

August 30, 2012

## **Comments from United Kingdom on Approval by Mail: Request for Endorsement of the Strategic Program for Climate Resilience for Papua New Guinea**

Dear Patricia

We congratulate PNG on putting together a credible well-constructed SPCR, which lists the critical risks and mitigations effectively and which as the independent review states 'overall comes across as a well-balanced package of interventions to achieve better climate resilience'. We do however welcome the move to table the SPCR at a sub-committee meeting for approval in line with standard PPCR procedures, and to give the chance for presentation by Government and proper discussion with donors.

Some areas that could be expanded on further in a subsequent draft or in implementation:

- The independent review recognises the importance to the success of the SPCR of strong support from Government, a clear institutional home and legal status for the institutional framework to support it. Whilst the SPCR is strong on outlining how it is aligned with national planning processes and the role of the lead agencies it doesn't specifically acknowledge any of the risks associated with political change, important for any programme reliant on one particular part of Government but even more so given the timing in an election year. As the document pre-dates the recent elections it wasn't possible for it to address this specifically but some further analysis of the governance context would be welcome in the next draft, as well as clearer measures to recognise and mitigate generic political risks.
- There is a welcome emphasis on the subnational elements in parts of the document but its not entirely clear how strong engagement has been with subnational government on a strategic level and how much ownership there is there (beyond for example the PNG Ports Authorities)
- Capacity building is a strong recurring theme throughout which is appropriate. It would be good to be clearer on how the SPCR will ensure its approach to capacity building is sustainable and follows best practice, ensuring capacity is transferred to permanent civil servants and is in line with Government structures, for example how will the PMU be transitioned into permanent government structures at the end of the programme or otherwise exit strategies made to close it? To avoid a proliferation of projectised structures.
- As the independent review recognises, the results framework as it stands is a mixture of process and outcomes, most appear to be activities rather than true outcomes. It would be useful to include better measures of the impacts achieved and to align these with the emerging overall PPCR overall result framework. For example ensuring that the number of people supported or made more resilient by the programme is captured as a priority. We would also support the areas identified for improvement by the reviewer – on baselines and on attribution

- More clarity is requested on the 'Project Management' component budget line which has \$2 million associated with it, this is additional to capacity building elements of the other components and to the AfDB supervision services so what does this consist of?
- We agree with the independent reviewer that it would be good if the technical assessments could be made publically available
- We welcome the apparent attention to stakeholder consultation in developing the SPCR but note the reviewers comment that this will need to continue and to deepen in implementation, especially at the subnational level and with civil society and the private sector
- Environmental and social assessments and analysis will be important in the projects as they are developed given the sectors which are identified – e.g. fisheries management, early warning systems and community resilience plans (also noted by the reviewer)

Many thanks

Jane

Jane Higgins | Policy Analyst - Low Carbon Development and Adaptation Teams  
| Climate and Environment Department | Department for International Development  
United Kingdom