levels of government and *down* to the community. Government officials are often directed this way because of the complex array of international climate funding mechanisms demanding their attention and major capacity constraints in-country.

The report also found many of the problems in accessing climate finance lie with the practices of key development partners. It argues there is scope for significant improvement in how donors and multilateral organisations work together to overcome the institutional and bureaucratic rigidity that limits access to climate financing and delays implementation of programs in the field.

While much more still needs to be done to improve access to climate finance, a core message also stressed by research participants was that responses to climate change depend heavily on building in-country capacity and collaboration among development actors at all levels of society – including the diverse array of non-state actors from business and private sector organisations to NGOs, churches, farmers associations, women's and youth networks, and local customary authorities.

Sound lessons on which to base future actions can be drawn from existing initiatives in response to climate change, and from projects in other sectors. For instance, supporting the formation of NGO consortia allows civil society to work collaboratively on community level adaptation and form a joint platform to engage with governments. Donor support of a flexible design phase allows community participation and innovation to determine the final project scope and funding. Supporting the valuable role of technical working groups and creating funding windows that allow more 'face-to-face' exchanges, including community-to-community visits and internships from staff in other ministries or organisations.

Despite major economic, cultural and geographic differences between the three focal countries (Tonga, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea), there were common challenges and lessons from their responses to climate adaptation that have broader applications. It is important that the lessons from experience across different countries are disseminated widely to improve effectiveness and accountability. Learning by doing is crucial, given the new and complex challenges posed by climate change and adaptation.

While there are important initiatives underway to strengthen government capacity, further resources could be applied to better meet all new climate adaptation demands placed on government leadership and coordination. There is a need to provide education and support for politicians and key decision makers to overcome a lack of strategic understanding of climate change and the complexities of climate finance.

The report highlights the benefits that could be gained from building in-country capacity and collaboration of development actors at all levels of society. The potential for better cooperation will remain untapped unless climate change strategies are targeted in five key areas:

- Capacity building;
- Partnerships and coordination;
- Information and communication;
- Learning cultures;
- Direct access to climate finance.

Over 60 specific actions and strategies were identified by participants in this research and from other sources. These are listed under each of the key areas in the recommendations chapter of this report. They could build the basis for stronger national governance of funding used for climate change adaptation. Regional and international donor governments, regional bodies and inter-governmental agencies and NGOs should support the necessary investments to ensure these are developed.

The ultimate goal of these collective actions is to empower the citizens most vulnerable to climate change, together with their governments, to drive the way adaptation finance is used to meet their needs – setting a process in motion to shift vulnerable Pacific countries towards adaptive resilience.

Underlying the many recommendations are five strategies that appear to be crucial in strengthening national-level governance of climate adaptation finance:

1. **Adopt good donor practice:** Direct support for government bodies leading on climate change and direct budget support are needed to enable capacity building. Donors need to be aware that until systems of direct budgetary support are better entrenched, project-based climate action will cause increasing obstacles and management burdens for Pacific governments, and these will continue unless donors coordinate effectively and simplify their systems. Although climate finance needs to be separate from, and additional to, aid funding, the lessons from international processes on aid effectiveness need to be applied to climate finance.
2. **Deepen approach to mainstreaming:** Consider climate change in all strategic national development planning and mainstreaming in the responsibilities of all government departments. In general, regional and national frameworks are being redesigned to better integrate climate change adaptation and disaster risk responses, sometimes with new departments set up to lead. But coordination between climate units and other ministries is often lagging for a number of reasons, including their limited capacity and scope of mandates.
3. **Build inclusive, meaningful partnerships:** Governments should work more extensively with non-state actors. Civil society organisations (including churches and customary structures) have significant expertise and an important role to play, not just in implementing adaptation projects, but also working with government officials to develop policy and to lobby at the regional and international level. Outreach, education and partnerships with civil society, the private sector and traditional leaders is needed to ensure that resilience is built in the economy and across society, including in outer islands and remote areas.
4. **Strengthen learning and accountability:** Effective action needs to be built on sound information, evidence, feedback and learning. This requires a greater degree of transparency and accessibility of information; sound baselines, monitoring and evaluation across society and effective learning cycles to improve performance.
5. **Include those most vulnerable:** Integrate the contributions of women, children and disadvantaged groups in climate change strategies. This requires disaggregating data and conducting more detailed research that measures how climate change affects men, women, children and people with disabilities in different ways, especially in multi-lingual and diverse societies.

Building resilience to climate change is a challenge for all society, not only national and provincial governments. In Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu, community leaders stressed the vast majority of land is held under customary ownership by kinship groups, not by the state. Therefore without the involvement of customary landholders, and community level involvement in the sustainable use of land and resources, responding to climate change will be impossible. Donors, governments and non-state actors need to create new mechanisms to redirect funding and information to rural and outlying communities, and allocate resources to address climate impacts.

This report has found encouraging innovations and examples of good practice in the three focal countries and other Pacific Island countries. However, formidable challenges remain and the recommendations above demonstrate the importance of governments playing a leadership and coordinating role to mobilise a broad response across Pacific societies based on a common aim to build resilience.

During the course of this research Oxfam has found willingness amongst a broad range of actors to contribute to achieving this aim and huge strengths to contribute. Mobilising such a broad constituency will be essential in meeting the profound challenges that climate change poses to the Pacific region now, and in coming decades.

ACRONYMS

ACFID	Australian Council for International Development
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AF	Adaptation Fund
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CAN	Climate Action Network
CBA	Community-based (vulnerability) assessment
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CIF	Climate Investment Fund
COP	Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific
CSFT	Civil Society Forum of Tonga
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DPPC	Development Partners for Climate Change
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EC	European Commission
EDF	European Development Fund
EFF	Eco-Forestry Forum (PNG)
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FAR	Fourth Assessment Report
FEMM	Forum Economic Ministers Meeting
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FPIC	Free Prior and Informed Consent
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
GCCA	Gender and Climate Change Alliance
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse gas
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
ICCAI	International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative
IFCI	International Forest Carbon Initiative
INGO	International Non-government Organisation
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
JNAP	Joint National Action Plan on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management
KSEC	Kiribati Solar Energy Company
LDC	Least Developed Country
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
MCT	Micronesia Conservation Trust
MDB	Multilateral Development Bank
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MIE	Multilateral Implementing Entity
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
NAB	National Advisory Board (Vanuatu)
NACCC	National Advisory Committee on Climate Change (Vanuatu)
NAPA	National Adaptation Program for Action
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NECCC	National Environment and Climate Change Committee (Vanuatu)
NEMC	National Emergency Management Committee (Vanuatu)
NGO	Non-government Organisation
NIE	National Implementing Entity
NZAID	New Zealand Agency for International Development

OAus	Oxfam Australia
OCCD	Office of Climate Change and Development (PNG)
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
OI	Oxfam International
ONZ	Oxfam New Zealand
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change
PALM	Pacific Leaders Meeting (Japan)
PCCR	Pacific Climate Change Roundtable
PCCSP	Pacific Climate Change Science Program
PEC	Pacific Economic Community Fund (Japan)
PEG	Pacific Energy and Gender network
PIANGO	Pacific Islands Association of Non-Government Organisations
PIC	Pacific Island country
PICTs	Pacific Island countries and territories
PIFACC	Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006 – 2015
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPCR	Pilot Program on Climate Resilience
Ppm	Parts per million
PRNGO	Pacific Regional Non-government Organisation
PSE	Pacific Solution Exchange
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation in Developing Countries
RIE	Regional Implementing Entity
RTSM	Regional Technical Support Mechanism
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SDA	Seventh Day Adventist
SGP	Small Grants Program
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPCR	Strategic Pilot Program for Climate Resilience
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program
SREP	Scaling up Renewable Energy Program in Low Income Countries
TCDT	Tonga Community Development Trust
TNYC	Tonga National Youth Congress
TWG	Technical working group
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
UNIFEM	United Nations Fund for Women
UNU-EHS	United Nations University Institute for Environment and Human Security
USP	University of the South Pacific
VANGO	Vanuatu Association of Non-government Organisations
VHT	Vanuatu Humanitarian Team
VMGD	Vanuatu Meteorological and Geo-hazards Department
VRDTCA	Vanuatu Rural Development and Training Centre Association
WCC	World Council of Churches
WCS	World Conservation Society
WHO	World Health Organisation
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

INTRODUCTION

Across the Pacific Islands, people are already feeling the effects of climate change. Their food supply, nutrition, health, education, livelihoods and social cohesion all suffer from extreme weather events and long-term changes to land and ocean environments. Some Pacific governments and communities are beginning to address cases of climate displacement, with the long-term potential for resettlement within and beyond island nations. With global warming now a growing reality, Pacific Island peoples have no choice but to adapt to the impacts if they are to build a resilient future.

All countries need extra financial and technical resources to adapt to the adverse effects of climate change. After the Copenhagen summit in 2009, OECD countries pledged US\$30 billion 'fast start' climate finance from 2010-2012, and long-term finance of US\$100 billion a year by 2020, to assist developing countries with mitigation and adaptation. This was recognised to be a different form of funding to aid, since most developing countries (and especially the Pacific) did little to contribute to the historic build up of greenhouse gases. Yet Pacific Island countries are suffering from the consequences of climate change, with limited resources to respond to its devastating impacts.

In successive climate change agreements there have been undertakings that finance would be made available to assist the Pacific and other developing countries to protect themselves from the impact of climate change and adapt. However Pacific governments have expressed concern these resources are not easily accessible. At a time of economic contraction in many developed nations, the effective use of climate funding is even more important, ensuring resources are reaching those most in need.

Adaptation and access to funding for adaptation both present major hurdles. Climate change is a cross-cutting issue, with risks and impacts experienced across all levels of society and all sectors. This means a coordinated multi-sectoral response is required, supported by accountability at a range of levels. It is essential the governance of funding at the regional and country level is shaped so the needs of the most vulnerable can be met. The focus must be on the poor and those who bear the daily burdens of adapting to changing environments, especially women whose work as farmers and carers is being transformed by climate change.

For Pacific countries, these hurdles are even greater. Located in one of the world's most vulnerable regions, the Pacific's Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS), face additional challenges due to their comparative smallness, remoteness and archipelagic character.

As well as drawing on local technical, cultural and financial resources, Pacific governments are seeking climate funding from developed countries through the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). In recent years, Pacific leaders have repeatedly stressed that current pledges of funding have not met the central need expressed at the Pacific Islands Forum leaders meeting in 2008: "The priority of Pacific SIDS is securing sustainable financing for immediate and effective implementation of concrete adaptation programmes on the ground."¹

There are several channels of adaptation finance that have started to provide resources to island nations, including multilateral mechanisms such as the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund. Another key mechanism will be the newly created Green Climate Fund, which should begin operations in 2014.

But in recent years, international debate has focussed on identifying sufficient sources of funds to meet the pledges made in Copenhagen and Cancun. The lessons learned from existing adaptation work and from the fast start finance period will be vital in coming years, as finance providers scale up

long-term climate finance. To meet their fair share of the target of US\$100 billion a year by 2020, countries like Australia and New Zealand will need a tenfold increase in their current climate funding over the next decade. Climate funding needs to be additional to the 0.7 per cent of GNI already pledged for official development assistance (ODA) identified as necessary to meet the Millennium Development Goals.

At the same time, development partners need to address what the World Bank has identified as “the institutional rigidity of donor organisations”: the complex bureaucracy and institutional competition amongst donors, which limits the capacity of Pacific governments and communities to easily access the resources they need to respond to the adverse effects of climate change.²

The ability to attract significant levels of global funding will not just depend on Pacific countries asserting their vulnerability and poverty, but also on Pacific countries demonstrating their own performance and in-country capacity to implement and manage activities, and thus to use funds effectively and transparently. Donors often cite a lack of absorptive capacity as the reason for not allocating more funding to Pacific countries. If both government and non-government actors in Pacific countries demonstrate an ability to use funds well over the next few years they will be far better placed to access future scaled up climate resources. The immediate challenge, therefore, is to build an enabling environment to ensure the activities being funded are reported and shared in a transparent manner.

This issue is the subject of this report – how climate finance in the Pacific can be used most effectively. The report is a contribution to ongoing debates amongst members of the Pacific Islands Forum, Pacific civil society and the international community on ways to strengthen governance of adaptation funding and to work with vulnerable communities who are on the climate frontline.

In 2011, Oxfam International published the report *Owning Adaptation: Country-level governance of climate adaptation finance*, looking at the governance of climate financing, and the accountability and effectiveness of increasing flows of resources for adaptation to climate change. The report was based on research in seven developing countries in Africa and Asia. This report extends the research into the Pacific Islands. It asks; What factors are limiting or enhancing national-level responses to strengthen governance of climate adaptation finance, to improve access to funding, and to build an enabling environment so that climate resources reach those most in need?

The research was based in three Pacific countries (Tonga, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea) where Oxfam works with local partners to support adaptation to climate change. The report draws on the outcomes of two workshops held in Tonga and Vanuatu (involving government officials, donors, non-government, church and community organisations) as well as an extensive literature review on adaptation and climate financing in the region. The authors have also received advice from key representatives from the national governments, civil society organisations, inter-governmental agencies, international donors, and member agencies of the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP).

This report found that, to date, a major focus of government officials is accountability *up* to climate fund donors, rather than *across* all levels of government and *down* to the community. Government officials are often directed in this way because of the complex array of international climate funding mechanisms demanding their attention and major capacity constraints in-country. There is scope for significant improvement in how donors and multilateral organisations work together to overcome institutional and bureaucratic rigidity that limits access to climate financing and delays implementation of programmes in the field.

While much more still needs to be done to improve access to climate finance, a core message stressed by research participants was that responses to climate change depend heavily on building in-country capacity and collaboration of development actors at all levels of society (including the diverse array of non-state actors; from business and private sector organisations to NGOs, churches, farmers associations, women's and youth networks, Councils of Chiefs and local customary authorities).

The report also highlights the benefits which could be gained from building in-country capacity and collaboration of development actors at all levels of society. These benefits include greater trust and confidence from donors; improved strategies, plans and funds management; stronger collaboration across different actors in society; widespread public understanding and support for adaptation programmes; greater support for decentralised actors who are empowered to build their own resilience; and greater impact and effectiveness of adaptation action.

However, the potential for better cooperation will remain untapped unless effective climate change strategies are undertaken in five key areas:

1. Enhancing national capacity
2. Strengthening partnerships and coordination
3. Sharing information and increasing communication and transparency
4. Fostering a culture of learning
5. Improving direct access to climate financing

These five areas are discussed under separate chapters. The report concludes with a list of suggested recommendations for local communities, civil society organisations, national governments, and international development partners. The ultimate goal of these actions is to empower the citizens most vulnerable to climate change, together with their governments, to drive the way adaptation finance is used to meet their needs; setting a process in motion to shift vulnerable Pacific countries towards adaptive resilience.

CHAPTER 1: ENHANCING NATIONAL CAPACITY

Pacific Island nations are already affected by the adverse effects of climate change and natural disasters and people across Pacific societies are struggling to cope with these impacts. Recent scientific research predicts significant climatic changes in coming decades, including increasing intensity of cyclones, sea-level rise and changes in precipitation, drought and flooding.³ For this reason, the level of funding required for adaptation is expected to increase. Pacific governments and their communities need to be well positioned to respond. To do so they must redesign existing resources and invest in new capacities that will better serve them in the changing environment.

At the regional level, member agencies of the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP) play a vital role in enhancing national capacity, especially amongst those countries with fewer resources. Higher levels of financial, social and human resources of large countries like Papua New Guinea and Fiji provide a strategic advantage compared with countries like Tonga and especially smaller atoll nations like Tokelau and Tuvalu. Beyond promoting 'better practice' and organising forums for regional dialogue, the CROP agencies can provide regionally-based expertise that is not always available at the national level, and support access to international climate financing structures (like the Adaptation Fund). This continuity is especially important for some countries when domestic politics are disrupted by a change in government and where there are high rates of ministerial and official turnover.

At the country level, the process of capacity building for governments involves: increased staff and training for coordination across ministries and agencies; building up the capacity of national and local institutions to implement policies that currently exist largely on paper; improved national collaboration between different sectors of society (including through climate taskforces, working groups and roundtables); and the allocation of resources to implement national adaptation strategies and align them with existing development plans.

It is important that the processes of capacity building do not stop with national government. Undoubtedly, government has a crucial role to establish the framework for climate change adaptation, to provide leadership and to set the strategic direction. However the national government's role in many areas will be as a facilitator of adaptation action, not as the primary actor. This is particularly important since the impacts of climate change are felt across society, and not confined to the major elements of infrastructure (seawalls, roads, utilities) that are often the initial focus of adaptation programmes.

Of particular concern in the Pacific are the diverse and serious impacts on people's livelihoods in rural areas. Building resilience for food and agriculture production is a challenge that must involve people across society, producers' organisations and the private sector.

Capacity development is therefore essential for others in society – Parliamentarians, local government, traditional leaders, civil society, the private sector, farmers, fishermen and vulnerable communities. Typically, adaptation programmes include consultation with other actors, but little

systematic capacity development to enable them to play their roles effectively and build their own resilience.

The next section describes efforts in the Kingdom of Tonga, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu to strengthen the capacity of environment ministries and national disaster management offices (NDMOs) and promote the effective use of climate financing to link adaptation, mitigation and disaster responses.⁴ It is followed by a discussion of the lessons that are common to all three countries, despite their economic, cultural and geographic diversity, and concludes with a set of recommendations to better enhance national capacity.

NATIONAL-LEVEL APPROACHES TO STRENGTHEN CLIMATE ADAPTATION

The JNAP process in Tonga

The first country to formally combine work on climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction was the Kingdom of Tonga.⁵ In July 2009, Cabinet gave approval for the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MECC)⁶ to work with other ministries, NGOs, statutory boards and donors to develop the Joint National Action Plan on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management 2010-15 (JNAP).⁷

The preparation of the plan was deliberately scheduled at the same time as a country-wide consultation to develop Tonga's second national communication to the UNFCCC, reducing 'workshop fatigue' amongst NGOs and communities who participated in both meetings.

The new plan was signed off by Cabinet in July 2010 with the aim of coordinating implementation and aligning local action with Tonga's commitments under national, regional and international agreements (from PIFACC and the Millennium Development Goals, to UNFCCC and the Yokohama and Hyogo Framework for Action on natural disasters).

To assist with implementing the plan, the Tongan government approved the creation of a JNAP Task Force with its own secretariat, based in the Environment Ministry. Primary funding came from donors, such as the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), which contributed dedicated funding for salaries through the International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative (ICCAI).

The JNAP Task Force includes representatives from a range of government ministries (Health, Education, Lands, Survey and Natural Resources, Agriculture and Food, Forestry and Fisheries), agencies (Police, Defence, Tonga Meteorological Services, National Emergency and Management Office, Water Board) and key community organisations involved in adaptation and disaster programmes, such as the Tonga Community Development Trust (TCDT), Civil Society Forum of Tonga (CSFT) and Tonga Red Cross.

The JNAP Secretariat, established in August 2011, is based at the Environment Ministry (from July 1, 2012 renamed the Ministry of Land, Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources). The unit currently includes a Team Leader, Climate Change Finance Officer and Technical Implementation Support Officer. To support JNAP staff, the process also established Technical Working Groups, involving government and key community organisations such as the Red Cross.

Beyond coordination, a core function of the Secretariat is to improve the effective use of resources, in line with regional and international agreements like the 2009 Cairns Compact and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Broader policy on climate responses is governed by a range of structures, at

parliamentary and senior officials' level. The Cabinet Committee on Climate Change (CCCC) includes the Ministers for Environment, Finance, Transport, Works, Justice and the Attorney General, while the Legislative Assembly of Tonga has created an Environment and Climate Change Standing Committee.

The National Environment and Climate Change Committee (NECCC) is mandated to coordinate all activities relating to the environment, climate change and impact assessments. The NECCC includes CEOs of key ministries and serves as advisor to Cabinet. The equivalent National Emergency Management Committee (NEMC) has the responsibility for Disaster Risk Management (DRM) capacity building.

Papua New Guinea's Office of Climate Change and Development

Papua New Guinea's experience of establishing a coordinating body for climate responses has been far more problematic than in other Pacific states, reflecting a complex interplay of factors: the diversity and size of an island nation of 7 million people; the greater focus on reducing carbon emissions from deforestation and degradation of forests (REDD+) rather than adaptation, and; broader problems in the management of public finances and lack of outreach to rural areas, at a time of major political change.

In 2008, the PNG government established an Office of Climate Change and Carbon Trading (OCCCT). The OCCCT was to report to the Office of the Prime Minister, and was headed by the Prime Minister's then chief-of-staff Dr. Theo Yasause. The agency was renamed the Office of Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability (OCCES) in early 2009, but its operations were crippled by allegations of fraud and mismanagement that led to the suspension of the Director in June 2009 and a review of OCCES. As one commentator has noted: "These scandals have significantly affected the legitimacy and trust in climate change institutions, both domestically and internationally, and raised serious concerns about nepotism in appointments to key climate change policy positions."⁸

Papua New Guinea's National Executive Council decided on March 23, 2010 to abolish the OCCES and create new structures to coordinate policy and action on climate change:

- The National Climate Change Committee first met in June 2010. Chaired by the Chief Secretary, it comprises key CEOs from planning, finance and line ministries, and was established as the main policy and decision making body;
- A new Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) was established in September 2010 as the main co-ordinating unit, with the Secretary of the Department of Environment and Conservation serving as OCCD's acting director.

OCCD recruited a range of young, professional staff and established a series of Technical Working Groups (TWGs), on Adaptation; REDD+; Low Carbon Growth; Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV); and National Communication. The working groups include a range of government, private sector and non-government representatives.

As detailed in the case study *Consulting the provinces in Papua New Guinea*, in Chapter 4 *Creating a culture of learning*, OCCD also began a national series of consultation workshops to reach to all provinces. Compared to other small Pacific Island nations, discussion on adaptation responses in Papua New Guinea are at a very early stage. Much more attention has focussed on REDD+ and the possible introduction of emissions trading schemes using forests as carbon sinks. Nonetheless, OCCD

has begun an adaptation programme focussed on: malaria and vector-borne disease; developing a coastal early warning system; mapping high risk areas for landslides or flooding; developing low-cost and cost-effective measures for adaptation responses by villages with limited resources (such as planting mangroves).

From NACCC to NAB in Vanuatu

As with other Pacific countries, Vanuatu has begun to investigate the integration of climate change and disaster risk management into one structure.⁹ According to an April 2012 government report, “The current separation between climate change and disaster risk management has led to stakeholder confusion, duplication of efforts, excessive time and resource demands on a limited number of actors, weak governance arrangements and a less effective delivery of services to ni-Vanuatu people.”¹⁰

The process of integration involves a range of tasks:

- Combining a series of overlapping strategic policy documents, including Vanuatu’s UNFCCC National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA), the National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (NCCAS) and National Action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management 2006–2016;
- Creating unified governance structures and processes. Until now disaster work has been managed through the Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management National Action Plan Task Force (NTF), housed under the Ministry of Internal Affairs. In contrast, the body that oversees climate change implementation, the National Advisory Committee on Climate Change (NACCC), is located under the Ministry of Infrastructure and Public Utilities, chaired through the Vanuatu Meteorological and Geohazards Department;
- Passing new legislation beyond the existing *National Disaster Act of 2000* to fully enable climate change and disaster risk integration (in contrast to the NTF, NACCC currently operates without formal legislation);
- Establishing a system of monitoring, reporting and verification on adaptation initiatives.¹¹

The reform process is supported by locally based consultants funded by the World Bank and jointly by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the German Agency for International Development (GIZ), as well as technical advice from the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), SPC and other regional networks.

In February 2012, the Vanuatu government held a workshop to discuss the shift to a new coordinating structure. The aim was to effectively merge the structures that currently manage work on disaster and climate responses into a single national advisory board (NAB). This board officially came into existence in May 2012, replacing the NACCC, and is made up of senior officials with clear tasks and mandates, detailed in legislation. A fully staffed Project Management Unit is being created as the NAB secretariat, based at the Vanuatu Meteorological and Geohazards Department.¹² The government has explicitly requested public feedback on the proposed structures, as well as draft legislation to implement the changes.

As detailed in the case study, *Creating a civil society climate network in Vanuatu* in Chapter 2, *Strengthening partnerships and coordination*, Vanuatu civil society organisations have formed a Climate Change Network, and local and international NGOs are working together on disaster responses through the Vanuatu Humanitarian Team. This networking has allowed them to come together to present common responses to government, especially over proposals in the draft legislation that might restrict their work on the ground.

LESSONS AND CHALLENGES

The three countries in this project reflect some of the diversity of the region, in politics, population, cultural mix and geography. From Tonga's highly educated population of 100,000 living under a constitutional monarchy, to Papua New Guinea's vast sprawl with over 800 language groups living in isolated mountains and outlying islands, to Vanuatu's diverse society, strong in *kastom* and still overcoming the bureaucratic and administrative legacies of decades of British and French colonialism.

Despite this diversity, many common lessons and challenges were discovered through interviews with key participants in the three countries and workshops in Tonga and Vanuatu:

- The need to educate decision-makers, particularly because of the fluidity of domestic politics impacting on progressive development of public policy and management;
- A lack of resources to meet all the climate units' designated mandate;
- The valuable role of inclusive technical working groups and non-state participants;
- The importance of community outreach and strengthening capacity and implementation at the provincial level;
- The need to extend capacity building to non-state actors in society;
- Recognition that men, women and children are affected differently by climate change, but also have varied positive contributions to the community response.

Each of these lessons is discussed in the next sections along with recommendations drawn from the research.

Educating decision makers

The fluidity of domestic politics often complicated the work of these climate units, with regular changes of government or minister impacting on the potential for new policy directions.

This is most noticeable in Papua New Guinea, where the rapid transition from OCCT to OCCES to OCCD in 2010-12 was fundamentally influenced by political tensions. National elections held in June 2012 have once again changed the political landscape, with a new environment minister in the government led by Prime Minister Peter O'Neill. Vanuatu has also had a series of coalition governments in recent years, with national elections scheduled in late 2012.

In December 2010 the office of Tongan Prime Minister was elected by Parliament rather than appointed by the monarch for the first time. Incoming Prime Minister, Lord Tu'ivakano decided to amalgamate a number of ministries to reduce their number from 24 to 14, with implications for the ministerial and executive leadership of key climate-related areas like environment, finance and national planning. On July 1, 2012, the new structure came into operation, with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change now amalgamated into a new Ministry of Lands, Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources.

In the *Strategic understanding for politicians and decision makers* section in Chapter 4, we outline ways politicians and decision makers can improve their engagement with officials and community practitioners and their understanding of climate change adaptation and related strategic and investment decisions. It is important that capacity building is available to Parliamentarians more

broadly, so that there can be policy continuity and cross-party support for climate change policies and programmes.

Boosting resources for action

Lessons from the three country approaches highlight an urgent need for longer-term, institutional capacity building with direct budgetary and sectoral funding to boost resources for action. Until systems of direct budgetary support are better entrenched, project-based climate action will cause increasing obstacles and management burdens for Pacific governments, and these will continue unless donors coordinate effectively and simplify their systems.

Core funding for staff salaries does not generally provide the resources needed for outreach to the community, awareness programmes and research. In Tonga, for example, initial funding support for JNAP salaries from AusAID has been welcomed, but this sort of support cannot be guaranteed long-term and, in terms of sustainability, donors would prefer to have core costs provided by government. Although the JNAP Secretariat has its own dedicated staff, there are still constraints on logistics, budget and office space. Eighty per cent of the Ministry's budget is project-funded which means implementation of national climate change plans is carried out almost entirely with short-term, limited commitments of resources. Ministry staff also acknowledged financial constraints on key tasks, like community outreach and awareness programmes, which have to be funded from project budgets rather than core funds.

The uneven distribution of resources across government is problematic. Climate units may be able to tap the increasing amounts of climate financing to run projects, with administration costs built in to help their ministry's bottom line. But these projects rarely provide the funds needed for other ministries or agencies crucial for the effective governance of climate adaptation, such as the management and auditing of public finances.

Pacific countries have to respond to immediate impacts of climate variability and natural disaster at the same time as planning long-term strategic investments in restructuring of the economy, government and production. But this cannot always happen in practice when short term funding and implementation cycles dominate donor and international development efforts. This challenge was noted in the outcomes of a 2011 Pacific climate adaptation conference, *Lessons for Future Action*: "Long-term planning, with medium term milestones, which allows new information to be incorporated, is required. It needs to allow actions and investments to be informed by projected future as well as current risks."¹³

Inclusive technical working groups

Papua New Guinea's experience with the use of technical working groups (TWGs) suggests they are a valuable way of tapping the expertise and capacities of non-state actors, though many participants had suggestions to make them function more effectively.

The OCCD doesn't have a specific TWG on funding, so the issue is dealt with by existing working groups on Adaptation, Monitoring Reporting and Verification, or REDD+. However some of these groups already have ambitious outcomes and existing members are participating because of their expertise on the working group topic, rather than in the management of environmental or development programmes crucial for capacity building.

The TWG's draft submissions are sent to the NCCC, where heads of government departments make decisions or pass a recommendation to Cabinet. But some participants expressed uncertainty about what is reported from their TWG discussions to NCCC, and many expressed interest in more systematic

engagement: “All we get to do is comment on pre-drafted documents, but we want to be involved from the start.”¹⁴

At the regional level, SPREP and other CROP agencies are developing a Regional Technical Support Mechanism (RTSM), which will be supported by a rapid response fund that will assist the deployment of technical assistance in response to country requests. This initiative will need financial support from development partners, but also from national governments who will need to free up staff for regional secondments.

Strengthening capacity in outer islands and remote areas

In spite of significant urbanisation in some nations – half the population of Fiji and Kiribati now live in towns or peri-urban settlements – most Pacific Islanders still live in rural and remote locations, especially in the more populous Melanesian nations like Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Capacity therefore needs to be strengthened in outer islands, which presents specific challenges.

Research participants stressed an ongoing problem is lack of capacity at the provincial level for follow-up and coordination of projects. As detailed in the case study in Chapter 4, *Consulting the provinces in Papua New Guinea*, the OCCD in PNG launched an ambitious programme of national consultation at provincial level. Recommendations from workshops included “establishing a climate change focal point in the provincial administration”, “creating provincial technical working groups with relevant stakeholders”, and “integrating climate change into provincial disaster response plans”.¹⁵

Papua New Guinea’s Manus Province appointed the first provincial-level climate change officer, and other provinces – including New Ireland and Simbu – have staff dedicated to climate change as well as environment or disaster response duties.¹⁶ But most provincial environment officers aren’t solely focussed on climate change and the particular tasks needed for long-term adaptation, creating additional challenges to climate change adaptation at the provincial level.

Building capacity for non-state actors

Building resilience to climate change is a challenge for all society, not only national and local government. In Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu, community leaders stressed the vast majority of land is held under customary ownership by kinship groups, not by the state. Therefore without the involvement of customary landholders, and community level involvement in the sustainable use of land and resources, responding to climate change will be impossible. Donors, governments and NGOs need to create new mechanisms to redirect funding and information to rural and outlying communities, and allocate resources to address energy disparities between provinces: for example, 77 per cent of households in Port Moresby have access to electricity, but the figure nationwide is less than 10 per cent.

Prioritising capacity development for women, men and children

Adaptation involves analysis of risk, vulnerability and resilience, and different sectors of the community face different risks in time of disaster. There is a growing body of evidence that shows women, men and children contribute to climate change responses in different ways and have different capabilities based on their knowledge, experiences and expertise. In spite of this, a leading analyst of international climate financing has noted: "While gender considerations are not completely absent in existing dedicated climate funds, they have been generally added only as an afterthought."¹⁷

What follows is a description of how gender is linked to climate change and some of the implications this has on designing appropriate responses.

Women and children are disproportionately the victims in floods, cyclones or displacement events, generally suffering a higher mortality rate.¹⁸ Beyond the immediate impact of disasters, the loss of homes, valuables, food gardens and livelihoods can place new stresses on family life, including violence in the home. In early 2011, for example, two tropical cyclones (Vania and Atu) hit Tafea Province in the south of Vanuatu. Women and children faced specific impacts after the cyclones left families without food or income in the first half of the year. Risks to children, especially girls, were identified in the Vania Joint Damage Assessment, but no formal protection response followed. The Tanna Women's Counselling Centre reported a 300 per cent increase in new domestic violence clients in the first nine months of 2011, in comparison to the previous year. There was also a tripling in the number of cases of lapsed child maintenance payments after the disaster.¹⁹

At grassroots level, changing weather patterns can have an impact on the need for cash or credit. For example, women farmers involved in a community climate change consultation in PNG's Manus Province highlighted changing needs for money: "In the past we used leaves to create shade for our plant nurseries, but nowadays the leaves dry out. Now we need money to buy shade cloth to protect our seedlings from the sun."²⁰ In response, organisations designing climate funds and programmes need to ensure women are not disadvantaged in gaining access to credit or financial extension services, such as rural banking programmes run by commercial banks.²¹ The experience of programmes like the Vanuatu Women's Development Scheme shows it is possible to provide accessible financial and business development services to economically marginalised individuals and communities.

In 2011, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) initiated a Gender Equity in Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation in the Pacific project, known as GenderCC. GenderCC workshops organised so far, in Tuvalu, Kiribati and Fiji, have highlighted the need to pay more attention to people who are not usually engaged in decision making; mainly women and youth. The workshops have offered a better understanding of why women are not always included in decision making due to cultural issues.²²

SUMMARY

In summary, Pacific governments and their communities need to respond to the increasing scale of climate challenges and climate finance flows by redesigning existing resources and investing in new structures and systems. Donors can play a key role by providing long-term commitments, with direct budgetary and sectoral support, rather than short-term project-based funding. Regional intergovernmental agencies can play a vital role in enhancing national capacity and maintaining continuity, especially amongst Pacific countries with fewer resources, and where progressive changes

to public policy and management are interrupted by political tensions and high ministerial and staff turnover. Crucial investment in resources and skills are needed at all levels to build capacity of governments (national and provincial), and in non-state actors – including civil society, traditional leaders, private sector organisations and local communities, especially in outer islands and remote areas. Particular attention needs to be paid to the most vulnerable groups in society, especially women and children.

A list of suggestions to improve efforts to enhance capacity for climate adaptation in Pacific countries is summarised in Chapter 6, *Recommendations*, on page 57.

CHAPTER 2: STRENGTHENING PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION

Stronger partnerships and better coordination between all stakeholders will reduce climate vulnerability and enable more efficient use of climate resources. Lack of coordination has been highlighted in a recent World Bank report analysing climate and disaster responses in the Pacific since the 1990s: “Progress in reducing vulnerability has been retarded in part because of fundamental problems with coordination and among relevant actors at all levels. The policy frameworks, governments, regional organisations, and donor and development institutions responsible for carrying out disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation often work in isolation from one another, and in isolation from the actors involved in socioeconomic development planning and implementation.”²³

Improved coordination needs to occur at a range of levels:

- Different development partners (governments, multilateral development banks and international NGOs) should **improve donor flexibility and coordination**, reduce the complexity of climate funding mechanisms, coordinate to avoid duplication of initiatives, share experience of better practice and streamline requirements for reporting and fiduciary standards.
- National governments should **improve coordination among government departments** (especially with planning, financial and aid coordination units).
- National governments should **improve coordination with non-state actors**, between government, business and the community sector, and with customary structures such as Councils of Chiefs.
- Non-government, church, private sector and community organisations should **strengthen coordination within, and amongst, the non-state actors**, to coordinate more effectively, form consortia, work with government to develop common standards and priorities, and empower vulnerable communities and marginalised groups that are not well represented in official decision making.

There are some encouraging examples of coordination at all these levels. But a common remark was that there was still a long way to go, with national governments lacking the time, resources or sometimes inclination, to improve accountability in these directions.

This chapter provides examples of some positive coordination efforts between donors, government departments and civil society, and suggests how new resources and ways of working could improve, or extend, this work.

Addressing problems of donor flexibility and coordination

There was widespread agreement amongst interviewees that institutional and bureaucratic inflexibility by donors and development partners is a major problem. The complexity of the global architecture of climate financing and delays in adapting systems to the particular needs of Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are significant obstacles limiting access to climate financing and delaying implementation of programmes in the field. For further discussion see also Chapter 5.

This concern was expressed not only by NGOs and Pacific government officials, but also by a range of officers responsible for administering climate and disaster programmes by major aid donors. A June 2012 World Bank report, on climate and disaster resilience in the Pacific, acknowledges this problem, stating: “the institutional rigidity of donor organisations makes cooperation and partnership more difficult... Joint programming of climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction activities by donors and implementing agencies is not widespread.”²⁴

A March 2012 assessment of multilateral agencies by the Australian government aid agency, AusAID, agrees there is a need to reduce the duplication of programmes, with “scope for significant improvement in how multilateral organisations work together in food security, emergency assistance and climate change”.²⁵

Debates about overcoming ineffective donor coordination are generally two sided. Most reports on climate finance highlight the weak institutional capacity of Pacific Island states and their lack of ‘absorptive capacity’ to manage and effectively utilise increased allocations of adaptation and development finance. Pacific governments readily acknowledge these constraints and, as detailed in Chapter 2, are moving to create new systems to address these weaknesses. In turn, Pacific leaders and officials have highlighted that one of the region’s biggest challenges is effective donor coordination, and that bilateral and multilateral donor engagement should be on the basis of island countries’ own priorities and strategies.²⁶

In 2009, Forum leaders agreed on the Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific.²⁷ The Cairns Compact outlines actions designed to improve the coordination and use of development resources in the region, and follows international principles stated in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. In spite of efforts under the Cairns Compact and a series of peer reviews on aid management coordinated through the Forum Secretariat, there is an ongoing challenge for SIDS to deal with the complex array of multilateral and bilateral climate funding channels, and for donors to effectively coordinate their initiatives.

One advantage in the Pacific is the small size of cities allows some improvement in coordination through informal and personal networking of key staff outside of institutional mechanisms. However many interviewees raised concerns about high staff turnover in donor agencies, arguing that sustainability of programming on climate change requires a long-term outlook, awareness of existing regional and local initiatives and coordination with other agencies, based on personal contact as much as institutional mechanisms.²⁸

Several examples exist of frameworks that can provide the basis for better donor coordination:

- **Development Partners for Climate Change (DPCC)** is an informal donors’ working group initiated by UNDP and Asian Development Bank (ADB), as a mechanism for Fiji-based donors and the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP) agencies, to coordinate climate activities. Interviewees identified the DPCC as a valuable structure for sharing information, but acknowledged it had not yet led to coordination of programmes at country level or inter-agency collaboration in programming.
- The nine regional inter-governmental agencies under the banner of the CROP established the **CROP Sub-Committee on Climate Change** in October 2010 which is currently developing a matrix to map what different actors are working on.
- The **Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)** has been undertaking research on climate financing. The Forum Secretariat presented an options paper to the Forum Economic Ministers Meeting in

2011 analysing a range of financing options, appointed a Climate Change Coordination Officer in February 2012, and began publication of a Climate Change Financing e-letter in June 2012. The Secretariat is co-coordinating a study of climate financing in Nauru and has published a study of various mechanisms used to govern climate finance in the region.²⁹

- Donor coordination in Papua New Guinea is run through the **Development Partners Climate Change Forum**, co-hosted by UNDP and the British High Commission. In 2011 the forum met regularly but meetings have been more ad hoc in 2012. The forum serves mainly for information sharing between donors, as priority setting is conducted through the National Climate Change Committee
- The Tongan government maintains a regular **donor dialogue meeting** (held twice in 2011), that has increased its attention on climate issues.
- In Vanuatu, donors have **monthly coordination meetings** (at Head of Mission level), including a sub-committee on gender, human rights and climate change.
- There are a range of other sectoral working groups or coordinating initiatives at regional level, such as the **Pacific Energy Donor Working Group**.

These donor coordination meetings allow for some coordination on climate change issues, but do not always meet regularly and can lack the authority to determine policy. Some in-country staff of key donor nations saw policy being driven from 'home base' rather than locally, with one noting: "climate programming is developed in capital cities and Suva, and we have little input into the overall strategic direction of policy or practice."³⁰

As detailed in Chapter 5, the use of direct budgetary support, national climate funds or direct access to the forthcoming Green Climate Fund may reduce these problems. However these mechanisms will require strict fiduciary standards and management of public and private finance that will be difficult for some Pacific governments to achieve in the short term. Although these have significant advantages for Pacific countries, blending finance from a variety of sources under these mechanisms presents another challenge as it will make it harder to track resources from a particular donor.

Improving coordination across departments

The impacts of climate change are cross-cutting, which means governments face new challenges to coordinate among departments. As described under the section, *National-level approaches to strengthen climate adaptation*, in Chapter 1, some Pacific countries have created, or expanded, specialised units to help coordinate the implementation of national adaptation and disaster response plans. They have also established national climate change committees that bring together departmental secretaries, or their alternates, to develop whole-of-government responses to climate change.

But these efforts have not always solved the coordination problem. As one analyst has noted, "new and exotic institutions, including climate-related funds, committees and even ministries, are emerging in some countries. However, in the near term, for many countries, climate governance will remain the domain of more familiar institutions, such as public utilities commissions and ministries of finance, forests and the environment. It will likely be on their already burdened shoulders that the challenge of making fair and effective climate policies will rest."³¹

In many smaller Pacific countries, government officials involved in climate change adaptation are often also involved in disaster preparedness and response. To avoid duplication of effort and reporting to two separate regional processes – the *Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006 – 2015* (PIFACC) and the *Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action* – some countries have begun to integrate planning and policy for the two sectors. To achieve

this, some countries, such as Kiribati, Cook Islands and Papua New Guinea, have based the lead coordinating function in the Office of the President or Prime Minister. Others have looked for leadership from Ministries of Environment and national climate change units.

Across the region, the integration of climate change analysis into national development planning and the work programmes of line ministries is one of the best ways to effectively utilise climate funding. But this is often lagging. For example, in spite of the importance of addressing the social impacts of climate change, the PNG Department of Community Development does not yet have a specific programme on climate change addressing needs of vulnerable and marginalised groups, although the Department is represented on the Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) Adaptation Technical Working Group.

Examples of efforts to improve coordination between government departments and other actors are:

- **Sectoral planning, targeting a theme or a particular location.** Climate planners can draw on the experience of previous sectoral initiatives in the region, such as integrated water management programmes that use risk management approaches and bring together steering committees with wide membership. One example is the Nadi River Basin Committee in Fiji, which involves local government, NGOs, government agencies and private sector businesses. Their work ranges from managing flooding, to drinking water and public health, and from water impacts on tourism and agriculture to the infrastructure capacity of the Public Works Department.
- **Joint development of a strategic roadmap.** Led by the World Bank, the 2010 Tonga Energy Roadmap was developed as a coordinated statement of Tonga's medium term energy priorities.³²

Linking governments and civil society

The promotion of exchanges and common areas of action between government and the community sector is an important part of improving climate responses in the Pacific. Non-government, church and private sector organisations have played a significant role, not just in implementing adaptation and mitigation projects at community level, but also working with government officials to develop policy and to lobby at the regional and international level.

Community-based organisations, such as local women's and youth groups and the networks of churches and NGO alliances, have a level of outreach and integration at the community level that governments often have trouble maintaining. Customary structures, such as councils of traditional leaders are another crucial avenue for outreach to local communities, especially to integrate traditional knowledge into climate adaptation. See the case study *Using traditional knowledge for adaptation* in Chapter 4.

In many Pacific countries there are often ad hoc meetings tied to particular initiatives (such as the preparation of national communications to the UNFCCC), but it would be valuable to hold regular scheduled national roundtables involving government officials, community and private sector practitioners, and development partners. These meetings could serve multiple purposes beyond basic information sharing: allowing outer island representatives to meet officials from the capital who rarely have time or budget to travel; allowing government to coordinate with key INGOs and CSOs, and gathering data to update climate portals and national reporting.

The idea of bringing together climate adaptation actors from rural areas and outer islands was welcomed by community groups in all the countries surveyed for this report. For example, the manager of the Global Environment Facility Small Grants Programme, based at the Vanuatu Association of NGOs

(VANGO,) noted: “on the ground, we are doing the work, but how can we share our findings? If we could get all our grantees together, not just on climate change... so we can blend our agendas. This would allow VANGO to collate information for government, saying this is what we’ve done and this is what we’ve faced. This sort of information can be brought together so it’s solid enough to influence government policy.”³³

However, there needs to be a certain amount of pragmatism in consultation, balancing the need for engagement with the expectation from target groups that some positive result will come from time spent volunteering information to visiting government officials or consultants. Officials could reduce the problem of ‘workshop fatigue’ in outlying villages, by coordinating NGO and government visits to outer islands – as representatives from Tonga’s Centre for Women and Children and government health workers do when they travel together to piggyback two programmes into one gathering.

Interviewees suggested a number of options for improving community engagement: creating dedicated NGO funding windows in financing mechanisms; ensuring NGO representation in Technical Working Groups, policy fora, and government delegations; and developing transparent processes for the selection of non-government members on climate coordination structures and trust fund boards.

Strengthening coordination within and amongst non-state actors

Efforts to coordinate NGO action should be positively supported and funded by donors and governments to overcome other factors that act as a disincentive to work together. NGOs are often forced to compete with one another to bid for small amounts of project funding. For example, in the first tranche of Australia’s A\$150 million International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative in 2008, an A\$2.7 million NGO window attracted over 40 bids for money, with just three projects funded. It was only in later stages of the Adaptation Initiative that funding was increased for NGOs, allowing a wider range of groups to participate and more scope for collaboration.

In response, NGOs across the Pacific have started to build coalitions to coordinate activities on climate adaptation, with Climate Action Networks established in Cook Islands, Tuvalu, Kiribati and other countries.

Case study: Creating a civil society climate network in Vanuatu

In Vanuatu, there are two new initiatives to break down silos between local and international NGOs, and allow more effective collaboration with government: the Vanuatu Humanitarian Team (VHT), focussed on disaster preparedness and response and the Climate Change Network, linking local and overseas groups working on adaptation, renewable energy and other climate responses.

The VHT is a network of non-government humanitarian actors, created with a main objective of ensuring timely and appropriate assistance to those affected by disaster in Vanuatu. Coordinated by Oxfam and funded by the European Community Humanitarian Office, the membership of the VHT includes:

- National agencies such as Vanuatu Association of Non-Government Organisations (VANGO) and the Vanuatu Rural Development and Training Centre Association (VRDTCA);
- International NGOs, including Oxfam, Save the Children, World Vision, CARE, Adventist Development and Relief Agency;
- The Red Cross movement, including Vanuatu Red Cross and French Red Cross;

- UN agencies (UNICEF, WHO, Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs).

The VHT is designed to improve coordination and preparedness by the non-government sector and also improve the engagement between the sector and government agencies (primarily the National Disaster Management Office). The VHT has already contributed to tangible improvements. For example, the assessment and decision-making process by government, donors and NGOs in response to Cyclone Jasmine in February 2012 was much more coordinated and effective when compared to the joint response to tropical cyclones Vania and Atu in early 2011.

Port Vila-based NGOs have established a network of climate change actors, which coordinates national and international organisations working on, or interested in working on, climate change. This Climate Change Network has been welcomed and recognised by the government and is now seen as a key consultative body in climate debate and policy development nationally. Through the civil society umbrella body VANGO, the Network has recently engaged with government over new climate change legislation, and through this dialogue contributed to significant revisions to the draft bill. As part of this process, Oxfam worked with government and NGOs to organise a workshop on climate change adaptation financing and how it could impact Vanuatu.

The growth of this network has coincided with a consortium proposal to seek funding for climate change adaptation. This coalition of local and international groups (including VANGO, VRDTCA, Oxfam, CARE, Save the Children, Vanuatu Red Cross and the German Society for International Co-operation (GIZ) was successful in securing funding from AusAID from the second round of the International Climate Change Adaptation Initiative NGO funding window, worth A\$2million over two and a half years. This donor support is for coordination work between consortium members, relatively unusual in climate funding, as well as the delivery of joined-up, on-ground climate adaptation programming. The members aim to secure long-term financial support to sustain the work of the consortium in the future.

This programme will build from the collective experience and specialist skills of consortium members in a range of ways: developing community level adaptation interventions; investing in evaluation, learning and research; lobbying and influencing government at the local through to national level, and in international processes. As well as operating throughout rural areas to address concerns over food and water security, this coalition-based approach increases the capacity to develop common messages and language to educate men, women and young people across Vanuatu about climate change, how it may affect them, and what government and other key players are doing.

Existing community networks already play a role in managing climate funds. For example, the Civil Society Forum of Tonga and VANGO already manage the Global Environment Facility-UNDP Small Grants Programme for their respective country. The creation of more effective civil society climate networks has many other benefits, including easier ways of reporting and consulting.

This practice is already producing tangible results, with NGOs well represented in the Technical Working Groups of PNG's OCCD and Tonga's JNAP Task Force, including the Tonga Trust, Red Cross and Civil Society Forum of Tonga. At international level, there are already many other examples of structures that include CSOs and private sector representatives, including women, on policy boards – as observers or full members with voting rights – providing lessons for Pacific governments to study and emulate.³⁴

Closer cooperation allows civil society groups to nominate appropriate community representatives to the board or committee responsible for overall decision-making and financial control of climate funding. This is important at national and regional level, as governments debate new climate financing mechanisms such as national climate funds or the proposed Pacific Regional Climate Change Fund. It is also important for Pacific governments and civil society views to influence the global negotiations, such as in the creation of forthcoming Green Climate Fund. See the *Strengthening Pacific voice in global negotiations* section in Chapter 5 for examples.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, addressing institutional and bureaucratic rigidity of donors and multilateral organisations is crucial to overcoming fundamental problems that limit access to climate financing. Actions that should be taken include: minimising staff turnover in donor agencies; providing better resourcing for existing frameworks for donor consultation at regional and national level; having more regular informal and formal meetings between aid and donor coordination institutions; and empowering cross-agency technical working groups to have an influence on policy development. Across the region, deeply embedding climate change analysis into national development planning and the work programmes of line ministries will be one of the best ways to effectively utilise climate funding. But coordination between climate units and other ministries is often lagging because of limited capacity and coordinated mandates.

Non-government, church and private sector organisations have a significant role to play, not just in implementing adaptation and mitigation projects at community level, but also working with government officials to develop policy. Their high levels of integration within local communities, including customary structures, and extensive networks, are attributes that governments cannot match. But civil society organisations need more support and encouragement to manage climate finance transparently, to coordinate, form consortia, work with governments to develop common standards and priorities, and empower vulnerable communities and marginalised groups that are not well represented in official decision making.

A list of suggested actions to strengthen partnerships and coordination to use climate resources more efficiently in Pacific countries are included in Chapter 6, *Recommendations* on page 61.

CHAPTER 3: BETTER INFORMATION, COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY

Although climate change is a global issue, its impacts are experienced locally and are cross-cutting in nature. To be effective, then, adaptation responses often need to be tailored to local environmental, social and cultural settings. This means the way information must be accessed, recorded, communicated and shared is different, and often more complex, than needed in the past for managing public sector services or aid programmes.

Often local climate responses are based on the skills, capacities and resilience that can be found within Pacific countries, but Pacific Islands people are also eager to obtain more external information and resources to respond to changes in the local environment.

The complex array of international mechanisms to access information and climate funding, as well as a lack of standardised definitions and methods for assessing and tracking funds, from pledges to action on the ground, does not make this task easy. See *Addressing problems of donor coordination* in Chapter 2.

New research will be needed to better understand local environmental, social and cultural settings and set baselines for future policy development, risk analysis and financial forecasting. Many Pacific Islands people are already well aware of changing weather patterns and have their own valuable experiences and understanding of climate, even though there is often limited understanding of the scientific explanations for it. Often climate change information is in a technical form that many people, from politicians to villagers, cannot easily use to guide action. The diverse cultures and linguistics of Melanesian countries – such as Papua New Guinea’s more than 800 languages – and traditional methods of communication, like storytelling, also provide challenges and opportunities for translating information so it is useful for decision making.

Crucially, it is not just about *what* information is useful, but *how* information is shared and discussed with communities. As governments develop well-intended national laws and policies, there is a need to ensure interventions are based on understanding and valuing Pacific culture.

This chapter outlines the need for better information, communication and transparency as central elements to improving the governance of climate financing and the delivery of community level adaptation projects in several key areas:

- **Better reporting and transparency in all climate funding mechanisms** by donors and multilateral agencies;
- Increased **sharing of information, particularly through the internet and new communications technology**;
- **Development of culturally appropriate information** and integration of Pacific culture;
- **Extending participatory and evidence-based research** to better represent local environmental, social and cultural variables that determine climate change responses and set baselines for future policy development;

- **Integration of gender and climate change** so the varying effects on different members of the community can be better understood and managed.

Improving transparency

Improving the transparency of information shared by donors, governments and community organisations is crucial to making progress in climate change adaptation. The call for transparency applies to Pacific governments and civil society as well as their international development partners.

Tracking donor funds from when they are pledged to action on the ground presents a major difficulty for Pacific communities and governments. New donor commitments to funding are often announced very publicly but these pledges sometimes double-count commitments made in previous years. For example, during a tour of the Pacific region in 2010, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced US\$21 million in adaptation funding, and then the same amount was re-announced by US officials at the 2011 Pacific Islands Forum leaders meeting.³⁵ The World Resources Institute has documented numerous examples of double-counting.³⁶

A May 2012 report from the OECD acknowledges “there is, as yet, no agreed definition of ‘climate finance’, and no centralised system for tracking all relevant climate flows. Crucial questions remain regarding what can be accounted for both under ‘climate’ and under ‘finance’, and which flows are eligible to be counted towards the US\$100 billion.”³⁷

A major priority for donors therefore, is to document not just *pledges* of climate funding, but whether the funding has been *budgeted* and *approved* by relevant legislatures or executive bodies; *dispersed* to recipient organisations, and *evaluated* for impact. All these steps need to be published and regularly updated on publicly accessible databases. These steps are all the more important as some governments and donors, such as UNDP, advocate the ‘blending’ of funds from a range of public and private sources in national climate funds.³⁸

It is increasingly important to document what climate funding is drawn from Official Development Assistance (ODA) budgets, and what is considered ‘new and additional’ funding.³⁹ Treaties such as the 1992 UN Framework Convention and the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, state climate finance for developing countries will be “new and additional.”⁴⁰ This distinction between climate finance and aid is crucial to avoid reduction to funding available for poverty reduction and development.

However the term ‘new and additional’ has never been properly defined and the uncertainty is becoming a major sticking point in the global negotiations. The Solomon Islands Ambassador to the United Nations, Collin Beck, has noted: “there are a lot of pledges but we are not sure where they are and whether it’s new and additional to their current overseas development assistance.”⁴¹

The Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund (AF) has made significant advances with transparency. On its website, the Board publishes operational documents and reports of its meetings, as well as key outcomes from major meetings of its committee and of its Accreditation Panel. But not all climate funds are equally transparent.

The call for transparency also applies to Pacific governments. When the UNFCCC developed a Fast Start Funds website to monitor initial fast start finance in 2010-12, the main information listed was provided by donors. Setting an example of transparency, the Republic of the Marshall Islands submitted its climate roadmap, energy policy and other reports, as well as the email and phone number of its Ambassador to the United Nations, as a sign of the need for greater information sharing by all governments.⁴²

There are a number of accountability mechanisms, such as community dialogue, traditional decision-making fora and social and environmental assessment that can ensure communities understand the impact of proposed projects, according to the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), and have input into the policies that should be actively promoted by Pacific governments.⁴³ There are also valuable initiatives like the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), designed to ensure detailed, accessible and timely information is available to meet the needs of different information users.

Using the internet and social media to share information

Although there are a number of websites that have started to publicise an analysis of climate finance, most focus on the international level, without much detail as to what is happening in the Pacific Islands region. Consistent definitions and standards of reporting are lacking and information is rarely made available in ways that enable it to be easily used.⁴⁴

In urban centres across the region, access to information is improving due to the significant spread of internet technology, social media, radio talkback and blogging, especially amongst the young.⁴⁵ One positive trend across the Pacific is that environment ministries and climate change units are developing internet portals that provide a useful one-stop shop for basic information on climate responses. See the case study *Developing climate portals*.

Case study: Developing climate portals

On April 18, 2012, Tonga's Minister for Environment and Climate Change, Lord Ma'afu Tukui'aulahi, launched the JNAP Secretariat website. According to the Minister: "the website is designed to both inform the public of all climate change adaptation and disaster risk activities within the Kingdom of Tonga, as well as a tool to aid in the coordination efforts for climate change and disaster risk activities by government agencies, NGOs, CSOs, and all relevant stakeholders and communities. The website also serves as a coordination tool for donor groups and development partners."⁴⁶

Going beyond promotional material for their ministries, many other countries have been developing functional climate change websites. The website for PNG's Office for Climate Change and Development (OCCD) publishes key documents and reports, a monthly e-newsletter, reports of provincial consultations, and fact sheets in English and Tok Pisin, with other languages to follow.⁴⁷

Vanuatu's Climate Change portal⁴⁸ includes a range of useful documents, such as: the National Action Plans on Adaptation (NAPAs); national communications to the UNFCCC; workshop reports and country strategies on climate adaptation or disaster response.

Other smaller sites can provide quick reference points to see which organisations are working in key sectors or areas, allowing better coordination between different players. For example, with support from the SPC-GIZ technical adviser, Vanuatu's Meteorology and Geohazards Department (VMGD) has produced a live Geographic Information Systems map of all climate and disaster risk reduction programmes and projects in Vanuatu.⁴⁹

The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP) has also developed the regional Pacific Climate Change Portal database of climate programming, as a tool for coordination and information sharing.⁵⁰

Development of culturally appropriate information

In spite of a growing awareness about climate issues – especially amongst urban youth who have privileged access to information either through schools, the internet or youth forum attendance – many people across the region cannot easily access information that could aid their responses to climate change. Many interviewees stressed this as a major challenge to raising community awareness. This challenge is heightened in Melanesian societies like Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, which have diverse cultural populations, hundreds of different languages and communities spread over vast areas, from peri-urban squatter settlements to outlying islands.

One simple step is to fund the translation of core information into local languages: Tonga's Ministry of Environment is seeking to translate climate change jargon into the Tongan language; the Eco-Forestry Forum (EFF) and PNG's OCCD have translated material from English into Tok Pisin (PNG pidgin), with other languages to follow; and Oxfam in Papua New Guinea has developed a manual on FPIC in both English and Tok Pisin.

However, in countries like PNG where the majority of people rely on local languages or Tok Pisin for daily communication, there are significant challenges in accurately translating the concepts of climate change using imagery and metaphors that resonate with people's lived experience and local culture. For example, in Tok Pisin the term 'greenhouse gas emissions' becomes *simok nogut igo antap long kilaut*, the bad smoke that rises above the clouds. As the EFF's climate coordinator noted, simply producing leaflets on climate change is not enough to serve as an awareness programme: "our people are still confused and awareness is a big task and a big challenge facing PNG now. This is because PNG is so diverse that you can't speak one language and convince everybody across the board. You have to speak 800 different languages to convince people and make people fully aware of climate change. Given the spread of our people, from the top of the mountain to the coast and the islands, how best can you reach them?"

A 2011 regional conference analysing the results of adaptation work in the Pacific found climate change information is not being translated to meet user needs or presented in a usable form. The conference stressed the need to "humanise information: describe likely impacts in a way people can relate to, such as how impacts may affect their livelihoods, families or traditions", by using a trusted person or source to deliver messages and a variety of methods and media to deliver information.⁵¹

But more importantly, in discussing concepts such as climate change, governments, civil society and development practitioners must ensure the information is linked to something community members can relate to. For example, instead of discussing climate change abstractly, discussions with communities should focus on changes to their physical environment over years (flooding, erosion, droughts and impacts on staple food sources) and impacts to their livelihoods and wellbeing, before gradually introducing insights from climate change science.

Beyond language barriers, there are other cultural norms and religious beliefs that affect attitudes to climate change in the Pacific. Some interviewees in Tonga suggested that there was a tradition to wait for government to respond to disasters rather than organise self-help initiatives: "in our Kingdom, people have been conditioned to be humble. For many ordinary people, they haven't come to realise that they have a part to play, they wait for help from somewhere."⁵²

There is also a complex theology in Pacific churches about the causes of environmental calamity and possible responses, with differing perspectives in mainstream, evangelical and Pentecostal churches.⁵³ In some cases, ideas of human agency in the stewardship of the environment are challenged by sense of fatalism about catastrophe, guided by a religious faith in God's protection.⁵⁴

The potential role of churches and other religious organisations in climate responses is crucial, especially given the social as well as spiritual role played by Christian denominations across the region, and the outreach of churches to every isolated community. Regional ecumenical organisations such as the Pacific Conference of Churches (PCC) are mounting education and action programmes on issues of climate change, adaptation and displacement. PNG's Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) has developed a formal memorandum of understanding with the Seventh Day Adventist church and its development arm, seeking funding to help with the church's programmes on the ground.

Donors and INGOs should increase the effective use of climate adaptation resources by supporting innovative ways of informing and educating different members of the community, using methods, concepts and language they understand:

- Recognising low levels of literacy in rural areas, the OCCD in Papua New Guinea supported the production of a 10-episode radio drama on climate change entitled *Taim wok long senis*, broadcast on the National Broadcasting Corporation (NBC). Given access to DVD technology in many villages, OCCD staff have started gathering footage to use for a film on climate impacts.
- In 2010, the University of the South Pacific (USP) in Suva hosted a major Oceanic Conference on Creativity and Climate Change, mobilising artists, writers, musicians, dancers and journalists to discuss ways to communicate climate messages to Pacific audiences.
- Vanuatu's Wan Smol Bag theatre has added environment issues to its long-running village and community theatre programmes.
- The Tuvalu Red Cross has run an innovative programme for young children called the Red Cross Juniors, which educates children about the environment around them through games, stories and practical tasks.

A core problem facing all countries is that much information is collated in reports that are only read by a narrow range of practitioners and officials, rather than in a format that is practically useful at the community level. In the Pacific region, sharing of information is often conducted through informal processes – kava circles, social networking and community conversations – rather than formal documentation, and this presents both a major challenge and an opportunity to address in the future. For example, rather than rely on written reports, development partners should investigate the creation of funding windows to promote more face-to-face exchanges, including community-to-community visits; the use of video, radio and art; internships from staff in other ministries or organisations; and hands-on sharing of experience across sectors, or even countries.

However, support for this type of work is rarely built into core government budgets, which usually cover salaries but not operational costs, so generally outreach and informational materials are only funded if the project budget covers this type of activity. There is also scope for more innovative responses, working with local civil society, rather than hiring overseas consultants who produce reports that are not as accessible as locally generated materials.

Extending participatory and evidence-based research

While the media promotes a broader awareness of variability in the weather and climate, there is a need to move from anecdote to evidence. Another area to strengthen climate responses is working with local communities, NGOs, universities and governments to research, document and publicise the social, cultural and economic effects of climate change, and develop baseline studies that will assist future action. To do this, Pacific governments and civil society need to better utilise participatory research and assessment tools to provide data and research that can set baselines for future policy development and financial analysis, as well as empower communities to improve their wellbeing and livelihoods. See also *Linking governments and civil society* in Chapter 2.

In many sectors, a lack of baseline data makes long-term policy development difficult. For example in Papua New Guinea, the 1998 El Niño drought caused major problems with food and water security in the Highlands region, and the Australian government funded A\$30 million of food aid in rural villages affected by food shortages. Many people, especially children, suffered gastro-intestinal disease as a result of changing their diet and water supply, but researchers lacked the baseline data from previous years to determine the exact causal relationship between the changing climatic patterns and an apparent spike of disease during the course of the drought.⁵⁵

For some governments, data is available but is scattered across different departments or databases. Interpretation of data can be a problem, due to lack of technical expertise. This suggests the need for investment in new methods of data gathering and dissemination in ways that are accessible, as well as more effective collaboration between government departments, community groups and organisations with specialist research and training skills.

A range of information used by different INGOs involved in climate adaptation programmes at community level must be standardised to enable assessments of need, vulnerability and learning. This will assist by allowing data to be directly compared with other INGOs working on similar projects, as well as the host government, in order to avoid the proliferation of studies and evaluations that are difficult to compare over space and time.

While many of the techniques for community vulnerability assessment and disaster preparedness have relevance for climate adaptation, they are not adequate to make long-term assessments of changes that may take decades to become apparent. Research participants noted there is a need for development of different research tools that involve baselines and rolling review, to cope with the drawn out nature of the climate emergency.

There are some encouraging initiatives. In recent years, there have been significant investments in meteorology and climate science through initiatives like the Australian-funded Pacific Climate Change Science Program, which produced a major regional report in November 2011. This project has been extended as the Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning Program, costing AUD\$32 million for 2011-13.⁵⁶ National institutions like PNG's Forest Research Institute and Institute for Medical Research have begun to integrate climate change into their work programme, while the SPC has led research on salt-resistant taro and other agricultural innovation. SPREP's Socioeconomic Assessment Guideline for the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change provides tools for looking at community impacts and adaptation. With support from the Asia Development Bank, the Cook Islands government has developed innovative community mapping of climate risks in Rarotonga and Aitutaki, looking at social, economic and environmental threats and developing community-based impact and adaptation strategies within four vulnerable communities.

But across the region interviewees identified gaps in other areas that need increased attention, including topics such as:

- Potential crop yields, changes to land use and economic losses in the agriculture sector from long-term climate change;
- Trends in disease vectors and public health related to global warming;
- Research in differing cultural contexts on the ways in which climate change affects men, women and children differently.

SPREP officials have stressed that a particular concern is to conduct analysis of the ‘loss and damage’ caused for SIDS by the adverse impacts of slow-onset climate change, in contrast to the extensive work already undertaken on natural disasters. As one adaptation specialist noted: “the UNFCCC, as a treaty, is designed to deal with the two paradigms of preventing dangerous climate change [adaptation and mitigation] and not with dealing with damages after they occur.”⁵⁷

Through extensive lobbying at UNFCCC meetings, members of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) have succeeded in establishing a work programme on loss and damage, but there is a need for case studies at the national level.

While evidence-based climate research was identified as a gap by donors, governments and community groups, there was no common agreement on the type of research that would best assist effective use of climate resources.

Community advocates raised concern that research often produces valuable data, but in formats that cannot easily be communicated to policy makers in the Pacific, let alone translated into concrete adaptation work in the low-lying atolls of the region. They expressed caution about simply allocating significant amounts from climate adaptation funds to scientific or academic research. As discussed in the case study below, Research for the future in Lifuka, the challenge for climate finance organisations is to develop participatory research processes that also draw on local knowledge and empower grassroots communities across the region.

There are a number of good examples of participatory research on climate adaptation in the Pacific that could be replicated with more funding and technical support, using methods such as *storian* (telling stories) as a method of data collection; developing seasonal calendars and historical timelines that draw on cross-generational knowledge of the local environment and using village walks to identify natural resources and vulnerabilities. See also *Respecting traditional knowledge for adaptation* in Chapter 4.

As one study on participatory research in Vanuatu notes, Community Based Assessment (CBA) “focusses largely on empowerment or helping people to help themselves. Planned CBA aims to reduce vulnerability to climate change by addressing local priorities and building on local knowledge and capacity. Unequivocally, CBA is something done ‘with’ rather than ‘to’ communities.”⁵⁸

Case study: Research for the future in Lifuka

In the Ha’apai Islands of the Kingdom of Tonga, a collaborative effort between government, NGOs, a regional organisation and local communities is investigating impacts on people’s livelihoods and environment from sea-level rise.

The island of Lifuka is in a unique situation after an earthquake in May 2006 caused land subsidence. Subsequent coastal erosion damaged a three kilometre section of the island, potentially affecting key community infrastructure such as the hospital, harbour and people's houses. Prior to the earthquake, Lifuka's reef had been fully exposed at low tide, allowing women to gather seafood to aid family nutrition. However since 2006, the reef is no longer exposed even at low tide and access to this important food source has declined.

The erosion on Lifuka models long-term problems small island states will face in coming years. With funding from the Australian government in 2012, research on Lifuka now involves Tonga's Ministry of Environment, staff from the Human Development and Applied Geoscience Divisions of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and NGO members led by Sione Faka'osi and Emeli Esau of the Tonga Community Development Trust (TCDT) and the Ha'apai Development Committee.

Early attempts to halt erosion involved a trial of a seawall made of sandbags on the foreshore. This barrier didn't last long because of storm surges. The initial failure sparked renewed community initiatives to seek alternatives, an example of the need for constant learning and project revision as reality intervenes. TCDT worked with villagers to develop a funding proposal, with 2000 pa'anga (NZ\$1400) allocated for each village under a small grants programme. Three of four villages in the area identified food security as a priority for a small grants pilot, while Hihifo wanted action on foreshore management.

Today, the project involves a range of components. As well as environmental assessments by SPC on coastal erosion and water resources, TCDT is also working with villagers to gather data on social, cultural and economic trends. The project is documenting the knowledge, experiences, observations and coping strategies of the villagers. This year-long research work serves to develop baselines for future action and to study both environmental and non-climate variables essential for adaptation.

Integrating gender and the rights of the vulnerable

Many interviewees identified a pressing need for more detailed research in different cultural contexts on how climate change affects men, women and children in different ways.

As outlined under *Building capacity for women, men and children* in Chapter 1, there is a concern women are more adversely affected by changing climatic effects, but this needs specific data in the context of Pacific cultures, especially in multilingual and diverse societies in Melanesia. In Port Moresby, UNDP climate advisor, Gwen Maru, noted, "given PNG's cultural complexity, with hundreds of language groups, it's difficult for us to go to a village and just say you should do more for women – we need more data and evidence base to show what's happening on the ground."⁵⁹

The collection of disaggregated data would permit project design to incorporate the differential needs and priorities of men, women and children, with regard to climate change adaptation. Existing development practice has developed a range of tools often ignored in climate finance policy documents perhaps because climate change is often framed as an environmental rather than a social, cultural and economic problem. Tools such as gender indicators, social and gender analysis, sex-differentiated datasets, gender monitoring and gender auditing can be used to "take the differentiated impacts on, and contributions of, men and women into account in project development and implementation".⁶⁰

While there have been a few initiatives to begin disaggregating the gendered impacts of climate change – such as the UNDP Pacific Centre's February 2008 workshop on the gendered dimensions of disaster risk management and adaptation⁶¹ – there is less effort to do the same for children in the

Pacific. Given children less than 18 years-of-age make up more than 40 per cent of most Pacific Island populations, it is a concern most policy documents on climate change in the Pacific ignore the issue of how children are affected.

Regional strategies such as PIFACC⁶², the Pacific Plan for Strengthening Regional Co-operation and Integration, National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs), climate policy documents from key donor countries like Australia,⁶³ or multilateral agencies like the World Bank,⁶⁴ make no explicit reference to the effects of climate change on children and rarely reference the unique vulnerabilities of children. This effectively ignores the potential for young people, at the intersection of home, school and community, to play a key role as adaptation actors.⁶⁵

Setareki Macanawai of the Pacific Disability Forum noted that “the disability community in our Pacific societies are often neglected and excluded when such important issues like climate change are discussed. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which some of our Pacific Island countries have signed and ratified, provides useful guidance on the inclusion of persons with disabilities and their representative organisations in such matters. Any planning or strategy on climate change in the Pacific or in any of our countries must include consultations with persons with disabilities and their representative organisations if such interventions are to be relevant, effective and inclusive.”⁶⁶

The Pacific Islands Forum has started to implement the Pacific Regional Strategy on Disability, with the Secretariat’s Disability Coordination Officer, coordinating support for an estimated 800,000 Pacific Island people living with disabilities. But there is a need for much greater support to integrate this neglected area into climate policy. There are lessons from other SIDS on how people with disabilities are affected in disasters and adaptation, with valuable models for activities that could be applied in Pacific countries. For example, the Bahamas Red Cross has embarked on an innovative campaign on climate change, working with deaf children in Nassau to promote disaster preparedness and response among people with disabilities.⁶⁷

SUMMARY

Although climate change is a global issue, its impacts are experienced locally and are cross-cutting in nature, and this poses new challenges to how information is accessed and shared. The introduction of well intended national laws and policies needs to be balanced with ensuring interventions are based on understanding and valuing the local customs and practices of Pacific culture. To do so requires new research on the social, cultural and economic effects of climate change, communicated in formats that support knowledge sharing and communities taking action on the ground.

A comprehensive body of data is crucial so Pacific governments can set baselines for future policy development, risk analysis and financial forecasting. Often this vital information doesn’t exist, is not stored in one place, or isn’t standardised and cannot be directly compared. Disaggregated data that measures the varying effects of climate impacts on different groups in society is also lacking and urgently needed, particularly for women, a group disproportionately affected by climate change. Language barriers, cultural norms and religious beliefs influence attitudes to climate change and there is a complex theology in Pacific churches about the causes of environmental calamity and possible responses, that need to be taken into account along with the important role church and other religious organisations can play in outreach and education of communities on climate change.

A comprehensive list of suggestions to improve information, communication and transparency for climate adaptation in Pacific countries is included in Chapter 6, *Recommendations*, on page 64.

CHAPTER 4: FOSTERING A CULTURE OF LEARNING

Better transparency and cooperation can increase benefits by using climate resources more efficiently and reducing the mismanagement of funds. However the political demand for financial accountability and rigorous funds management needs to be balanced with openness to experimentation. This chapter describes actions to develop an innovative cycle of learning which can strengthen national systems and provide evidence to support increased allocation of finance and the scaling up of projects.

As in other areas of development work, concern over potential corruption and misuse of climate funds has led to “an increasing compliance focus which undermined the realisation of mutual accountability between partners, as well as learning, risk taking and innovation more broadly.”⁶⁸ At a time when climate financing is scheduled to increase to US\$100 billion a year by 2020, it is vital now to expand a ‘learning by doin’ approach, initiating a range of trials to provide evidence for later increases of financing and scaling up of pilot projects.

The politics of climate change also places pressure on practitioners to deliver tangible results (such as physical evidence of seawalls) while it is harder to quantify less tangible outcomes, such as the learning gained from project evaluation. But it is not enough to seek results from tangible assets without building in an innovation cycle that allocates additional human and financial resources to document and learn from pilot projects’ successes and failures, so these improvements are incorporated in future programmes.

To develop an innovation cycle of planning, implementation, reflection and learning that operates at all levels, resources need to be invested in:

- **Empowering communities through effective participation**, using a range of culturally appropriate methods;
- **Respecting traditional knowledge** and developing culturally informed climate change awareness programmes;
- **Providing strategic understanding for politicians and decision-makers**, to draw on lessons from other sectors in making strategic investment choices and integrating climate policy into national development priorities;
- **Enabling peer-to-peer knowledge sharing.**

Empowering communities through effective participation

One ongoing challenge for governments, donors and INGOs is to allocate the time and resources to consult effectively with local communities and different sectors, in ways that can truly capture their perspectives and encourage their participation. See case study below, *Consulting the provinces in Papua New Guinea*.

Without adequate community consultation in the early design stage there is a danger an adaptation project may need later adjustment after communities have been consulted, and the project subsequently revised to take local realities into account. However, interviewees noted project funding is often rigid and doesn't allow for this period of adjustment. A funder may therefore misinterpret any changes as a shifting from one project to another, and if the original design does not allow this flexibility, the government may be perceived as mismanaging the funds. New types of project funding that allow for early community participation and flexibility in the design phase are therefore needed.

Methods also need to be tailored to allow participation by a range of different groups. Formal consultation processes undertaken through written submissions or formal hearings will often miss some of the most valuable inputs. Informal settings and traditional processes for dialogue and decision-making are likely to involve a wider set of views than those of practitioners and academics who are able to engage in the formal processes.

This is especially important for young people, given that more than half the Pacific population is under the age of 25, and the region's median age is only 21 years. In interviews, young people highlighted the constraints in formal consultation processes, especially in cultural contexts in the Pacific where it is difficult to contradict or challenge the views of elders or leaders in the room. One youth leader in Tonga told us: "the youth did participate in the climate consultations but I don't know if their views were taken into consideration. In the actual consultation, there's lots of elderly people around and they get so technical quickly. The youth who were represented in the room were not able to voice out what's their ideas and their issues. It would be better to have youth-only consultations, where they don't have to be frightened and stop talking altogether."⁶⁹

Follow up processes to enable participants to understand what has happened to their inputs and how they can be involved in an ongoing way is crucial to avoid consultation being seen as a 'tick box' activity – one that is required but not taken seriously. Genuine consultation needs to provide opportunities for participants to engage with the reasoning behind the different alternatives, and why a particular programme or policy is being suggested. People need to feel as if their voice is listened to and respected. Otherwise, people will feel disempowered when they realise they are being consulted on decisions that have already been taken.

More representative and effective consultation at the national level, involving women, youth and marginalised groups such as the disabled and elderly, would also provide more accurate information for governments to feed into regional and global structures. There is a danger that the upwards reporting doesn't take into account minority views or the perspectives of women.⁷⁰

Case study: Consulting the provinces in Papua New Guinea

As a country of 7 million people spread across difficult and varying terrain, with hundreds of language groups and limited literacy rates for women, Papua New Guinea faces particular challenges in engaging with populations in rural and remote villages, as well as people living in peri-urban squatter settlements.

In the past, the PNG government has been challenged for failing to involve the community in the formulation of climate adaptation and REDD+ policy, instead using highly paid international consulting firms to develop policy such as the PNG Climate Compatible Development Strategy.⁷¹ A lack of stakeholder and community consultation, particularly on PNG REDD+ policy, led to major criticism and a lack of national ownership, including within implementing agencies.⁷²

In response, since 2010, PNG's Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD) has begun to put more resources into community engagement, including the establishment of a National Communication Working Group. According to the OCCD's acting director: "at the national level, OCCD staff have been involved in an intensive period of national consultation... to field test the

ideas in the National Climate Compatible Strategy and to connect local communities to national climate change options and capture the needs and priorities of these communities that are severely affected.”⁷³

In mid 2010, the OCCD began with a whole-of-government workshop and an NGO workshop, followed by a series of consultations at provincial level. The process aims to:

- Inform and educate on the facts of climate change and options for climate-compatible development;
- Gain on-the-ground understanding of local community needs and perspectives to incorporate in the national strategy;
- Develop working relationships between relevant government departments, provincial authorities and civil society;
- Empower local government to communicate the national strategy and test community interest and willingness to participate in REDD+ schemes.

The first workshop in Manus, involving 127 ward councillors and representatives of local level government, was piggybacked onto a leaders’ summit being organised by the provincial Governor and national Member of Parliament. OCCD consulted with members of its Technical Working Groups and local NGOs on who should participate in the workshops, and designated key areas for discussion.

The consultations continued across another dozen provinces in 2010-12, with reports of each workshop available on the OCCD website.⁷⁴ Some consultations were coordinated with NGOs, such as a workshop in East New Britain co-sponsored by the Eco-Forestry Forum, a local NGO network working on landowner rights. However thus far, the OCCD has been unable to work with other line ministries, such as Agriculture, to coordinate consultations.

By June 2011, OCCD had produced a template for consultations that can be used by provincial and district authorities. This includes *OCCD guidelines for stakeholder engagement and participation*, outlining core principles on representation, transparency and accountability, recourse mechanisms and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). Drawing on long-standing civil society experience of community engagement, OCCD has also produced *Consultation in a box*, a toolkit with guidelines for provincial and district leaders on engaging with local communities. The box contains manuals, checklists and DVDs on ways to run a consultation, with practical suggestions on conduct and follow-up.⁷⁵

Early workshops raised local expectations that government would act on issues raised in the discussion. But the OCCD had limited resources and staffing to immediately respond to concerns. This disadvantaged well-organised provinces which ran early workshops, like Manus, as by the time of the Bougainville workshop in October 2011, OCCD had taken these lessons on board and obtained resources to allocate to problems identified in workshops.

Engagement by community members varied from province to province. In island provinces like Manus and New Ireland, there was ‘genuine and active’ representation of women in the consultations, where women involved in agricultural production brought up key issues on access to finance. In mainland provinces, debate focussed on different concerns – for example, in East Sepik the discussion focussed on logging and mostly involved men. One OCCD staff member noted that in different parts of the country, cultural constraints stop women speaking out in a public forum. In these areas, women tended to approach OCCD staff on the sidelines to raise their issues.

After the initial round of consultations, OCCD staff plan to work on a range of activities: focussing on specific projects, extending the consultation to district level in the larger provinces; and working more intensively on particular project sites.

Respecting traditional knowledge for adaptation

The 2007 Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) stated that indigenous knowledge is “an invaluable basis for developing adaptation and natural resource management strategies in response to environmental and other forms of change.”⁷⁶

There is increasing international interest in this issue, as shown with the 2010 publication by the United Nations University (UNU) of a compendium of case studies of adaptation and mitigation by indigenous peoples.⁷⁷ As they prepare the Fifth Assessment Report, the IPCC and other agencies supported a major conference on adaptation and indigenous peoples in Mexico in 2011,⁷⁸ attended by delegates from the Tonga Community Development Trust and other Pacific organisations, followed by a March 2012 workshop in Australia on mitigation issues for indigenous communities.⁷⁹

One valuable way research participants identified to improve the effectiveness of climate funding was to support more applied research in the Pacific on the generation, protection and transfer of traditional knowledge in response to the effects of climate change. This involves integrating indigenous ecological knowledge and practice into contemporary western methodologies of climate observation, research, assessment and response.⁸⁰

Across the Pacific there are a number of examples that have shown the value of integrating Western and indigenous forms of scientific knowledge. See case study below: *Using traditional knowledge for adaptation*. However, this approach involves recognition of the rights of land and resource owners that can conflict with government or corporate interests. As one study from Vanuatu noted, “enduring solutions to achieve sustainability in community-driven initiatives are unlikely to be found if policy reform is framed solely in terms of articulating local rights and/or the use of plants and animals. The focus should be broadened to require the establishment of institutional processes that secure local peoples’ involvement in environmental decision-making systems in an integrated and proactive manner.”⁸¹

Case study: Using traditional knowledge for adaptation

Around the Pacific, researchers and NGOs have begun to document how local knowledge and experience can be harnessed to respond to the adverse effects of climate change and extreme weather events.

Working with local meteorologists in Apia, Penehuro Fatu Lefale from New Zealand’s Meteorological Service, has examined Samoan ecological knowledge of weather and climate. Lefale found Samoans have their own unique seasonal calendar based on observations of local environmental changes, which in turn are influenced by weather and climate. Local knowledge of cloud formation, the onset of severe weather systems and seasonal changes in climate help people anticipate and adapt to extreme weather events.⁸²

In Vanuatu, a Global Environment Facility funded project worked with traditional landholders, chiefs and their communities on Gaua, Tanna and Santo islands, to strengthen traditional mechanisms to conserve biodiversity in lands under communal resource ownership. A key focus was strengthening local, provincial and national capacity to support local biodiversity conservation activity. Inter-village committees were established to support traditional

landholders and maintain temporary taboos (sacred, no-entry and no-take zones) in coastal, marine and terrestrial environments.⁸³

The Australian Red Cross report, *Traditional knowledge and Red Cross disaster preparedness in the Pacific*, shows practical ways local communities have monitored changes to coastlines, forests, weather and places to access water, as well as adaptation measures such as how to secure food resources in times of disaster and how to construct housing to resist cyclone damage.⁸⁴

An AusAID-funded project on Pacific Islands Climate Prediction at Australia's Bureau of Meteorology worked to document how a combination of data collection from scientific researchers and local experience can have practical applications, such as examining rainfall and weather patterns to help with predicting malaria outbreaks.⁸⁵

In Palau, the community environment group Ngarcholtitech is using video to record the traditional coping strategies of community elders of Babeldaob Island, who have been reporting salt intrusion in the wetland taro patches, and coastal erosion and silt accumulation in mangroves and reefs.⁸⁶

Strategic understanding for politicians and decision-makers

Over the next decade, global climate funding pledged by developed countries under the Copenhagen Accord is scheduled to increase to US\$100 billion a year, although it is not clear what proportion will be available for adaptation (most of the climate finance to date has been for mitigation) and how much will be public finance. Politicians and key decision-makers will be faced with making a range of strategic decisions on climate financing; from whether to establish a National Climate Fund, to how to blend new climate funds into existing revenue flows, to whether to choose a few, or multiple, development partners as a source of climate finance.

During research for this report, many public servants expressed concern that politicians lack strategic understanding of climate change and the complexities of climate finance on which to base their decisions. Politicians in turn noted that climate change is just one of many areas they need to prioritise. In Tonga, one leading politician stated, "in Parliament, climate change is one of the major topics discussed in the House, but we are more engaged in other matters like the economy."⁸⁷

Politicians and key decision-makers will also need to learn new decision-making tools, including long-term risk analysis required by the high levels of uncertainty and delayed onset of climate impacts.⁸⁸ They will also need to learn that, increasingly, climate change is about the economy; particularly since most of the Pacific Island countries are so heavily dependent on the natural environment for food, livelihoods and other services.

Some public servants also expressed concern that need for long-term planning and strategic choices would be overwhelmed by responding to short term priorities, especially in LDCs and SIDS with limited capacity. The tension for politicians between responding – and being seen to respond – to short-term priorities as well as planning for the long term was highlighted by Sunia Fili, the then-Deputy Prime Minister of Tonga, who noted the rehousing of flooded families is a dominant priority, as is the over-the-horizon problem of new road infrastructure projects that lack any capacity for drainage in low-lying areas. Such projects will be increasingly vulnerable to flooding from storm surges and extreme weather events.⁸⁹

A core priority should be to improve understanding of climate finance by politicians and key decision makers, promoting leadership and developing “climate champions”. Tonga has established a Cabinet Committee on Climate Change and a Parliamentary Standing Committee on Climate Change. These examples could be a model for other countries, but rely on leadership to make them work (many research participants in Tonga questioned why the latter body has not met during the term of the current Parliament). Lessons on how to educate and inspire politicians can also be drawn from other sectors. During the 1990s, for example, HIV activists and public health officials launched a ‘First Wives’ initiative across the Pacific, educating and mobilising the spouses of Prime Ministers and Presidents as a very practical way of lobbying politicians to promote HIV-AIDS up the government’s agenda.

Enabling peer-to-peer knowledge sharing

As governments and civil society begin to access climate funding, there is potential to share practical lessons on the complexities of using a particular mechanism. For example the four countries that have successfully accessed funds through the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund, Cook Islands, Fiji, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, have important lessons for other countries yet to complete the process.

Pacific government officials often gather at regional workshops to exchange information with their peers across the region. Often there are too many meetings attended by the same group of officials and ministers and greater knowledge sharing could be achieved by investing in a dynamic learning process, involving more diverse perspectives and a wider range of participants. Furthermore, this short-term (and often informal) process could add more value if it was supplemented with a series of exchanges where government officials could undertake internships in other sector or country, to learn lessons on how to access climate funds or integrate climate financing into national development plans and departmental budgets. For example, in interviews staff of the VMGD in Vanuatu expressed interest in Tonga’s experience developing a Joint National Action Plan (JNAP), as the government of Vanuatu undertakes a similar restructuring. Officials suggested it would be valuable to have key Tongan staff spend time working through the process with them.

In the Pacific region there are a number of good examples of peer-to-peer lesson learning, drawing on the experience of development practitioners: conferences on best practice; internet-based sharing of experience; initiatives linking academics and practitioners; efforts to document NGO initiatives on gender and youth (see case study below: *Enabling peer-to-peer knowledge sharing*). However, these types of learning communities need sustained financial, human and administrative support by development partners and INGOs.

Another problem is some of the best reporting and lesson learning in the Pacific is focussed on small projects rather than broader programmes, making them less applicable for mainstreaming. This is especially true for issues such as gender in the climate sector, which matches the international experience.⁹⁰

It will be important for the new Pilot Program for Climate Resilience, jointly funded by ADB and World Bank, to be monitored and the lessons shared from the beginning to ensure the experience of participant countries (Tonga, Samoa and Papua New Guinea) can inform future tranches of funding. See case study: *Designing a programme for climate resilience* on page 51 in Chapter 5.

Case study: Enabling peer-to-peer knowledge sharing

There are already several regional initiatives among officials and researchers which build information networks that support experimentation. This sort of information can help countries to quickly adjust activities based on lessons that emerge. It is vital national governments participate in these initiatives and extend them to national level.

There is a growing **Asia-Pacific dialogue on Climate Change Finance and Development Effectiveness**, with conferences held in 2010 and 2011.⁹¹ The 2010 Bangkok Call for Action and case studies prepared on climate financing in five Asian countries have useful lessons for the Pacific. However, there is a need to develop particular responses for SIDS, which have different capabilities and challenges than larger developing nations in Asia.

SPREP has coordinated three regional meetings of the **Pacific Climate Change Roundtable** since 2008, bringing together government, donor and community representatives to monitor and evaluate progress on implementation of the *Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006 – 2015*.⁹² The next regional roundtable is scheduled for 2013.

Pacific Solution Exchange (PSE) operates through internet and face-to-face meetings allowing government, NGO and academic workers to exchange 'better practice' lessons through a moderated response. Through its Climate Change and Development Community, facilitated by UNDP, PSE hosts a series of e-discussions to enhance problem-solving about climate change adaptation and development in the Pacific.

SPREP and the Pacific Environment Information Network maintain a **Virtual Library of Lessons Learned and Best Practices in Environment Management**, drawing on meetings such as the May 2011 Lessons for Future Action Conference in Apia.⁹³ Its website includes links to a broad range of reports and articles on environmental action.⁹⁴

The non-government **Pacific Gender Climate Coalition**, coordinated by Ulamila Kurai Wragg in the Cook Islands, has been sharing lessons on ways to empower women in decision-making for climate responses.⁹⁵

SUMMARY

The increased demand for stricter compliance and for tangible results in the field must not crowd out valuable learning opportunities that can be applied to future projects. Building innovation cycles into adaptation work, and allocating additional human and financial resources to document and learn from pilot projects' successes and failures, is vital to improving future projects. Shared learning can strengthen national and community adaptive capacity and provide robust evidence to support eligibility for increased climate financing and scaling up adaptation projects.

Responses to climate change must do more to respect the value of Pacific culture and traditional knowledge, and participation methods must be tailored to allow different groups in the community, including women and youth, to contribute. An innovation cycle must be enabled at all levels using a range of tools, from information networks that break down organisational silos and share experience of best practice among line ministries through to funding windows which allow more 'face-to-face' exchanges, including community-to-community visits and internships from staff in other ministries or organisations. Education and support for politicians and key decision makers is essential to overcome

a lack of understanding of climate change and the complexities of climate finance, especially in advance of an expected increase in flows of climate finance to the region.

Recommendations that will help to foster learning cultures to improve Pacific country responses to climate change adaptation are summarised in Chapter 6, *Recommendations*, on page 67.

CHAPTER 5: IMPROVING DIRECT ACCESS TO CLIMATE FINANCING

Ensuring Pacific countries have access to predictable, adequate and sustainable financing for climate change adaptation is crucial. However, the international debate over climate funding is highly political and there are fundamental differences within, and between, UNFCCC negotiating blocs like the Annex 1 countries, the Group of 77 plus China, and the Alliance of Small Islands States (AOSIS) over the mechanisms that might ensure adequate and effective financing. There is also evidence that some developed states see climate financing as a carrot to encourage compliance in other areas of the global climate negotiations.⁹⁶

Many OECD donors have been favouring the use of existing Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs), which have managed development aid for decades, to channel climate finance. In the face of opposition from many developing countries, the World Bank was chosen as interim trustee of the new Green Climate Fund, the proposed central mechanism for financing adaptation and mitigation over the next few years.

In the Pacific, in addition to multilateral channels there are a number of key bilateral donors for climate adaptation and mitigation projects, with funds available through a number of programmes. Examples include the European Union's Global Climate Change Alliance, including a major collaboration with the University of the South Pacific, and the regional programme implemented by the German Agency for International Development in cooperation with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community called Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region, operating with a budget of €17.2 million across 12 Forum member countries.

In spite of this diverse array of funding mechanisms, many Pacific leaders have stressed they are not fully benefitting from Fast Start funding pledged in the Copenhagen Accord. Pacific leaders have raised concerns about the complexity, delay and effectiveness of accessing climate funding and the failure of donors to fully deliver on pledges.⁹⁷ They express concerns over the adequacy of funding; the balance of funds allocated for mitigation rather than adaptation; whether funds are 'new and additional' or simply repackaged development assistance; whether funding is provided as loans or grants; and whether funding mechanisms can be adapted to take account of the particular needs of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs).⁹⁸

The time taken to deal with donor requirements can divert limited resources from concrete work at the community level, as noted in a 2010 briefing paper for Forum Economic Ministers, "countries have tried to build their capacity to understand and influence these funds, but the challenges faced in accessing these funding mechanisms, and in many instances the process itself, has diverted capacity from sound management and implementation of climate change priorities."⁹⁹

The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme's climate advisor, Espen Ronnenberg, has noted: "the wide range of available climate change financing is cumbersome and difficult to work with for administrations with low technical and personnel capacities... many countries will only begin preparing project concepts if there is an assurance of funding. The window however, between the

assurance and the deadline of submission, is usually short and many for this reason miss a deadline set by the funding agencies. The complexity of certain funding applications may also work against low capacity countries, as the focal point may be an expert on the adaptation needs of the country, but that person does not have all the financial and auditing information required by the application.”¹⁰⁰

For this reason, AOSIS members have been advancing their own agenda on climate financing. Pacific negotiators have been calling for more funds to be allocated through new institutions, bypassing multilateral implementing agencies such as the MDBs and agencies like the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). They stress new funds should be channelled through national institutions, to build local capacity and meet local priorities.

The next sections describe efforts to influence international negotiations to improve access for vulnerable developing countries and to secure and manage climate funding for adaptation through a range of mechanisms, including: accreditation to the Adaptation Fund; accessing the Global Environment Fund; monitoring multilateral development banks; blending resources in national climate trust funds; and promoting direct budget support.

Strengthening Pacific representation in global negotiations

The limited capacities of small island states means Pacific representation needs to be carried into the rapidly evolving global negotiations creating new funding mechanisms. As representatives of SIDS, LDCs or the Asia-Pacific Group, Pacific Islands people participate in a range of global climate institutions. For example, Samoa’s UN Ambassador, Ali’ioaigi Feturi Elisaia, represented SIDS on the Transitional Committee for the Green Climate Fund throughout 2011; Marlene Moses, Permanent Representative of Nauru to the United Nations, is Chair of AOSIS, and Phillip Muller, Permanent Representative of Marshall Islands to the United Nations, represents SIDS as Vice President on the executive bureau for the 18th UNFCCC Conference of Parties (COP 18) in Qatar 2012.

Pacific representation is enhanced by improving the coordination and activity of Pacific Island ambassadors at the United Nations. One example is the resolution on *Climate Change and its possible security implications* at the UN General Assembly in 2009 and Security Council in 2011.

In September 2011, the Asia Group within the United Nations formally changed its name to the Group of Asia and the Pacific Small Island Developing States, a reflection of this new diplomatic vibrancy and growing links between Forum Island Countries and Asian powers. (Key Oceanic partners like Australia and New Zealand remain in the Western European and Others Group within the UN system).

In spite of this level of engagement, there is an ongoing need for Pacific officials to upgrade their negotiation skills, to better represent regional interests in the global arena. SPREP has developed a negotiation skills training framework and offered the training over the last four years, as well as pre-COP training sessions in Copenhagen and Cancun. These sessions help explain the workings of the COP and simulate negotiations. However, training is funded on an ad hoc basis and should be supported in a systematic and ongoing manner.

Updating regional frameworks

At the regional level, Forum Island Countries frame their climate responses through the *Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006 – 2015* (PIFACC). Disaster response initiatives are co-ordinated through the *Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005 – 2015*. PIFACC sets priorities for adaptation funding for donor agencies, and is the key strategic document for regional intergovernmental agencies like SPREP and SPC. It outlines priorities on climate change, renewable energy, ozone depletion and global negotiations.¹⁰¹

Participants in this research noted however, there is a need to update this framework to take account of changes in national priorities and the emergence of new perspectives on important issues. For example, PIFACC does not make any explicit reference to questions of migration and displacement, even though some smaller atoll nations are discussing issues of relocation and resettlement of affected communities.¹⁰² Neither Framework differentiates children as an especially vulnerable group.¹⁰³

With these two policy frameworks ending in 2015 – alongside the UN process on the Millennium Development Goals – members of the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP) will initiate a review, starting in July 2013, with the intention of combining processes on climate change, meteorology and disaster risk management into one framework. This is an opportunity for development partners, governments, civil society and community organisations to input ideas, with new paradigms that address the effective use of climate funding, but participants will need resourcing to effectively contribute.

Gaining accreditation to the Adaptation Fund

Forum Island Countries have placed a priority on establishing direct access to climate funding without the involvement of intermediary implementing entities like UN agencies or multilateral development banks. A key component of direct access is the rigorous process of accreditation for the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund (AF).¹⁰⁴ A similar process will be necessary with the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

Pacific institutions are developing their understanding of what is required to gain National Implementation Entity (NIE) accreditation, based on strengthening their financial integrity and management; institutional capacity; project and programme management; and transparency and self-investigative powers.¹⁰⁵ Work to strengthen the management of aid and climate funding will bring benefits in the medium term, but pose real challenges about the short term costs and human resources involved in seeking accreditation, particularly amongst SIDS and LDCs with fewer resources to redirect to new projects than other larger countries.

Another option for the Pacific is for regional bodies to obtain accreditation that would allow them to support Pacific Island members. SPREP has applied for accreditation as a Multilateral Implementation Entity (MIE) as a step towards Regional Implementation Entity status. This application has been subject to a long process of consultation with documents resubmitted to the Adaptation Fund Board.¹⁰⁶

Accessing the Global Environment Facility

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is an independent institution that provides support for four different international agreements, including the UNFCCC, and Convention on Biological Diversity.¹⁰⁷ The GEF operates a Pacific Small Grants Program (SGP), which has increased engagement by small island states and provided a valuable link between government and community programs in the Pacific, with SGP managed by umbrella NGO bodies such as the Vanuatu Association of Non Government Organisations (VANGO), or the Civil Society Forum of Tonga (CSFT).

According to SPREP, Pacific countries have raised issues associated with GEF including, “access of resources and heavy procedural and reporting requirements, as well as the difficulty of involving civil society.”¹⁰⁸ Extensive lobbying over the lack of access to GEF funds has led to improvements,

including the appointment of a GEF Advisor at SPREP and the creation of a special GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability, the only regional window in the world. However, funding for the GEF advisor ran out in late 2011, leading to delays in reappointing an applicant for the position.

The GEF Council is dominated by donor countries and there are extensive administrative and reporting requirements to access funding, which places great burdens on SIDS that lack resources needed to finalise timely funding proposals. For example, the regional Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) initiative, a US\$13.12 million project which covers all Forum Island Countries (except Kiribati) took three years to develop.

The experience of GEF small grants programs has also prompted growing discussion at international level about the possibility of civil society organisations (CSOs) directly accessing climate financing. The complexity of GEF processes for CSOs, which often require external support to access the resources, has highlighted the need to adapt systems to enable the most vulnerable communities to access the resources they require.

Monitoring the multilateral development banks

Monitoring the role of MDBs in the Pacific is important: first, they are expanding their role and profile across the region; second, they seek to play an important part in climate financing through the establishment of the Climate Investments Funds; third, they have become key channels for significant amounts of climate financing from donors such as Australia and the European Union; fourth, they are increasingly channelling funds through private financial intermediaries whose profit motives can conflict with development objectives.¹⁰⁹

In per capita terms, the World Bank and ADB give comparatively little to Pacific Island countries when compared to other nations of similar Human Development Index ranking. ADB lending in the Pacific region has increased in recent years, up from 2.2 per cent of its portfolio in 2000, to 3.6 per cent in 2009.¹¹⁰ However, both banks have expanded their profiles across the region, gaining formal observer status with the Pacific Islands Forum, sending delegations to the annual Forum Leaders' meetings and opening Joint Liaison Offices in Solomon Islands, Tonga, Samoa and Vanuatu. The Pacific operations of the Pilot Program on Climate Resilience (the CIF for adaptation) is detailed in the case study *Designing a program for climate resilience*, below.

Case study: Designing a programme for climate resilience

One significant funding initiative in the Pacific is the Pilot Program on Climate Resilience (PPCR), managed by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and World Bank.¹¹¹ The experience of PPCR across the region so far provides some useful lessons on the importance of addressing civil society involvement, gender considerations and national government priorities as major climate projects are developed.

For the Pacific Islands region, PPCR has four components: national programmes in Samoa (managed by the World Bank), Tonga and Papua New Guinea (both managed by ADB), with a US\$10 million regional program for 14 countries through SPREP, SPC, Forum Fisheries Agency and others in the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP). Funds for PNG's programme are around US\$25 million (including concessional loans); for Samoa, US\$25 million and for Tonga, about US\$15 million. Samoa represents SIDS on the PPCR Management Committee.

The PPCR aims to support mainstreaming adaptation programs into existing national development plans. The governments of Papua New Guinea, Tonga and Samoa have been working with bank officials to develop plans for each country, with an initial planning phase, then a more in-depth implementation phase. Participants in the process highlighted the importance of investing in the design phase, with one noting: “if the government doesn’t take this phase seriously but pushes through a wish list quickly, they may change priorities later during the implementation phase, causing problems for donors. Potentially there’s a billion dollars in CIF funds so [the country] needs to spend the first tranche well, so they can access later tranches.”¹¹²

The process of developing these plans and negotiating agreements for a final Strategic Program for Climate Resilience (SPCR) highlights the importance of avoiding donor-driven agendas, and aligning climate finance to the needs and priorities of the country. For example in Tonga, the first PPCR joint mission, held in April 2010, included officials from the ADB, World Bank, UNDP, DFID and AusAID. The donors proposed an ‘infrastructure plus’ approach, building climate resilience in water, transport and energy infrastructure and ‘climate proofing’ government infrastructure projects.¹¹³ However the visit to Tonga lasted only two days, and the proposals reflected past designs in Samoa and Papua New Guinea that ignored local conditions, causing a high level of debate afterwards. (Reportedly, the Government of Tonga initially refused to sign off the mission’s official aide memoire.)

Over time, consultation with a wider range of groups was undertaken, with the Tongan Ministry of Environment bringing together government departments, agencies and community organisations for meetings in 2011 – 2012. Tonga’s JNAP Taskforce (described in Chapter 1) had not previously met until the PPCR process brought them together. This allowed key community groups already working on climate and disaster programmes (such as the Tonga Community Development Trust, the Tonga Red Cross and Civil Society Forum of Tonga) to contribute their insights as to the mix of activities that might be included in the SPCR.

A second joint donor mission in October 2011 helped determine a list of priority activities under the SPCR; then a third mission in March 2012 led to decisions for submission to the global PPCR Committee. Compared to the original priority almost exclusively given to infrastructure in 2010, the final package includes an innovative mix of activities that include for example, funding to legally establish a Climate Change Trust Fund, which would then receive US\$5m in seed funding for activities including a climate change microfinance and micro insurance program for farmers, fishers and vulnerable communities (with 50 per cent reserved for women and women’s organisations).

As these programmes are implemented, there is a particular need to monitor gendered outcomes. According to a UNDP / Gender and Climate Change Alliance analysis: “as the first programme to be operationalised under the Strategic Climate Fund, the PPCR did not include any gender considerations in its original design or operational principles. Nonetheless, as pilot countries’ Phase One proposals have been developed, many of them have demonstrated attention to the gender dimensions of their plans.”¹¹⁴

For this reason, there is a need to reaffirm several core elements as SPCRs are implemented: national government plans should set the agenda for PPCR activities; civil society and communities should be guaranteed meaningful participation throughout the process of implementing the range of activities; participation by all members of the community (men, women, children, and people with disabilities) should be integrated into these climate funding processes; there should be regular engagement and reporting back to ensure transparency and accountability with independent evaluation of results, rather than the banks’ alone conducting their own internal evaluations.

Blending resources in National Climate Trust Funds

Many Pacific countries, including the three focal countries for this research (Tonga, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea) are investigating the establishment of National Climate Funds. The Pacific region has long experience with trust funds as a development mechanism, although some have been managed better than others. See case study below: *Conservation trust funds*.

Smaller Pacific countries, such as Tuvalu, have long relied on a national trust funds and as the ADB has noted; “donors and development institutions are finding that where well established policy and governance structures are in place, trust funds can be an effective way to accumulate, preserve, grow, and mobilise capital for development.”¹¹⁵

Although it requires extra administrative and management burden, establishing a specific climate fund has a number of advantages over channelling climate financing to existing sovereign wealth funds. Well-managed climate funds could provide the opportunity to blend funding support from a range of donors, track which funds are ‘new and additional’ above existing ODA flows, reduce reporting and administrative burdens, and contribute to predictability of funding. A new fund would allow the appointment of people actively involved in climate policy and action, including non-state actors and women, to participate on boards or management committees. The 2011 Options Paper developed by the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) examines different options for national trust funds, and outlines some of the pros and cons of these various options.¹¹⁶

In the Pacific, Samoa has taken the lead on this issue, while Tonga and PNG have included amounts in their forthcoming Strategic Program on Climate Resilience (SPCR) to investigate a trust fund. Samoa’s SPCR provides funds for technical assistance to develop an environmental trust fund that will provide small grants to local communities for adaptation-related activities at the local level.

Oxfam International has been directly involved in initiatives to establish National Climate Funds in other countries, including Indonesia and the Philippines. In June 2012 the Philippines Congress approved legislation for the People’s Survival Fund (PSF), a domestic climate adaptation fund that will blend monies from domestic sources as well as international climate funds. The PSF provides for direct access by civil society and community actors, and reflects country ownership through the creation of a national governance structure, the PSF Board.

Case study: Conservation Trust Fund

The range of conservation trust funds that manage resources for protecting biodiversity and other environmental programmes provide an interesting model for government, community, private sector and donor cooperation for climate adaptation work.

The **Micronesia Conservation Trust** (MCT) was established in 2002 with the objective of supporting biodiversity conservation and sustainable development for the people of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM). In 2008, MCT completed its transitional growth from a national organisation operating solely in FSM, to a regional organisation supporting and facilitating sustainable development in five Micronesian countries. An analysis of the operations of the conservation trust notes: “MCT is fulfilling important mediating functions connecting community-based conservation stakeholders in Micronesia with a broad range of private and public donors interested in supporting improved conservation outcomes in the Micronesia region.”¹¹⁷

The **Mama Graun Conservation Trust Fund (MGCTF)** is a finance organisation that supports conservation efforts and sustainable development to Melanesian communities through a grant programme. Mama Graun was registered in Papua New Guinea in 2000 but its Board of Trustees voted in 2008 to expand operations across Melanesia, including Timor-Leste and New Caledonia. The MGCTF Executive Director notes, “all too often we see funds destined for work at a site swallowed up by salaries, travel and office equipment for the recipient organisation, while a very small proportion, if at all, finds its way to the community level. Most often, it may be in a form of a workshop run by an outside organisation with members of the community only as passive participants. Trust funds reduce ‘elite capture’ and enable large proportions of donor funds to go directly to the communities for which it was intended, using competitive disbursement mechanisms which have been trialled and tested.”¹¹⁸

Supporting smaller states through a Pacific Regional Climate Change Fund

Given the limited institutional capacity and human resources of some smaller island nations, in 2010 an SPREP-commissioned report recommended establishing a Pacific Regional Climate Change Fund.¹¹⁹ This region-wide financing mechanism would administer, manage and monitor the influx of adaptation and mitigation funding, and provide technical support to small island states that cannot manage their own national fund.

Some donor governments have expressed reservations about creating a new regional fund that would involve high levels of administration, suggesting more effort should be placed on strengthening institutional capacity and donor coordination at the national level.¹²⁰ However there are a number of practical advantages for a regional funding mechanism: some of the smallest Pacific nations (such as the Cook Islands, Tokelau, Niue and the United States and French Pacific territories) are not full members of the United Nations, the World Bank or other multilateral institutions, and face eligibility hurdles to access World Bank administered funds and programmes; Pacific Island countries could access funding from one set mechanism on a determined timeline rather than use a multiplicity of donor processes.

Implementing direct budget support

Forum Economic Ministers have stated their preference for direct budgetary assistance as the most accessible and efficient financing mechanism, followed by the development of national trust funds – although individual countries have also welcomed other options, such as sectoral funding as priorities.

In Tonga, for example, the Ministry of National Planning created a budget support policy matrix to reduce the range of conditionalities (associated with multiple funding sources) and allow a variety of donors to provide general budget support. This initiative has been endorsed by key donors such as the World Bank, Australia, New Zealand and the European Union, and should be extended to other areas. Samoa has developed a similar Joint Policy Action Matrix with the ADB, World Bank and the New Zealand Aid Programme for disbursing budget support.¹²¹

Some countries such as Australia and New Zealand have agreed on direct budget support in certain sectors, although (for various reasons) this is still difficult for other major regional donors such as the

EU. In the long-term, the European Commission has plans to move to budget support of national governments in the Pacific (either through the general budget or sectoral programs) but there are ongoing debates about the terms of eligibility for such support, and their rigorous management.

SUMMARY

There are fundamental differences between different UNFCCC negotiating blocs over the mechanisms that might ensure predictable and scalable climate financing. Pacific leaders have concerns about the adequacy and accessibility of climate funding while international finance providers caution their governments want to see good practice in the effective use of existing resources before they guarantee further significant funds, including to the Green Climate Fund. Pacific countries are using limited resources to influence rapidly evolving global negotiations on climate finance by: up-skilling Pacific negotiators, coordinating between Pacific UN missions and securing high level roles on decision making entities, such as the Transitional Committee for the Green Climate Fund. Strengthening regional frameworks that set the policymaking context for climate change, such as the 2013-15 review of the *Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006 – 2015* and the *Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005 – 2015* is also considered important to improving accessibility of climate funds.

The Forum Economic Ministers' stated preference for direct budgetary assistance is challenged by there being no single set of internationally agreed eligibility criteria for direct budget support. Forum Island Countries have placed a priority on establishing direct access to climate funding and are investigating a range of mechanisms to achieve this: evaluating options for gaining accreditation to the Adaptation Fund; expanding allocations for the Global Environment Facility-UNDP Pacific Small Grants Programme; and investigating the establishment of National Climate Funds, including a Pacific Regional Climate Change Fund. Monitoring and influencing the multilateral development banks as they expand their role as key channels for significant amounts of climate financing in the Pacific region is also a priority.

A list of suggestions to improve direct access to climate financing are included in Chapter 6, *Recommendations*, on page 70.

CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS

Better access to resources is a crucial element of the regional and national response to the adverse effects of climate change. As this report has documented, there are already a number of positive initiatives by national governments, civil society organisations and development partners to improve access to climate financing. But there is an urgent need for further action in five key areas, to ensure Pacific governments are assisted to take leadership of climate adaptation, and these resources are used effectively to benefit the most vulnerable members of the community:

1. Enhancing national capacity
2. Strengthening partnerships and coordination
3. Sharing information and increasing communication and transparency
4. Fostering learning cultures
5. Improving direct access to climate financing

Providers of finance, national governments and other development partners can act now to make these objectives a reality by taking action on the recommendations listed in Table 1: List of recommendations to improve efficient use of climate resources by stakeholder groups. The nature of climate change impacts and need for a multi-sector, whole-of-government and society response is illustrated by the fact that most recommendations require more than one group of actors to work collaboratively to support the five key strategies.

Table 1: List of recommendations to improve efficient use of climate resources by stakeholder groups

Objective	Key areas to improve efficient use of climate resources	Stakeholder	Group				
	<p>(1) ENHANCING NATIONAL CAPACITY</p> <p>Pacific governments and communities will need to strengthen national capacity at all levels to better serve them in the changing environment by redesigning existing resources and investing in new structures and systems which link adaptation with mitigation and disaster responses.</p>	Donors	Pacific Govt	Pacific CSOs	INGO	Reg. Agencies	Private Sector; Academics
Enhance government capacity	Increase resources for longer-term, institutional capacity building through sectoral funding support and support for key staffing positions.	Donors					
	Align funding with national strategies, plans and processes, particularly those that have been prepared with full consultation and involvement of key actors across society.	Donors	PGov				
	Increase staff and training for coordination of climate policy across ministries and agencies, in line with national development plans.	Donors	PGov				
	Beyond existing support for climate coordination units, increase support for other ministries or agencies that are crucial for the effective governance of financing (planning departments; auditor-general’s offices; aid coordination units).	Donors	PGov				
	Improve national collaboration on climate adaptation and disaster response between different sectors of society through climate taskforces, working groups and roundtables.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	
	Develop strategies and plans that involve and support a broad range of actors across society, including a range of government departments, parliamentarians, civil society, private sector and traditional leaders.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	PrivS

Expand inclusive technical working groups	Promote the use of technical working groups to tap the expertise and capacities of non-state actors.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	PrivS
	Include CSO or technical experts' delegations to regional and international conferences (with more involvement from civil society).		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	
	Organise education workshops on climate financing, that allow government officials, donor staff and a range of church, women's and environmental organisations to discuss the implications of different funding mechanisms, and how they might operate in the national context.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	
Strengthen capacity in outer islands and remote areas	Improve capacity at provincial level for follow-up and coordination, bolstering provincial links and increasing administration and outreach in the outer islands (e.g. establishing a climate change focal point in the provincial administration and provincial technical working groups).	Donors	PGov				
Build capacity for non-state actors	Create new mechanisms to engage with the full range of non-state actors (NGOs, private sector, church etc) and provide information and resources to customary landowners who own and manage the majority of land in most Pacific societies.		PGov	PCSO	INGO		
Prioritise capacity development for women, men and children	Address the pressing need for more detailed research in different cultural contexts on how climate change affects men, women and children in different ways, especially in multi-lingual and diverse societies in Melanesia.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	Acad
	Design climate funds and programs to ensure women are not disadvantaged in gaining access to credit or financial extension services.	Donors	PGov	PCSO		RegAg	
	Include gender experts in the country missions during climate project preparation, and organise consultations with gender and age-disaggregated groups.	Donors	PGov		INGO	RegAg	

	Reach out to national departments or agencies responsible for gender or women's issues (such as Women's Ministries, National Councils of Women, YWCA and church women's networks) to include climate change in their mandate, raise awareness about climate funding opportunities and develop gender action plans for specific projects.		PGov			RegAg	
	Develop and implement a comprehensive gender policy for regional and national funding mechanisms, create gender balance on Trust Fund Boards and Committees and involve women's organisations as active observers.		PGov	PCSO		RegAg	
	Support CSO networks (such as the <i>Pacific Gender Climate Coalition</i>) and raise awareness of climate impacts in existing women's networks.	Donor	PGov		INGO		

	(2) STRENGTHENING PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION Better coordination and stronger partnerships between all stakeholders will reduce climate vulnerability and enable more efficient use of scarce climate resources. Fundamental problems with coordination must be improved to avoid policy frameworks, governments, regional organisations, and donor and development institutions responsible for carrying out disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation working in isolation from one another, and in isolation from the actors involved in socioeconomic development planning and implementation.	Donors	Pacific Govt	Pacific CSOs	INGO	Reg. Agencies	Private Sector; Academics
Address problems of donor flexibility and coordination	Coordinate between development partners (governments, multilateral development banks and international NGOs) to avoid duplication of initiatives, share experience of better practice, streamline requirements for reporting and fiduciary standards and reduce the complexity of climate funding mechanisms.	Donors	PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	
	Minimise staff turnover in donor agencies to maintain sustainability of programming on climate change and awareness of existing regional and local initiatives.	Donors					
	Provide better resourcing for existing regional frameworks for donor consultation at regional and national level that provides the basis for better coordination (for example, the Development Partners for Climate Change, CROP Sub-Committee on Climate Change or sectoral working groups on energy, renewable energy and gender issues).	Donors	PGov			RegAg	
	Increase regular donor dialogue meetings at national level, with a focus on gender, human rights and climate change.	Donors					
	Reduce time and personnel pressures on Pacific governments, through: joint missions by outside consultants and donors; piggybacking donor climate change roundtables with other regional meetings held in-country.	Donors	PGov			RegAg	

	Encourage small donors or NGOs to provide niche funding on research, coordination, national roundtables or small grants.	Donors	PGov	PCSO	INGO		
Improve coordination across departments	Improve coordination across line ministries and planning and financial units and integrate climate change analysis into national development planning and the work programs of line ministries.		PGov			RegAg	
	Improve inter-sectoral coordination, between government and business and/or the community sector, and with customary structures such as councils of chiefs.		PGov	PCSO	INGO		PrivS
	Establish national climate change committees that bring together departmental secretaries or their alternates, to develop whole-of-government responses to climate change.		PGov				
	Create, or expand, specialised units to help coordinate the implementation of national adaptation and disaster response plans.	Donors	PGov				
Civil society coordination with governments	Contribute knowledge and skills to government on environmental management, gender policy and community development.			PCSO	INGO	RegAg	Acad
	Investigate dedicated NGO funding windows in financing mechanisms.	Donors	PGov	PCSO	INGO		
	Develop transparent processes for the selection of non-government members on climate coordination structures, trust fund boards or committees responsible for decision-making and financial control of climate funding.		PGov	PCSO	INGO		
	Nominate knowledgeable NGO representatives for official delegations to regional and international climate meetings, technical working groups and policy fora.		PGov	PCSO			

Strengthen coordination within and amongst non-state actors	Form civil society networks and consortia to work with government, develop common standards and priorities, and empower vulnerable communities and marginalised groups that are not well represented in official decision making.	Donors		PCSO	INGO		
--	---	--------	--	------	------	--	--

	(3) SHARING INFORMATION AND INCREASING COMMUNICATION AND TRANSPARENCY						
	Responding to climate change requires access to accurate, timely and useable information and the sharing of technical skills and local knowledge. There is a need for better information, communication and transparency as a core component of improving access to climate financing and delivery of community-level adaptation projects.						
Improve transparency by donors, governments and community organisations	Improve the documentation and reporting of climate funding mechanisms and whether funds are 'new and additional', drawn from public finance or other sources.	Donors					
	Document not just <i>pledges</i> of climate funding, but whether the funding has also been <i>budgeted</i> and <i>approved</i> by relevant legislatures or executive bodies; <i>dispersed</i> to recipient organisations, and <i>evaluated</i> for impact. All these steps need to be published and regularly updated on publicly accessible databases. Develop consistent definitions and standards of reporting in ways that allow information to be easily accessed and used.	Donors	PGov				
	Investigate and implement policies from the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), which are designed to ensure detailed, accessible and timely information is available to meet the needs of different information users.		PGov			RegAg	
	Utilise techniques of "bottom up" accountability and participatory budgeting processes that mobilise communities to monitor climate finance pledges to ensure they are translated into action.			PCSO	INGO	RegAg	

Using the internet and social media to share information	Fund, maintain and update internet portals and websites that provide a useful one stop-shop for basic information for climate responses.	Donors	PGov	PCSO		RegAg	
Development of culturally appropriate information	Look beyond external resourcing, to draw on the skills and capacities that can be found within Pacific countries.	Donors	PGov		INGO	RegAg	
	Support innovative ways of informing and educating different members of the community, and that support local community responses to climate change, using methods, concepts and language that they understand (e.g. radio drama theatre, art works, programmes for young children).		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	Acad
	Fund the translation of core climate information into local languages, especially for rural communities and outlying islands in countries with low literacy levels or limited access to the media and internet.	Donors	PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	
	Investigate cultural norms and religious beliefs that affect attitudes to climate change in the Pacific (such as research by Pacific churches about the theology of disaster, causes of environmental calamity, and possible responses).		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	Acad
Extending participatory and evidence-based research	Improve participatory research into climate impacts, to develop baselines, interpret existing data, and disaggregate statistics and evidence to show the varying effects on different members of the community.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	Acad
	Conduct research and analysis of the 'loss and damage' caused by the adverse impacts of slow-onset climate change, support the UNFCCC work program on loss and damage and develop case studies at national level.		PGov		INGO	RegAg	
	Utilise participatory research techniques that reduce vulnerability to climate change by addressing local priorities and building on local knowledge and capacity.	Donors		PCSO	INGO		

	Invest in the design phase of community-level adaptation projects, with funding to allow for early community participation and flexibility to adjust the project scope based on community input.	Donors	PGov	PCSO	INGO		
--	--	--------	------	------	------	--	--

	(4) FOSTERING A CULTURE OF LEARNING While responding to immediate community needs, it is still important to allow trials of processes that may not bear immediate results, but provide directions for the future expansion of climate funding. Partners need to develop an innovation cycle of planning, implementation, and learning, with a range of trials at early stages to provide evidence for later increase of financing and scaling up of pilot projects.	Donors	Pacific Govt	Pacific CSOs	INGO	Reg. Agencies	Private Sector; Academics
Empowering communities through effective participation	Develop more effective community consultation and participation processes, tailored to allow participation by a range of different groups, including more representative and effective consultation at national level, involving women, youth and marginalised groups like the disabled and elderly.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	
Building sustainable adaptation using traditional knowledge	Support more applied research in the Pacific on the protection, transmission and innovation of traditional knowledge in response to the effects of climate change, integrating indigenous ecological knowledge and practice into contemporary western methodologies of climate observation, research, assessment and response.	Donors	PGov	PCSO		RegAg	Acad
	Document examples of participatory research in a Pacific cultural context (methods such as story telling; developing seasonal calendars and historical timelines and village walks).			PCSO	INGO	RegAg	Acad
Sharing lessons between governments and civil society	Share experience with other Pacific countries and Small Island Developing States about the best way to access, disperse and account for climate resources. Including, for example, documenting the experience of using a particular mechanism – such as the four countries that have successfully accessed funds through the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund.		PGov			RegAg	

	Supplement short-term and informal information sharing with a series of exchanges where government officials could undertake internships in other sector or country, to learn lessons on how to access climate funds or integrate climate financing into national development plans and departmental budgets.		PGov			RegAg	
	Hold regular scheduled national climate change roundtables involving government officials, community and private sector practitioners as well as locally-based development partners.		PGov	PCSO	INGO		PrivS
Improving strategic understanding by politicians and decision makers	Improve understanding of climate finance by politicians and key decision-makers, promoting leadership and developing 'climate champions'. Draw lessons from other sectors on how to educate and inspire politicians e.g. efforts by HIV promoters and public health officials to educate decision makers on the HIV-AIDS pandemic.	Donors	PGov			RegAg	Acad
	Draw on lessons from other sectors in making strategic investment choices and integrating climate policy into national development priorities.		PGov				
	Approach the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the Centre for Democratic Institutions in Australia and other parliamentary networks to include sessions on climate finance in their education programs.	Donors	PGov				
Enabling peer-to-peer knowledge sharing	Expand information networks that break down organisational silos and share experience of best practice, including the integration of decades of experience in community development and gender mainstreaming.		PGov			RegAg	
	Encourage peer-to-peer learning, through conferences on best practice; internet-based sharing of experience; initiatives linking academics and practitioners; document NGO initiatives on gender and youth.		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	Acad
	Provide sustained financial, human and administrative support for virtual and face to face learning communities.	Donors	PGov			RegAg	

	Create funding windows to allow more face-to-face exchanges, including community to community visits, internships from staff in other ministries or organisations, and hands-on sharing of experience across sectors or even countries.	Donors	PGov				
--	---	--------	------	--	--	--	--

	(5) IMPROVING DIRECT ACCESS TO CLIMATE FINANCING	Donors	Pacific Govt	Pacific CSOs	INGO	Reg. Agencies	Private Sector; Academics
	Pacific governments and community organisations require support to assess alternatives that could improve direct access to climate funding, while maintaining the necessary fiduciary standards and management that will ensure the effective use of the new resources. More climate funds should be channelled through national institutions, to build local capacity and meet local priorities.						
Strengthen Pacific engagement in global negotiations	Guarantee systematic and ongoing funding to upgrade Pacific officials' negotiating skills, to better represent regional interests as new climate funding mechanisms are developed (for example through support for SPREP's negotiations skills training framework).	Donors				RegAg	
Updating regional frameworks	Ensure opportunities for governments, civil society and community organisations to participate in the 2013-15 review of regional frameworks such as the <i>Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006 – 2015</i> and the <i>Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005 – 2015</i> .	Donors	PGov	PCSO		RegAg	
	Increase the focus on vulnerable communities in regional and national climate change frameworks to ensure ongoing prioritisation of adaptation at community level and support for women, youth and vulnerable groups like children and the disabled.		PGov			RegAg	
Gaining accreditation to the Adaptation Fund	Prioritise direct access to climate funding without involvement of intermediary implementing entities like UN agencies or multilateral development banks. Support accreditation as a National Implementing Entity for the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund and equivalent systems with the new Green Climate Fund.	Donors	PGov		INGO	RegAg	
	Organise national level workshops, training and mentoring of relevant staff in how to access the Kyoto Adaptation Fund, Green Climate Fund and other		PGov			RegAg	

	climate funding mechanisms.						
Using the Global Environment Facility (GEF)	Expand allocations for the GEF-UNDP Pacific Small Grants Program (SGP).	Donors					
	Budget funds for the retention of a GEF Advisor at SPREP and the maintenance of the GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (PAS).	Donors				RegAg	
Monitor multilateral development banks	Guarantee civil society and community organisations' meaningful participation throughout the process of implementing the World Bank / ADB Pilot Program on Climate Resilience (PPCR).	Donors	PGov	PCSO			
	Organise regular engagement and reporting back to ensure transparency and accountability, with independent evaluation of MDB projects in the Pacific, rather than the banks alone conducting their own internal evaluations.		PGov	PCSO		RegAg	Acad
	Lobby for the Climate Investment Funds to participate in the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI).		PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	
	Continue and enhance coordination activities between existing multilateral funds, such as joint annual meetings of governing bodies, regular planning meetings and information sharing, including a peer review process to promote dissemination of high quality information.	Donors	PGov				
	Include additional social indicators into the CIF frameworks, including gender-disaggregated data and policies on groups vulnerable to climate change and disasters (e.g. people living with disabilities).	Donors	PGov	PCSO			
National Climate Trust Funds	Support the establishment of National Climate Change Trust Funds.	Donors	PGov			RegAg	
	Investigate useful innovations such as funding windows for community organisations, seed funding for small grants programmes and micro-	Donors	PGov	PCSO	INGO	RegAg	

	financing, technical counselling services for project applicants.						
	Share lessons from the practice of National Climate Funds in Indonesia, the Philippines and other larger developing nations.		PGov		INGO	RegAg	Acad
Creating a Pacific Regional Climate Change Fund	Resource the ongoing work for the creation of a Pacific Regional Climate Change Fund, and provide technical support to small island developing states that cannot manage their own national climate fund.	Donors	PGov			RegAg	

Key:

Donors – International finance providers and bilateral donors

PGOV – Pacific Government

PCSO – Pacific Civil Society Organisations

INGO – International Non-Government Organisations

RegAg – Regional Agencies (UN and CROP agencies)

Acad – Academics

PrivS – Private Sector

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ Forum Communiqué, 39th Pacific Islands Forum Leaders meeting, Alofi, Niue, August 19–20, 2008, p3.
- ² World Bank: *Acting today for tomorrow* (World Bank, Washington, 2012), p3, 4. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/06/01/000425962_20120601150348/Rendered/PDF/694550Box369270q0today0for0tomorrow.pdf
- ³ Australian Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO: *Climate Change in the Pacific: Scientific Assessment and New Research*, Volume 1: Regional Overview, Volume 2: Country Reports (Pacific Climate Change Science Program, November 2011). <http://www.cawcr.gov.au/projects/PCCSP/publications.html>
- ⁴ These summaries are based on interviews conducted in the three countries between February – May 2012, and information in their reports and websites. Similar capacity building is underway in Cook Islands, Marshall Islands, Nauru and FSM, with other Forum member countries to follow.
- ⁵ This overview is based on interviews conducted in Tonga in February 2012, with staff of MECC, the Ministry of National Planning and other government agencies and community groups. For a detailed overview of the process see Lupe Matoto and Luisa Tuiafitu Malolo, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MECC): Tonga's key achievements since the 2009 PCCR, <http://www.pacificdisaster.net/pdnadmin/data/documents/6560.html>
- ⁶ From July 1, 2012 renamed the Ministry of Land, Environment, Climate Change and Natural Resources
- ⁷ Information on Tonga's JNAP can be found at: http://www.preventionweb.net/files/18242_000922tongajointnationalactionp.pdf
- ⁸ Andrea Babon: "Snapshot of REDD+ in PNG", *CIFOR Infobrief* No.4, August 2011. <http://www.cifor.org/online-library/browse/view-publication/publication/3443.html> Accessed 19 July 2012. The OCCES head was later convicted and jailed on a separate murder charge.
- ⁹ This section is based on interviews conducted with a range of government officials, NGO and donors in Port Vila during May 2012, with thanks to VMGD Director Jotham Napat.
- ¹⁰ *Integrating Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management: A Strategic Approach in support of the Sustainable National Development of Vanuatu*, Concept Note, April 11, 2012. <http://www.taktik.net/ccp-vanuatu/sites/default/files/documents/DRAFT%20Concept%20Note%20for%20NACCC%2012%20Apr.docx>
- ¹¹ Interviews with Tevi Obed of the World Bank, VMGD staff and planning documents such as: *Enhancing the Steering, Coordination and Governance of Climate Change and Disaster Risk in Vanuatu: A Proposal*, Discussion Paper and Recommendations from a NACCC & NTF Reorientation Workshop, February 6–7, 2012.
- ¹² Report and outcomes, *NACCC & NTF Reorientation Workshop*, February 6–7, 2012. <http://www.taktik.net/ccp-vanuatu/sites/default/files/documents/NACCC%20%20%26%20NTF%20Reorientation%20REPORT.pdf>
- ¹³ Summary of Outcomes: *Lessons for Future Action Conference - Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Reduction in Small Island Developing States*. Samoa, May 23–26, 2011. http://www.adaptationpartnership.org/system/files/resource/Pacific_Workshop_Summary_of_Outcomes.pdf
- ¹⁴ Interviews with government, industry and NGO members of OCCD Technical Working groups, Port Moresby, May 2012.
- ¹⁵ OCCD: *Provincial Consultation Feedback Report 2011, Manus Provincial Government*, Office of Climate Change and Development, Port Moresby, November 2011, p18.
- ¹⁶ Information from David Posile, Manus Provincial Climate Change officer, OCCD workshop, Port Moresby, May 2012
- ¹⁷ Liane Schalatek with Smita Nakhooda: *Gender and Climate Finance*, Brief No.10, Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America with Overseas Development Institute, November 2011. http://www.boell.org/downloads/10_CFF_GENDER.pdf. Accessed 19 July 2012 See also UNDP: *Adaptation Fund - exploring the gender dimensions of climate finance mechanisms*, brochure, United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Gender and Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), November 2010. <http://www.adaptationlearning.net/sites/default/files/Adaptation%20Fund%20final%202010.pdf>
- ¹⁸ For example there was a high mortality and morbidity rate among children following the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, where the largest numbers of fatalities were women and those under the age of 15. See J. Telford, J. Cosgrave and R. Houghton: *Joint Evaluation of the international response to the Indian Ocean tsunami: Synthesis Report*. Tsunami Evaluation Coalition, 2006. <http://www.alnap.org/resource/3535.aspx>
- ¹⁹ Data from Linda Pennells: "Gender insights in agriculture and food in Vanuatu's response to TC Vania / Atu", Presentation to workshop on *Strengthening disaster response in the agricultural sector*, Fiji, October 3–4, 2011
- ²⁰ Interview with Gwen Sissiou, Director of MRV and National Communication, Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD), Papua New Guinea, April 2012.

²¹ Liane Schalatek with Smita Nakhooda: *Gender and Climate Finance*, Brief No.10, Heinrich Böll Stiftung North America with Overseas Development Institute, November 2011.

<http://www.adaptationlearning.net/sites/default/files/Adaptation%20Fund%20final%202010.pdf>

²² Workshop reports from Fiji, Tuvalu and Kiribati can be found at: <http://www.gendercc.net/about-gendercc/national-activities/pacific-island-countries.html>

²³ World Bank: *Acting today for tomorrow – a policy and practice note for climate and disaster resilient development in the Pacific Islands region* (World Bank, Washington, 2012), p3. http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2012/06/01/000425962_20120601150348/Rendered/PDF/694550Box369270q0today0for0tomorrow.pdf

²⁴ World Bank: *Acting today for tomorrow* (World Bank, Washington, 2012), p3, 4.

²⁵ AusAID: *Australian Multilateral Assessment*, Australian Agency for International Development, Canberra, March 2012, pp22-23. http://www.ausaid.gov.au/Publications/Pages/693_6999_8205_7111_6531.aspx

²⁶ For examples, see Nic Maclellan: *Improving access to climate financing for the Pacific Islands*, Analysis paper, Lowy Institute for International Policy, July 2011, pp8-10. <http://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/improving-access-climate-financing-pacific-islands>

²⁷ Details of the Cairns Compact can be found at

<http://www.ausaid.gov.au/countries/pacific/pages/cairnscompact.aspx>.

²⁸ Concerns over the high turnover of staff in Australian and multilateral agencies are detailed in Australian National Audit Office (ANAO): *AusAID's Management of the Expanding Australian Aid Program*, The Auditor General Audit Report No.15, 2009-10 Performance Audit, pp49-50. http://www.anao.gov.au/uploads/documents/2009-10_Audit_Report_15.pdf. Accessed 20 July 2012; AusAID: *Australian Multilateral Assessment*, Australian Agency for International Development, Canberra, March 2012, p29.

http://www.ausaid.gov.au/Publications/Pages/693_6999_8205_7111_6531.aspx Accessed 20 July 2012

²⁹ PIFS: *Pacific experiences with modalities relevant for Climate Change Financing* (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, 2012),

<http://www.forumsec.org/resources/uploads/attachments/documents/Pacific%20experiences%20with%20modalities%20relevant%20for%20Climate%20Change%20Financing,%202012.pdf>

³⁰ During the research, a range of development partners were interviewed, including staff from the World Bank, Asian Development Bank (ADB), Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID); New Zealand Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT); European Union Delegations to the Pacific; British High Commission (Suva and Port Moresby). All interviews were conducted under confidentiality, to allow free and open discussion.

³¹ Jacob Werksman: *Climate Governance: Ensuring a Collective Commitment to a Low Carbon, Climate Resilient Future*, Paper to 14th International Anti-Corruption Conference, Bangkok, Thailand, 10-13 November 2010, p3.

<http://14iacc.org/wp-content/uploads/JacobWerksmanClimateGovernance14IACC.pdf>

³² Although in interviews, civil society representatives in Tonga suggested this process was very high-level and didn't have the same 'bottom up' consultation process as the creation of Tonga's Joint National Action Plan or the overarching Tongan Strategic Development Framework.

³³ Interview with Leah Nimoho, SGP officer, VANGO, Port Vila, April 2012.

³⁴ For discussion of the Adaptation Fund, the Guidance Committee of the Amazon Fund and other mechanisms, see Global Witness: *Safeguarding REDD+ Finance - Ensuring transparent and accountable international financial flows*, February 2012.

<http://www.globalwitness.org/sites/default/files/library/Safeguarding%20REDD+%20Finance.pdf> .

³⁵ "Island leaders drowned out at Forum", PACNEWS, 14 September 2011.

<http://pina.com.fj/index.php?p=pacnews&m=read&o=8811510234e703d80fa0549c407285>

³⁶ World Resources Institute (WRI): *Summary of developed country 'fast-start' climate finance pledges*, http://pdf.wri.org/climate_finance_pledges_2011-11-18.pdf updated 18 November 2011.

³⁷ Christa Clapp, Jane Ellis, Julia Benn, Jan Corfee-Morlot: *Tracking climate finance – what and how?* OECD / IEA, May 2012, COM/ENV/EPOC/IEA/SLT(2012)1 <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/16/50/50293494.pdf>

³⁸ UNDP: *Blending Climate Finance Through National Climate Funds - A Guidebook for the Design and Establishment of National Funds to Achieve Climate Change Priorities*, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), September 2011.

http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/Climate%20Change/Capacity%20Development/Blending_Climate_Finance_Through_National_Climate_Funds.pdf

³⁹ For discussion, see Nic Maclellan: *Improving access to climate financing for the Pacific Islands*, Analysis paper, Lowy Institute for International Policy, July 2011, pp8-10. <http://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/improving-access-climate-financing-pacific-islands>

⁴⁰ Article 4, paragraph 3, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1992, FCCC/INFORMAL/84 GE.05-62220 (E) 200705, p8. Access at http://unfccc.int/not_assigned/b/items/1417.php

⁴¹ Makereta Komai: *Samoa and Solomon Islands raise questions on fast track finance*, PACNEWS Climate Pasifika Media, Cancun, Mexico, 1 December 2010.

<http://www.pina.com.fj/?p=pacnews&m=read&o=11944309874cf5cdc871082deb100e>

⁴² Information available at http://www.faststartfinance.org/recipient_country/marshall-islands

⁴³ Oxfam in Papua New Guinea has been working on FPIC manuals in English and Tok Pisin that outline the concept in a regional context.

⁴⁴ Maya Forstater with Rachel Rank: *Towards Climate Finance Transparency*, Publish What You Fund / AidInfo, May 2012 http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/files/Towards-Climate-Finance-Transparency_Final.pdf

⁴⁵ Data from Jenny Hayward-Jones et al: *The Pacific Islands and the World: Realising the Pacific's Potential Perspectives*. Outcomes Report, Lowy Institute Conference, September 2011, p11-13. http://www.li-minihost.com/events-docs/PIWC_Outcomes-report.pdf See also *Net Benefits - Upgrading the coconut wireless: Internet uptake in the Pacific*, Pacific Institute of Public Policy, Vanuatu, Discussion paper No.20, April 2012. http://www.li-minihost.com/events-docs/PIWC_Outcomes-report.pdf

⁴⁶ Tonga's Joint National Action Plan (JNAP) Secretariat website can be found at: <http://www.tongajnapsecretariat.to/>.

⁴⁷ Papua New Guinea's Office for Climate Change and Development (OCCD) website can be found at: <http://www.occd.gov.pg/>

⁴⁸ Vanuatu's Meteorology and Geohazards Department (VMGD) website can be found at: <http://www.taktik.net/ccp-vanuatu/>

⁴⁹ Available at <http://maps.google.vu/maps/ms?msid=200527231445744678809.0004ba23ed07a6a621bb2&msa=0&ll=-16.235772,169.420166&spn=5.978497,10.821533>

⁵⁰ <http://www.pacificclimatechange.net/>

⁵¹ Summary of Outcomes: *Lessons for Future Action Conference - Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Reduction in Small Island Developing States*. Samoa, May 23-26, 2011. http://www.adaptationpartnership.org/system/files/resource/Pacific_Workshop_Summary_of_Outcomes.pdf

⁵² Participant in CSFT / MECC / Oxfam workshop on 'Using climate resources effectively', February 2012.

⁵³ For discussion of differing religious responses to disaster, see Phillip Fountain, Sara Kindon and Warwick Murray: "Christianity, calamity and culture: the involvement of Christian Churches in the 1998 Aitape Tsunami Disaster Relief", *The Contemporary Pacific*, Vol.16 No.2 Fall 2004. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/cp.2004.0045>. See also Gerhard Hoffstaedter: *Religion and development - Australian Faith-Based Development Organisations*, ACFID Research in Development Series report No.3, Australian Council for International Development, Canberra, August 2011. <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/humansecurity/assets/downloads/ACFID-IHS-WP02-Hoffstaedter.pdf>

⁵⁴ In interviews, older people have cited Biblical injunctions like God's promise to Noah after the Flood as justification for fatalism about climate change: "Neither will I ever again smite everything living as I have done" (Genesis 8:21).

⁵⁵ James Wangi and Michael Douglas: "Papua New Guinea: did the drought affect public health status?" *Information for Action*, No.1 - 1998.

http://www.spc.int/phs/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=112&Itemid=102

⁵⁶ PCCSP publications available at: <http://www.cawcr.gov.au/projects/PCCSP/publications.html>

⁵⁷ Saleem ul Huq: "Climate change: Paradigm shift needed?" *Daily Star*, 4 March 2012. <http://www.thedailystar.net/newDesign/news-details.php?nid=224809>

⁵⁸ Olivia Warwick: "Ethics and methods in research for community based adaptation: reflections from rural Vanuatu", *Participatory Learning and Action* No.60. <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/602815.pdf> For a similar perspective from Fiji, see Patrina Dumar: "Community-based adaptation: enhancing community adaptive capacity in Druadrua Island, Fiji", *WIRES Climate Change*, Volume 1, Issue 5, September / October 2010, pp751-763. http://research.usp.ac.fj/fileadmin/user_upload/content_data_01/Shalini/Druadrua_WIRES_sept2010.pdf

⁵⁹ Interview with Gwen Maru, UNDP Papua New Guinea, 28 March 2012

⁶⁰ For discussion, see UNDP: *Climate Investment Funds - exploring the gender dimensions of climate finance mechanisms*, brochure, United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Gender and Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), November 2010. <http://www.uncclearn.org/sites/www.uncclearn.org/files/inventory/UNDP86.pdf>

⁶¹ Cheryl Anderson et al: *The gendered dimensions of disaster risk management and adaptation to climate change - stories from the Pacific* (AusAID / UNDP Pacific Centre, Suva, 2008). *The gendered dimensions of disaster risk management* <http://www.adaptationlearning.net/sites/default/files/UNDP%20PC%20Climate%20Change.pdf>

⁶² Text of PIFACC available at:

www.sprep.org/att/publication/000438_PI_Framework_for_Action_on_Climate_Change_2006_2015_FINAL.pdf

⁶³ AusAID: *Engaging our Pacific neighbours on climate change - Australia's approach* (Australian Agency for International Development, Canberra, 2009).

<http://www.climatechange.gov.au/-/media/publications/international/engaging-pacific-neighbours.pdf>

⁶⁴ Muthkumara Mani, Anil Markandaya and Viju Ipe: *Policy and institutional reforms to support climate change adaptation and mitigation in development programs - a practical guide* (Environment Department, World Bank, Washington, 2008) <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEEI/Resources/DCCToolkitCRAlores.pdf>; Sofia

Bettencourt et al.: *Not if but when - adapting to natural hazards in the Pacific Islands region*, World Bank Policy note, World Bank Pacific Islands Country Management Unit, (2006).

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPACIFICISLANDS/Resources/Natural-Hazards-report.pdf>

⁶⁵ UNICEF Pacific has begun commissioning studies of the effects on children: Nic Maclellan, Mia Urbano, Dr. Tilman Ruff and Dr. Grant Blashki: *Climate change and children in the Pacific – report for UNICEF Pacific* (Nossal Institute for Global Health, University of Melbourne, April 2010)

http://www.sustainable.unimelb.edu.au/files/mssi/UNICEF-Pacific_Climate-Change-and-Children-in-the-Pacific-Islands_2010.pdf; Donovan Burton, Johanna Mustelin, J. and Peter Urich: *Climate Change Impacts on Children in the Pacific: Kiribati and Vanuatu technical report*, a Climate Planning report commissioned by UNICEF, 2011. http://www.unicef.org/eapro/pacific_climate_change_report.pdf

⁶⁶ Setareki Macanawai, contribution to PSE debate on children and climate change, June 2012. For the Convention on disabilities see <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>

⁶⁷ Red Cross Climate Centre: *Red Cross / Red Crescent Climate Guide* (Red Cross Climate Centre, Netherlands, 2007). http://www.climatecentre.org/downloads/File/reports/RCRC_climateguide.pdf

⁶⁸ Chris Roche: *Promoting Voice and Choice - Exploring innovations in Australian NGO accountability for development effectiveness*, Australian Council for International Development, ACFID, 2009 http://www.acfid.asn.au//resources/docs_resources/Promoting%20Voice%20and%20Choice%20ACFID%202010.pdf

⁶⁹ Interview with Tonga National Youth Congress (TNYC), Nuku'alofa, February 2012.

⁷⁰ Elizabeth Arend and Sonia Lowman: *Governing climate funds - what will work for women?* Gender Action, September 2011, p14.

⁷¹ For example, see critiques on blogs in PNG and overseas: PNGExposed: "PNG govt still paying millions to McKinsey for climate strategy", 9 June 2011 <http://pngexposed.wordpress.com/2011/06/09/png-govt-still-paying-millions-to-mckinsey-for-climate-strategy/>; David Ritter: "Under attack, McKinsey dumped from rainforest role in PNG", Crikey, December 1, 2011. <http://www.crikey.com.au/2011/12/01/under-attack-mckinsey-dumped-from-rainforest-role-in-png/>

⁷² Andrea Babon: "Snapshot of REDD+ in PNG", *CIFOR Infobrief* No.4, August 2011. <http://www.cifor.org/online-library/browse/view-publication/publication/3443.html> Accessed 19 July 2012

⁷³ Wari Iamo, OCCD Acting Executive Director at the time of his presentation to opening of OCCD Workshop, Port Moresby DATE, April 2012.

⁷⁴ Provincial workshop feedback reports are found at:

http://www.occd.gov.pg/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=21&Itemid=72

⁷⁵ *Consultation in a box*, Office of Climate Change and Development (OCCD), version 1.0, June 2011.

⁷⁶ Case study 15.6.1: "Traditional knowledge for adaptation", Working Group II: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, IPCC Fourth Assessment Report on Climate Change (2007).

⁷⁷ Kirsty Galloway McLean: *Advance Guard: Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation, Mitigation and Indigenous Peoples - A Compendium of Case Studies*. United Nations University – Traditional Knowledge Initiative, Darwin, Australia, October 2010.

http://www.unutki.org/downloads/File/Publications/UNU_Advance_Guard_Compendium_2010_final_web.pdf

⁷⁸ Kirsty Galloway McLean, Ameyali Ramos-Castillo and Jennifer Rubis (eds): "Indigenous Populations and Climate Change: Vulnerability, Adaptation and Traditional Knowledge Meeting report" IPMPCC Workshop Report 2, July 19-21, 2011 Mexico City, Mexico

⁷⁹ "Climate Change Mitigation with Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples: Practices, Lessons Learned and Prospects." Details at http://www.unutki.org/default.php?doc_id=213

⁸⁰ *Weathering Uncertainty: Traditional Knowledge for Climate Change Assessment and Adaptation*, UNESCO-UNU, 2012. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002166/216613e.pdf>

⁸¹ "Vanuatu: Facilitating and strengthening local resource management initiatives of traditional landholders and their communities to achieve biodiversity conservation objectives" in *Indigenous Communities and Biodiversity* (Global Environment Facility, Washington, 2008), pp25-27.

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/indigenous-community-biodiversity.pdf>

⁸² Penehuro Fatu Lefale: "Ua 'afa le Aso - Stormy weather today: traditional ecological knowledge of weather and climate. The Samoa experience" *Climatic Change*, No.100, 2010 pp.317-335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10584-009-9722-z>

⁸³ Vanuatu: Facilitating and strengthening local resource management initiatives of traditional landholders and their communities to achieve biodiversity conservation objectives", in *Indigenous Communities and Biodiversity* (Global Environment Facility, Washington, 2008), pp25-27.

<http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/publication/indigenous-community-biodiversity.pdf>

⁸⁴ Australian Red Cross: *Traditional knowledge and Red Cross disaster preparedness in the Pacific*, http://www.pacificdisaster.net/pdnadmin/data/original/ARC_2010_traditional_knwldg.pdf November 2010.

⁸⁵ Nic Maclellan: "Preparing for storms – protecting the islands", *Islands Business*, January 2011. http://www.islandsbusiness.com/islands_business/index_dynamic/containerNameToReplace=MiddleMiddle/foeusModuleID=19545/overrideSkinName=issueArticle-full.tpl

- ⁸⁶ *Report on Climate Frontlines*: <http://www.climatefrontlines.org/en-GB/node/554#pacific>
- ⁸⁷ Interview with Member of Parliament, Nuku'alofa, Kingdom of Tonga, 20 February 2012.
- ⁸⁸ Kelly Levin: "World Resources 2010 Framing Paper: Decision Making in a Changing Climate." World Resources Report, Washington DC. Available online at <http://www.worldresourcesreport.org>
- ⁸⁹ Interview, Nuku'alofa, Kingdom of Tonga, 22 February 2012.
- ⁹⁰ UNDP: *Climate Investment Funds - exploring the gender dimensions of climate finance mechanisms*, brochure, United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Gender and Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), November 2010. <http://www.unccllearn.org/sites/www.unccllearn.org/files/inventory/UNDP86.pdf>
- ⁹¹ Information at <http://www.aideffectiveness.org/ClimateChangeFinance2011>
- ⁹² Disaster response initiatives are also coordinated through the *Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005 – 2015*.
- ⁹³ Summary of Outcomes: *Lessons for Future Action Conference - Climate Change Adaptation & Disaster Risk Reduction in Small Island Developing States*. Samoa, 23-26 May 2011. http://www.adaptationpartnership.org/system/files/resource/Pacific_Workshop_Summary_of_Outcomes.pdf
- ⁹⁴ The Virtual Library is at: <http://www.sprep.org/Pacific-Environment-Information-Network/lessons-learned-and-best-practices-in-environment-management>
- ⁹⁵ Website at: <http://pacificgender.org/>
- ⁹⁶ As revealed by Wikileaks, a US Embassy cable on a meeting on February 11, 2010 between EU Climate Action Commissioner Connie Hedegaard and US Deputy Special Envoy for Climate Change Jonathan Pershing, stated that Hedegaard suggested "the AOSIS [Alliance of Small Island States] countries could be our best allies given their need for financing." Climate: Pershing and Hedegaard commit to close co-operation", US cable from Brussels embassy UNCLAS section, 17 February 2010, online at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/us-embassy-cables-documents/249185>.
- ⁹⁷ For examples, see interview with Toke Talagi, Premier of Niue: "Accessing climate funds 'really hard to get'", *Islands Business*, April 2011, or "Show me the money! Pacific governments lobby for climate finance", *Islands Business*, June 2011.
- ⁹⁸ For discussion of all these debates, see Nic Maclellan: *Improving access to climate financing for the Pacific Islands*, Analysis paper, Lowy Institute for International Policy, July 2011. <http://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/improving-access-climate-financing-pacific-islands>
- ⁹⁹ Background paper, Forum Economic Ministers' Meeting, Alofi, Niue, 26-28 October 2010, PIFS(10) FEMM Background E.
- ¹⁰⁰ Contribution to PSE debate on national climate funds by Espen Ronnenberg, SPREP, May 2012. <http://www.solutionexchange-un.net/pacific/ccd/index.html>
- ¹⁰¹ The initial policy between 2000 – 2004 was called the 'Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea-level Rise'. PIFACC was revised in 2008 and 2010, with the current text available at: www.sprep.org/att/publication/000438_PI_Framework_for_Action_on_Climate_Change_2006_2015_FINAL.pdf
- ¹⁰² Displacement Solutions: *Climate Change Displaced Persons and Housing, Land and Property Rights Preliminary Strategies for Rights-Based Planning and Programming to Resolve Climate-Induced Displacement* (Displacement Solutions, Geneva, 2009). http://displacementsolutions.org/files/documents/DS_Climate_change_strategies.pdf
See also Nic Maclellan: "Kiribati's policy for 'migration with dignity'", *Inside Story*, 4 December 2011. <http://inside.org.au/kiribati%E2%80%99s-policy-for-migration-with-dignity/>
- ¹⁰³ Nic Maclellan, Mia Urbano, Dr. Tilman Ruff and Dr. Grant Blashki: *Climate change and children in the Pacific – report for UNICEF Pacific* (Nossal Institute for Global Health, University of Melbourne, April 2010), p10. http://www.sustainable.unimelb.edu.au/files/mssi/UNICEF-Pacific_Climate-Change-and-Children-in-the-Pacific-Islands_2010.pdf
- ¹⁰⁴ The Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund (AF) was established under the UNFCCC and became operational in 2009. The Global Environment Facility (GEF) provides secretariat services to the AF and the World Bank serves as its trustee, both on an interim basis. The AF has defined three legal structures which can meet the accountability and fiduciary standards required to directly access funds: a National Implementing Entity (NIE), such as a statutory agency or even a domestic non-government organisation, a Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE), such as an accredited UN agency or development bank, and a Regional Implementing Authority. Countries without an NIE can work with an MIE to apply for AF funds, with the MIE claiming up to an 8.5 per cent administration fee for each project. The four Pacific countries that have gained AF funding as of mid-2012 (Solomon Islands, Cook Islands, Fiji and Papua New Guinea) have relied on UNDP as their MIE. However, after a decision at COP17 in Cancun, the future of the fund is uncertain as it is governed by forthcoming decisions on the Green Climate Fund. Accreditation of an NIE is valid for five years, and is judged by a panel made up of two board members and three experts.

-
- ¹⁰⁵ A full toolkit on the AF accreditation process is available on the Adaptation Fund website, <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/Accreditation%20Toolkit%20English.pdf>
- ¹⁰⁶ SPREP's experience of RIE accreditation is discussed in PIFS: *Pacific experiences with modalities relevant for Climate Change Financing* (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, 2012), pp22-23. http://www.sustainable.unimelb.edu.au/files/mssi/UNICEF-Pacific_Climate-Change-and-Children-in-the-Pacific-Islands_2010.pdf
- ¹⁰⁷ On climate change, it serves as the operating entity for several specialised funds operating under the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC, including: (i) The Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), established under the Convention in 2001 to finance projects relating to: adaptation; technology transfer and capacity building; energy, transport, industry, agriculture, forestry and waste management; and economic diversification; (ii) The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), established to support LDCs to carry out the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs).
- ¹⁰⁸ David Sheppard, Director of SPREP, presentation to PCCR, Alofi, Niue, March 2011.
- ¹⁰⁹ See Oxfam International (2012) *Risky Business: Intermediary Lending and Development Finance*. <http://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/ib-intermediary-lending-and-development-finance-180412-en.pdf>
- ¹¹⁰ Jonathan Cornford: *Banking on aid - An examination of the delivery of Australian aid through the World Bank and Asian Development Bank*, Oxfam Australia and Manna Gum, Discussion paper, October 2011. <http://www.mannagum.org.au/downloads/banking-on-aid>
- ¹¹¹ This case study is based on interviews conducted by Nic Maclellan (Lead Researcher) during February-June 2012 with World Bank and ADB officials in Papua New Guinea, Tonga and Fiji, with special thanks to Marc Overmars (ADB climate advisor, Suva); Allen Oliver (World Bank, Port Moresby) and Saia Faletau (ADB/World Bank Joint office, Nuku'alofa) – none of whom are responsible for the analysis or commentary
- ¹¹² Interview with PCCR participant, Nuku'alofa, February 2012.
- ¹¹³ Aide memoire of the first joint mission (ADB/WB/UNDP/AusAID-DCCEE/DFID) for the Kingdom of Tonga Component of the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PCCR), May 18-19, 2010, p6.
- ¹¹⁴ UNDP: *Climate Investment Funds - exploring the gender dimensions of climate finance mechanisms*, brochure, United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and Gender and Climate Change Alliance (GCCA), November 2010. <http://www.unclearn.org/sites/www.unclearn.org/files/inventory/UNDP86.pdf>
- ¹¹⁵ Benjamin Graham: *Trust Funds in the Pacific - Their role and future* (Asian Development Bank, Manila, 2005). <http://www.adb.org/publications/trust-funds-pacific-their-role-and-future> The experience of Tuvalu's National Trust Fund is detailed in PIFS: *Pacific experiences with modalities relevant for Climate Change Financing* (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, 2012), pp8-11. http://www.sustainable.unimelb.edu.au/files/mssi/UNICEF-Pacific_Climate-Change-and-Children-in-the-Pacific-Islands_2010.pdf
- ¹¹⁶ The PIFS Climate Financing Options Paper is available at: http://www.forumsec.org/resources/uploads/attachments/documents/2011FEMM_FEMS.05_Report.pdf
- ¹¹⁷ Justin Rose: *"The Micronesia Conservation Trust: Securing Finances for Micronesia's Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development"* (SPREP, n.d.). http://www.sprep.org/att/irc/ecopies/pacific_region/387.pdf. See also PIFS: *Pacific experiences with modalities relevant for Climate Change Financing* (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, 2012), p12-14. http://www.sustainable.unimelb.edu.au/files/mssi/UNICEF-Pacific_Climate-Change-and-Children-in-the-Pacific-Islands_2010.pdf
- ¹¹⁸ Interview with Jane Mogina, Executive Director of the Mama Graun Conservation Trust Fund, *Eldis communities website*, 11 December 2010.
- ¹¹⁹ *Mobilising Climate Change Funding in the Pacific Islands Region - A Report to the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program* (SPREP), October 2010. http://www.sprep.org/att/publication/000912_final_piccafreport_2010.pdf
- ¹²⁰ The section reflects debates at the 2011 Pacific Climate Change Roundtable in Niue, and interviews with officials and government representatives from Australia, New Zealand, the European Union and Forum island countries.
- ¹²¹ For discussion, see PIFS: *Pacific experiences with modalities relevant for Climate Change Financing* (Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Suva, 2012), pp4-7. http://www.sustainable.unimelb.edu.au/files/mssi/UNICEF-Pacific_Climate-Change-and-Children-in-the-Pacific-Islands_2010.pdf

Oxfam Research Reports are written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development and humanitarian policy and practice. They do not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

For more information, or to comment on this report, email sarah.meads@oxfam.org.nz

© Oxfam New Zealand and Oxfam Australia August 2012

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. E-mail media@oxfam.org.nz.

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam New Zealand in August 2012.

Oxfam New Zealand, 14 West St, Newton. PO Box 68357, Auckland 1145.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 17 organizations networked together in over 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty:

Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)
Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)
Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)
Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)
Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)
Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)
Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)
Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)
Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)
Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)
Oxfam Japan (www.oxfam.jp)
Intermón Oxfam (www.intermonoxfam.org)
Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)
Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)
Oxfam Japan (www.oxfam.jp)
Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)
Oxfam New Zealand (www.oxfam.org.nz)
Oxfam Novib (www.oxfamnovib.nl)
Oxfam Québec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)

Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org.