

February 21, 2013

**Comments from Germany and Spain on Approval by Mail: Pacific Region:
Implementation of the Strategic Program for Climate Resilience (SPCR) (ADB)**

Dear Pacific region team,

thank you very much for your project proposals which we support. Please find attached our comments.

kind regards
Annette

Dr. Annette Windmeisser
Klimapolitik und Klimafinanzierung
Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung

Division for Climate Policy and Climate Financing
senior political advisor
Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development

**Joint German and Spanish Comments on proposed project: Pacific Region
Implementation of the Strategic Program for Climate Resilience – Capacity
Development Technical Assistance (R-CDTA)**

Summary

The Pacific island states are especially vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. Inhabitants of many islands are already enduring extreme weather conditions such as drought, hurricanes and floods, coastal erosion and – especially in atolls – water shortages. People are not yet sufficiently prepared for the approaching climate change. There is also a lack of knowledge, reliable data and adaptation strategies. In addition, the effects of climate change and possible adaptation strategies have not yet been fully incorporated into policy frameworks or regulatory structures. We therefore particularly welcome the proposed Regional Capacity Development Technical Assistance (R-CDTA) to support the implementation of the SPCR for the Pacific Region. We have no major objections. We however would like to see our recommendations (see **bold** highlights below) incorporated during project implementation.

Individual Comments on the Proposed Project

The proposal is well written with clear goals. However, it appears confusing that Component 2 does not align with Output 2. We therefore recommend renaming Component 2 (WB/SPC) to become Component 3.

Output 1 seems very ambitious given the resources and the time-frame. The Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (SPREP) has limited expertise in implementation in the highlighted sectors (food security and infrastructure) and in absence of formalised partnerships for delivery in these areas. We therefore recommend (1) not venturing into sector-level mainstreaming and focussing only on mainstreaming in planning processes (sub-national and local). In order to work at sub-national planning levels there will be a need to have personal on the ground in the selected countries. This will be a relatively new area for SPREP and it will be vital in order to achieve success that resources are placed in-country to support the process. We therefore recommend (2) clarifying the need to have technical assistance on the ground in the selected countries. Central government Ministries (e.g. Ministry for Local Government, Ministries for Home Affairs etc.) have not always been given the adequate attention and voice in national processes. We therefore recommend strengthening the role of agencies which manage sub-national planning and governance.

As stated in the proposal, information, experience, best practices from existing initiatives will be identified. We appreciate the intentions to complement, not duplicate, major on-going climate change adaptation (CCA) and related disaster risk reduction (DRR) initiatives being implemented with support from the region's development partners. Strengthening local level CCA and DRR planning and implementation is a priority in the region and early steps have been taken by several projects – including the SPC/GIZ Programme Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region (CCCPIR) – to work at the provincial and local planning levels (e.g. in Choiseul Province in Solomon Islands, or support to provincial officers in Vanuatu). There are also overlaps with efforts undertaken by the EU and Australia. We therefore recommend clarifying in the proposal how **coordination and cooperation with other development partners** will be ensured (see also recommendations on synergies with other donors below).

We believe that the Regional Technical Support Mechanism (RTSM) could lead to a significant improvement in the deployment and coordination of technical assistance in the Pacific island states. There is often limited coordination across CCA and DRR projects resulting in duplication, lack of responsiveness to country needs and added burdens to already stretched national systems. We therefore recommend engaging existing CCA and DRR projects to use the RTSM to facilitate the deployment of technical expertise financed from their projects.

We also recommend hosting of the RTSM by the Pacific Climate Change Portal and Pacific Disaster Net to have one system (databases etc.) displayed on both portals and

not to create a separate website for RTSM. This would strengthen ownership of the existing mechanisms and assist in directing countries to knowledge products developed in other Components of the project.

The results framework contains no explicit references to the PPCR core indicators, yet most of them are covered. It does not seem clear to us, however, which indicator is meant to align with the core indicator B1. The project design includes a wide variety of PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies, activities to respond to climate variability and climate change. In order to ensure that these tools etc. are actually *used* by vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public sector services, we consider it important to establish this connection. We therefore recommend specifying how the core indicator B1 is incorporated into the design and monitoring framework. The design and monitoring framework contains an indicator that aims at tracking the success of the project at outcome level by measuring vulnerability: *“By 2016: Vulnerability of communities to climate change impacts in selected sectors and countries reduced by 5%.”* However, it does not make further reference as to how the reduction of the vulnerability will be measured. Measuring a reduction in vulnerability seems intuitively plausible, however, to our knowledge, there is no readily available standard procedure for measuring vulnerability. We therefore greatly appreciate further details on the concept of measuring of vulnerability underlying this indicator, and we recommend clarifying what kind of baseline will be used for this indicator, and how the reduction of the vulnerability will be measured.

The second output in the design and monitoring framework contains the *indicator “80% of CCA and DRR knowledge and tools are applied in 3 pilot Pacific DMCs”*. It remains unclear to which collection/list of CCA and DRR knowledge and tools the 80% refers to, and how application can be measured as a percentage value. (If 80% of tools were being used, it would suffice for 4 out of 5 tools to be used once, and then never again, to satisfy the indicator – this can hardly be intended. Measuring the use of knowledge as a percentage would be even more challenging, as we doubt that knowledge can be expressed in numerical terms.) **We therefore recommend further clarification on which CCA and DRR knowledge and tools will be applied, and how their application can be expressed as a percentage.**

Synergies with other donors – in particular German – Climate Change Related Engagement in the Country / Region

Reference is made to other development partners throughout the proposal, though an explicit listing of the various programmes (e.g. SPC/GIZ CCCPIR, SPC GCCA:PSIS,

UNDP DRR, SPC DRM programme) is only given in the background documentation. The explicit coordination of the programme by WACC (Working Arm on Climate Change- CROP-wide climate change coordination group) should ensure that existing CROP mechanisms will be built on. The SPCR's components 1 and 2 are overlapping with those of the German-funded SPC/GIZ CCCPIR, which is also working with SPREP, the University of the South Pacific USP and 12 Pacific island countries, amongst them the three SPCR countries Samoa, Tonga and Papua New Guinea. **We therefore recommend undertaking all possible efforts to ensure cooperation and giving more emphasis to collaboration with CCCPIR on sub-national mainstreaming and using staff based in the countries to facilitate on-going support at country level.**

Comments on Cross-Cutting Issues

Participation

The proposal does not sufficiently address selection criteria for the countries which will be supported. We therefore recommend providing more information on these criteria.

Gender

The proposal takes into account some of the agreed outcome level indicators of the revised PPCR results framework. Training programs are for instance being proposed, which *“will include gender mainstreaming in CCA and DRR in the public and private sectors and, in collaboration with the Pacific Gender Climate Coalition, revision of CCA and DRR policies and plans to become more gender sensitive”*. Given that many Pacific DMCs have male-dominated local governance systems it will be important to build on specific mechanisms to ensure that the different CCA and DRR priorities of men and women are captured at the planning level. Training for provincial, district and local government agencies in this area will be necessary to support this. In this context, we would also like to note that a Gender and Climate Change Toolkit (developed by SPC, SPREP, UNDP, and GIZ) will be available by May 2013 to support work in this area. We appreciate that the proposal contains considerations as to whether climate change affects the livelihoods of women and men differently in the context of the Pacific DMCs. However, these considerations are not reflected in the results framework, as there is no indicator considering gender aspects. To be able to track the increase of resilience (outcome) and improvement in quality of life (impact) of female and male beneficiaries, we consider it very important to disaggregate the results for indicators on project impact

and outcome (provided the measurement of vulnerability can be made operational, see comment above) by gender. In addition, we consider it important to ensure that the capacity building measures included in project design will reach and benefit both women and men. To this end, it would be useful to differentiate the results of the indicator “80% of CCA and DRR knowledge and tools are applied in 3 pilot Pacific DMCs” (output 2) or its eventual replacement (see comment above) by gender. And finally, the “6 policies developed or strengthened” (indicator for output 1) should explicitly address gender and climate change issues. In summary, we recommend incorporating gender differentiation into the indicators measuring project impact, outcome, and outputs (as listed above).

Learning

We recommend focusing on knowledge and learning mechanisms and using existing Email-Networks such as the Pacific Solution Exchange, Webinars, Blogs as well as Radio and DVDs in local vernacular.