

October 14, 2010

**Comments from Australia on the Decision-by-Mail - Pacific regional program: Tonga, PNG and Samoa Proposal for Phase 1 Funding**

Dear PPCR Sub-Committee Members

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Phase 1 funding proposals for Tonga, Samoa and Papua New Guinea as part of the Pacific regional pilot.

Firstly Australia would like to congratulate all those involved in developing these proposals. We especially appreciate the MDBs' efforts to engage with host countries and key development partners during the development of the three proposals. We are pleased to see that the proposals and consultation processes show increasingly stronger partner government ownership of the PPCR as this will be a crucial factor in the success of the pilots.

Australia is supportive of all three project proposals, but has some specific comments and suggestions outlined below. We encourage that the below points to be addressed in each country's Strategic Program for Climate Resilience (SPCR).

**Tonga**

- We reiterate the importance of close engagement with all key stakeholders, including the Government committee on climate change, Heads of Departments, State Owned Enterprises and donors, in the targeted sectors to ensure a coordinated approach that helps achieve adaptation objectives of the Government of Tonga. Engaging high level leadership in Tonga will continue to be important, particularly following the elections in November 2010.
- Whilst we applaud the scope of the activities, Australia has some concern that the proposal may be somewhat ambitious given the limited available funds for phase one of the Tonga pilot. One option could be for the proposal to be refined to a smaller number of components in phase one and/or engage with donors on possible co-financing of components.
- We appreciate the inclusion of risk assessment, but would welcome a more detailed budget and M&E framework in the SPCR.

**Samoa**

- Australia is concerned that attempting to develop the Climate Resilience Investment Programme (CRIP) and a broader National Climate Change Program and Plan will stretch the resources available for phase one. The proposal could possibly be refined to consider including development of the broader plan in phase two.
- Australia would welcome further information on how the proposal reflects the Sub-committee's desire to see PPCR funding for Samoa operate in an accelerated manner to assist with the response to the 2009 tsunami.

- Whilst bio-fuel production and energy efficiency efforts are already underway in Samoa, Australia would welcome a stronger justification of the adaptation benefits for their inclusion in phase two under Component B (outcomes two and three).
- Australia is pleased to see a focus on community based adaptation and the recognition of the need for close coordination (with Australia and the UNDP) on the proposed expansion of these activities, noting that both the GEF and Australia have existing community based activities in the region.
- Australia would like to see more information on risk assessment and risk management options of the Samoa proposal in the SPCR.

## **Papua New Guinea**

- We reiterate the importance of close engagement with all key donors in the targeted sectors to ensure a coordinated approach that helps achieve Government of PNG's adaptation objectives.
- Given the focus on transport infrastructure, we encourage the MDBs to ensure adequate attention is paid to possible adverse impacts through increased transmission of HIV, as this significant development issue has close linkages with transport infrastructure.
- Australia is concerned that the limited available funds for phase one of the PNG pilot may hinder ability to deliver what is an ambitious proposal, and we encourage the MDBs to consider engagement with donors on possible co-financing of some elements.
- We would welcome a more detailed budget and M&E framework in the SPCR.

In general we feel that each proposal could be further improved by more detail in the SPCR around how each component will assist in achieving development outcomes.

We ask the MDBs to continue to engage with Pacific and Australian science agencies and the Australian Government Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (particularly on outcome 1.iii) to enable a coordinated approach to development and use of climate change science and impact information in these countries and the region.

In addition we note the ongoing discussions, including this week in Nandi, on the shape of the regional component of the Pacific pilot, and that the SPCRs will need to adequately reflect that once the regional component is further developed.

We hope this input is useful and we look forward to continued engagement in implementation of phase one and development of the SPCRs.

Regards

**Jean-Bernard Carrasco**