

October 13, 2010

**Comments from the United Kingdom on the Decision-by-Mail - Pacific regional program
(Tonga, Samoa and Papua New Guinea) : Proposal for Phase 1 Funding**

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for sharing these papers with us. We understand from our colleagues and friends in the region that the process to arrive at these drafts was based on an increasingly consultative approach between the pilot country governments, MDBs and wider stakeholders which is really good news. As is the high-level leadership that the national governments of Tonga, Samoa and PNG have given to the PPCR to date and hope that senior-level leadership continues.

We welcome all of the proposals although we do have a number of comments which are a mixture of some common to all but also on each individual proposal:

We particularly welcome the regional approach, especially because it goes beyond lesson learning to developing regional institutional capacity and tools such as those for climate monitoring. It will be important to ensure that implementation also maintains a focus that goes beyond simply sharing lessons across the region, and that the regional outcomes are achieved across the region, not just in the three pilot countries

Welcome the focus on private sector participation. In the PNG proposal, however, much of the private sector engagement strand is currently output-focused, for example producing information products and holding conferences. It will be important to show how the desired outcome of increased leverage of climate resilient finance and activity will be achieved and measured.

The proposals should set out how they have validated the assumption that NGO representation in PPCR design and implementation translates into genuine representation of vulnerable communities, groups and individuals.

Each of the proposals could learn from the other two. For example, the Samoan proposal focuses on sustainable financing for adaptation, makes clear links between PPCR investments and the MDGs and other national development outcomes, and includes an M&E framework, and the other two proposals could usefully draw on these strengths.

We welcome Samoa's focus on how PPCR will assist in achieving the MDGs. However, we would need to see a clearer explanation of the causality between PPCR investments and progress towards the MDGs. For example, while investments might create income generating opportunities, to whom will these accrue (and in particular, how are the results disaggregated by vulnerability, gender, etc)?

The proposal from PNG explains that 80% of the population relies on subsistence agriculture, therefore it is important to explain why the focus of the proposal is on infrastructure/transport.

We welcome Samoa's proposal to undertake a SESA, but recommend that this be a regional activity for all three pilot countries as well as to understand regional opportunities and risks.

We are please to see strong reference to the engagement of stakeholders from the community level, and in particular the rolling up in the Tonga proposal of learning from the community level into policy at the national and regional level.

We welcome the cross-government, multi-stakeholder approaches the proposals are taking, and the efforts to build on existing strategies and institutions and thus avoid duplication.

The Samoa proposal has an M&E framework, which is excellent. However, it hasn't identified actual indicators for most of the input and output targets. The other proposals will need to include a strong M&E framework in their final proposals.

We welcome the focus on gender issues, especially in the PNG proposal. The Samoa proposal will need to ensure that gender issues are considered to ensure vulnerable men as well as women are taken into account - the proposal currently has a focus on women, rather than gender.

We would like to see a more explicit illustration of the development impacts expected from the PPCR in **PNG and Tonga**, in particular the impact on the poor. This is particularly important given the focus on infrastructure, particularly because such a high proportion of the population in each country relies on agriculture for their livelihoods. Linked to this, we welcome the M&E framework **Samoa** has provided, and would welcome a similar framework being included in the final proposals for **PNG and Tonga**.

We would also like to see a more detailed budget for **PNG and Tonga**, to include information about how much money would be spent on local/regional and international experts. As we expressed in the last sub-committee meeting, while we understand that international consultants are sometimes required due to capacity limits in country, where international consultants are needed, their terms of reference should include an element of capacity building of local experts.

We would welcome an assessment of risk on the delivery of phase 1 in **Samoa** and an indication of how risks will be mitigated.

We recognise the importance of energy security in the region but:

- We would ask that the in the context of the proposal to move to large-scale bio fuels in **Samoa**, considerations of the wider environment are taken into account and risks of maladaptation addressed. [Do we mean addressed here (i.e. they've already been identified, we agree with their mitigation strategy, and we want to ensure they implement that strategy) or do we want to say "risks of maladaptation assessed and mitigated"?)]
- We would like to understand the transmission mechanisms between component III and improved energy security in **Tonga** as referenced in table 1 row 4. We are not clear how delivery on component III would deliver improved energy security for **Tonga**.

We would be happy to make available to those leading on these proposals, a short independent assessment of each one which we commissioned to help us to understand how well they met the objectives of the PPCR.

We are happy to approve these proposals subject to these comments being incorporated in a revised final version of the phase 1 proposals, to ensure our comments are taken into account in the implementation of phase 1.

We look forward to seeing revised versions of the proposals.

Kind regards,

Su-Lin