



EN

THIS ACTION IS FINANCED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

ANNEX V

of the Commission Implementing Decision on the Annual Action Programme 2017 part III for Environment and Climate Change under the Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic programme

Action Document for Global Climate Change Alliance Plus – Scaling-up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA)

1. Title/basic act/ CRIS number	Global Climate Change Alliance Plus – Scaling-up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA) CRIS number: ENV/2017/40482	
2. Zone benefiting from the action/location	The Pacific Islands The action shall be carried out at the following locations: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Republic of Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga and Tuvalu. Financed under the Development Cooperation Instrument - Global public good and challenges	
3. Programming document	GPGC, Global Climate Change Alliance Plus – Annual Action Document (AAP) 2017	
4. Sector of concentration/ thematic area	Multiple	DEV. Aid: YES
5. Amounts concerned	Total estimated cost: EUR15 million Total amount of EU budget contribution EUR 15 million (100 % with no co-financing foreseen)	
6. Aid modality(ies) and implementation modality(ies)	Project Modality: Indirect management with Regional Organisations – PAGODA Co-delegation agreement with the Pacific Community (SPC), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the University of the South Pacific (USP) - if USP is recognized as an International Organisation at the time of the signature of the agreement. Should USP not be recognized, a Grant agreement between the European Commission and USP will be signed.	
7 a) DAC code(s)	43010 – Multi-sector (70 %); 410 – Environmental protection (10 %); 110 – Education (10 %); 15160 – human rights (10 %).	
b) Main Delivery Channel	Pacific Community (SPC) – 47096	

8. Markers (from CRIS DAC form)	General policy objective	Not targeted	Significant objective	Main objective
	Participation development/good governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Aid to environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Gender equality (including Women In Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Trade Development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Reproductive, Maternal, New born and child health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	RIO Convention markers	Not targeted	Significant objective	Main objective
	Biological diversity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Combat desertification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Climate change adaptation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) thematic flagships	Global Climate Change Alliance Plus Consistent with GPGC thematic areas: climate change adaptation, sustainable management of ecosystems, enhanced and sustainable food security, and empowerment for better livelihoods.			
10. SDGs	Main SDG 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; Secondary SDGs: SDG 1 - end poverty; SDG 2 – zero hunger; SDG 3 – Good health and wellbeing; SDG 5 – gender equality; SDG 6 – clean water and sanitation; SDG 14 – life below water.			

SUMMARY

Climate change and natural disasters are two of the greatest challenges jeopardising and undermining the ability of all countries, in particular Pacific countries, to achieve sustainable development and reduce poverty. The proposed Global Climate Change Alliance Plus – Scaling-up Pacific Adaptation (GCCA+ SUPA) action falls under the GCCA+ flagship initiative and will support the three priorities¹ of the GCCA+ and target countries where prior GCCA actions have been successfully implemented in small Pacific island countries. The Action's overall objective is to enhance climate change adaptation and resilience within ten Pacific island countries. The specific objective is to strengthen the implementation of sector based, but integrated, climate change and disaster risk management strategies and plans. The overall amount of the project is EUR 15 million. The project will be implemented in ten countries (Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, Kiribati, Republic of Marshall Islands (RMI), Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga and Tuvalu) using a sector based approach, and wherever possible focused on outer island communities, and implemented with a gender sensitive, rights-based approach.

¹ The plus of the GCCA+ <http://www.gcca.eu/about-the-gcca/what-is-the-gcca>

The Action takes into account the Pacific Islands position to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for increased funds for climate change adaptation to reflect their specific characteristics and extreme vulnerability, and to address the imbalance between mitigation and adaptation funding. In particular, this Action will achieve three outputs. Output 1 is climate and disaster risk information, knowledge management, monitoring and strategic planning capacities strengthened at national and regional levels. Output 2 is planning and decision making capacities to address climate change and disaster risks at sub-national and community level strengthened, applying participatory, gender-sensitive and rights-based approaches. Output 3 is for strategic and local interventions for climate change adaptation and mainstreaming scaled up in five pre-defined sectors.

Key problems identified revolve around three main areas. Firstly, given the wide scope of the thematic area, there are a large number of ongoing interventions addressing climate and disaster risk, resulting in Pacific countries having to focus on project delivery rather than taking a longer-term planning approach. Added to this is the absence of assessments in the Pacific islands of the longer-term impacts and outcomes of completed interventions. Secondly there is very limited climate and disaster risk capacity at the sub-national governance level, which in the Pacific islands represents an important interface between the hundreds of communities in widely scattered islands and the national government. Thirdly, on-the-ground adaptation measures have, to date, been *ad hoc* demonstration projects and there is a need to adopt a scaling-up approach, such that climate change adaptation becomes integral to a particular sector and with a particular focus on the previously neglected outer island communities. To achieve this, countries will likely focus on the sectors selected for the GCCA: PSIS project interventions: agriculture (Tuvalu), coastal protection (RMI, Tonga), human health (Kiribati), marine resources (Cook Islands), water (FSM, Nauru, Niue, Palau), and still to be determined in Fiji.

The Action also supports the **new European Consensus on Development² and its priorities** 3.1- human development, 3.2-climate change and environment and 3.3-sustainable growth; and supports the goals of the Global Climate Change Alliance Plus, an EU flagship initiative funded under Global Public Goods and Challenges. The Action primarily responds to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 13 – urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts, and secondly to SDG 1 – end poverty; SDG 2 – zero hunger; SDG 3 – good health; SDG 5 – gender equality; SDG 6 – clean water; and SDG 14 – life below water. It will contribute also to the **European Union Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy³** through implementing its principles of engagement and partnerships and the **Commission Communication Next steps for a sustainable European future: European action for sustainability⁴** The Action supports two of the thematic areas of the EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020⁵ namely, promotion of the social and economic rights/empowerment of girls and women and strengthening girls' and women's voice and participation.

² The document was signed on 7 June 2017: http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-17-1503_en.htm

³ <https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/en/global-strategy-foreign-and-security-policy-european-union>

⁴ http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/commission-communication-next-steps-sustainable-european-future_en

⁵ https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/news-and-events/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment-transforming-lives-girls-and-women-through-eu_en

The Action contributes to the implementation of the 2017-2030 Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (endorsed by Pacific leaders in 2016)⁶, as well as the Paris Agreement to the UNFCCC⁷ and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction (2015-2030)⁸.

1. CONTEXT

1.1 Regional context

The ten countries covered by this Action are Small Island Developing States (SIDS) with a total population of about 1.5 million people spread over an immense area of ocean in the western Pacific equivalent to 15 % of the globe's surface. This diverse region falls into three geographical areas of the western Pacific: Melanesia (Fiji); Micronesia (Palau, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), RMI, Nauru and Kiribati); and Polynesia (Cook Islands, Niue, Tonga and Tuvalu). The nine project countries located in Micronesia and Polynesia each have populations of less than 110,000 and five of those countries have populations less than 20,000. The population of Fiji is 837,271. The total gross domestic product (GDP) for the ten countries is EUR 7.6 billion (2015 estimate).

This group of countries (with the exceptions of Tonga and Fiji) forms a specific group known as the Pacific Smaller Island States (Pacific SIS) established in 2005 at the Pacific Islands Forum Meeting, to recognise the special needs of smaller island states given their limited capacity, and fragile and vulnerable environments. These eight countries, together with Tonga and Fiji, have voiced their concern on numerous occasions that climate change remains the single most important priority for their countries and in addition they are particularly concerned about the impact of disasters on their economies. Nine of the countries benefitted from the GCCA: Pacific Small Island States project (GCCA: PSIS), and with Fiji taking the presidency of COP 23 , together they form a group SIDS highly vulnerable to climate change and committed to take proactive adaptation and mitigation measures.

Three of the countries, Kiribati, RMI and Tuvalu, consist only of low lying atolls, whilst the other countries have a mixture of high volcanic islands, raised atolls, low islands and atoll islands. Eight of the ten countries - exceptions being the single-island raised atolls of Nauru and Niue - are archipelagic states with many populated islands outside of the main capital island. The challenges faced by the seven archipelagic countries to provide services and opportunities for communities in the outer islands are immense, given the vast distances, limited air and sea transport routes, and the scattered nature of the population centres. As a result many countries are seeing migration to their capital island leaving outer islands with depleted populations, and capital islands facing increasing challenges associated with urbanisation, lack of housing and jobs. The project will build on the successful approach to outer island project delivery adopted by the GCCA: PSIS project, which focused on delivery of on-the-ground adaptation activities in

⁶<http://www.forumsec.org/resources/uploads/embeds/file/Annex%201%20-%20Framework%20for%20Resilient%20Development%20in%20the%20Pacific.pdf>

⁷ http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php

⁸ <http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/sendai-framework>

outer islands, e.g. marine resource management in Manihiki, an island in the northern group of the Cook Islands and on water security in the five outer island states of Palau. The valuable logistical lessons learnt in project implementation and delivery, such as understanding local transportation and capacity constraints and therefore building in sufficient contingency and flexibility, as further detailed in the lessons learnt section, will be applied in this Action.

Two of the countries are ranked as medium on the 2015 Human Development Index (HDI) (FSM is 123rd and Kiribati is 137th out of 188 countries); three countries are ranked high (Palau is 60th, Fiji is 90th and Tonga is 100th), while the remaining five countries (Cook Islands, RMI, Nauru, Niue and Tuvalu) are not ranked because of data deficiency and/or international affiliations. Only three of the ten countries are ranked on the 2015 Gender Development Index (Fiji, Palau and Tonga are ranked as high); there is insufficient data for the other seven countries.

Numerous studies indicate that the effects of climate change are not gender-neutral, rather women are disproportionately affected due to pre-existing inequalities such as their higher risk to the physical impacts of climatic disasters, and their higher dependence on the natural resources required for subsistence agriculture. In their 2012 Gender Equality Declaration⁹, Pacific Leaders recognized that gender inequality was imposing, inter alia, a high economic cost on Pacific peoples and countries and that improved gender equality would make a significant contribution to Pacific development. However, the situation still exists whereby women are under-represented in decision-making processes, e.g. there are very few women in the executive branches of government, and women are less likely to have access to formal employment.

All the countries are environmentally fragile and highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change, including rising temperatures, changing rainfall patterns, an increase in extreme events, rising sea levels and ocean acidification. The countries are already experiencing the impacts of climate change.

There have been few attempts to quantify the **impacts** of ongoing and projected changes in climate on natural and man-made systems across the Pacific Islands. This is partly because of the complexity of the attribution process which requires extensive, long-term (decades-long) research, monitoring and analysis to separate environmental change, man-induced change and climate-induced change for any one impact. There have been numerous vulnerability assessments for the countries, but these do not provide national ranking of impacts.

The following is a summary of how the climate is projected to change for the period to 2100 for the ten countries (based on the results of the Pacific Climate Change Science Program: Australian Bureau of Meteorology and Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, 2014), together with a selection of published examples of recent impacts.

⁹<http://www.forumsec.org/resources/uploads/attachments/documents/2012%20Forum%20Communique,%20Rarotonga,%20Cook%20Islands%2028-30%20Aug1.pdf>

- Average mean and extremely high daily temperatures will continue to rise (VHC¹⁰). Among the many impacts including heat stress, food scarcity and human health impacts, the incidence of ciguatera (caused by consumption of contaminated reef fish) has been linked to increasing sea surface temperatures and the El Niño cycles and has increased over recent decades in the Pacific islands (WHO 2004). The impact on food security will particularly impact women, who play a major role in subsistence agriculture e.g. in Tuvalu, women undertake 78 % of the subsistence agriculture.
- Average annual rainfall – there is a variation across the region from increase to no change to decrease (MC). This will impact food security, e.g. staple food crops such as sweet potato are vulnerable to water logging, and domesticated yam is highly sensitive to increased rainfall variability.
- Drought frequency – there is variation across the region from increase to no change to decrease (MC). This impacts water and food security, for example in Palau, the recent 2015-2016 extreme El Niño event caused a serious drought such that in April 2016, the main reservoir for the centre of population, Koror, had less than three weeks supply of water left.
- More extreme rain events (HC) e.g. in December 2016, Tropical Depression 04F caused flood damage in Fiji estimated at EUR4.9 million with 2,327 people having to be evacuated.
- The projections for changes in the magnitude and frequency of tropical cyclones/ typhoons in the Pacific islands are still awaiting scientific consensus. But even with no change in their magnitude or frequency, the impacts of these extreme events is already devastating for those countries directly and indirectly impacted by a particular event; e.g. Tropical Cyclone Pam in 2015 directly impacted Vanuatu with damage estimated at 60 % of GDP, while Tuvalu, a small atoll nation located more than 1,000 km from the centre of the cyclone suffered wave damage to outer island coastal defences, agriculture and housing costing 33 % of GDP.
- Ocean acidification will continue (VHC). Global projections suggest that by 2050 under current carbon dioxide (CO₂) emission levels, coral reefs in the western tropical Pacific may stop growing and start to get smaller as they dissolve faster than they are built. This will have major impacts for coastal fisheries, coastal ecosystems and coastal protection. This projection is authenticated by a study of natural CO₂ seeps in Milne Bay, Papua New Guinea, which replicate the process of acidification in a shorter time period.
- Risk of coral bleaching to increase (VHC). The increasingly frequent coral bleaching events (three global events in the last 20 years) is having serious impacts for food security since about 70 % of protein in the diet of Pacific islanders is derived from nearshore reef fisheries.
- Sea level will continue to rise (VHC). This is one of the most serious impacts for Pacific coastal zones where the majority of people reside and critical infrastructure is located. Besides the obvious impacts of increased coastal erosion and flooding, saltwater intrusion is threatening water and food security. Especially in the low-lying atoll nations of Kiribati, RMI and Tuvalu, flooding and damage to infrastructure, which also impacts livelihoods, is an annual event during the Pacific “King tides”.

¹⁰ VHC = very high confidence; HC = high confidence; MC = medium confidence.

- El Niño and La Niña events will continue to occur (VHC), there is no consensus on changes in frequency or magnitude. The El Niño/La Niña cycle is one of the major factors in climate variability in the Pacific and plays a major role in the frequency of cyclones and rainfall variability.

Against these very serious scenarios, the Pacific island countries are unanimous in their efforts to adapt to climate change and to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions.

1.1.1 Public Policy Assessment and EU Policy Framework

This Action will support global, regional and national policies. At the **global** level, the Action supports the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the 2015 Paris Agreement; as well as the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030). The Action is primarily aligned with SDG 13 – action to combat climate change and its impacts, and contributes to SDG 1 - end poverty; SDG 2 – zero hunger; SDG 3 – Good health and wellbeing; SDG 5 – gender equality; SDG 6 – clean water and sanitation; SDG 14 – life below water. The Action supports the three main objectives of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity: conservation, sustainable use and fair and equitable sharing of the benefits, and the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People and in particular the right to free prior and informed consent. The Action supports two of the thematic areas of the EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020 namely: promoting the social and economic rights/empowerment of girls and women and strengthening girls' and women's voice and participation.

At the **regional** level, the Action will support: 1- the 2017-2030 Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: an integrated approach to address climate change and disaster risk management (FRDP), which was endorsed by Pacific leaders in September 2016. It provides guidance and support for building resilience to climate change and disasters in the Pacific island region. Recognising that climate change exacerbates the magnitude and impacts of climate variability and some natural hazards, the FRDP advocates for the adoption of integrated approaches for coping with and managing climate change and disaster risks. This provides for efficient use of resources and effective mainstreaming of risks into development planning and budgets. It replaces the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (2005-2015) and the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action, which expired in 2015. A Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP) is being developed to govern the FRDP. 2 - the Framework for Pacific Regionalism (2014) lays out a regional process for enhancing and monitoring sustainable and inclusive development for the Pacific islands and territories and for the Pacific region as a whole. 3- the Pacific Leaders Gender Equality Declaration (2012 and reaffirmed in 2015) commits to lifting the status of women in the Pacific and empowering them to be active participants in economic, political and social life.

At the **national** level, each of the ten countries has a strategic development plan with a long-term vision for social and economic development. National plans closely align with regional and international agreements, conventions and targets, especially the SDGs and the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway. The more up-to-date plans also address gender equality and human rights, e.g. Cook Islands Sustainable

Development Plan 2016-2020, goal 9 addresses gender equality, women's empowerment and the rights of youth, elderly and persons with disabilities.

Most of the countries covered by this Action Document have up-to-date climate change policies. In addition, Joint National Action Plans (JNAPS) for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management have been prepared over the last ten years by each country. Extensive national consultation was undertaken in the preparation of the JNAPs to develop priorities and costed actions for a five-year period. Some countries are already in their second round of JNAPs, e.g. Tonga. The JNAPs are in some cases supported by national policy documents, also with prioritised action plans, e.g. Palau.

All ten countries have ratified the Paris Agreement, which came into force on 4th November 2016, and they have all prepared their Intended Nationally Determined Contributions (INDCs). These documents set out clear emission reduction targets and implementation mechanisms including diversified energy portfolios. Some countries also address adaptation in their INDCs, e.g. Kiribati.

Beginning in 2014, national climate change finance and institutional assessments have been finalised for several of the countries covered by this Action¹¹. All of the countries covered by this Action will have these assessments completed shortly with support from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

There exist in all the countries national ministries responsible for local government. The countries have various sub-national governance levels, e.g. local, island and state governments, with the exceptions of the "single island" countries of Nauru and Niue. Overall, the capacity for addressing climate change and disaster risk management at the sub-national level is limited.

All of the countries, with the exception of Tonga, are party to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)¹²; all are party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC); and all except Niue are party to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)¹³. Tuvalu is the first Pacific island country to have a comprehensive national action plan for human rights – the Tuvalu National Human Rights Action Plan (2016-2020) launched in February 2017.

Coherence with EU Policies: 1 - Cotonou Partnership Agreement's principles of eradicating poverty consistent with the objectives of sustainable development and integration in the world economy, through sustainable management of natural resources, and of the environment including climate change; 2 - New European Consensus on Development and its priorities 3.1. (human development), 3.2 (climate change, environment), 3.3 (sustainable growth); 3 - EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy through implementing its principles of engagement and partnerships; 4 - EU Communication Towards a renewed EU-Pacific development partnership; 5 - EU Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC) (2014-2020)

¹¹ Nauru, RMI, Tonga

¹² <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/>

¹³ <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html>

thematic programme and its actions in environment and climate change; 6 – EU Global Climate Change Alliance Plus, an EU flagship initiative supporting climate resilience and funded under the Global Public Goods and Challenges (GPGC); 7 - EU Strategic Framework on Human Rights and Democracy adopted by the Council in June 2012 which promotes the use of human rights based approach in the area of development cooperation; 8 - EU Gender Action Plan 2016-2020 and the 'Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment: Transforming the Lives of Girls and Women' adopted by the Council in October 2015.

The Action will be aligned with commitments made under the Paris Agreement and is in line with the GCCA+ priority areas, namely: (1) mainstream climate change into poverty reduction and development efforts; (2) increase resilience to climate related stresses and shocks; and (3) support formulation and implementation of concrete and integrated sectoral based climate change adaptation strategies.

The joint communication on International ocean governance stresses the need to reduce pressure on the oceans¹⁴. EU action should focus on climate change, and its impact, marine pollution and eutrophication, the preservation, conservation and restoration of marine ecosystems and biodiversity, and the sustainable use of marine resources.

Overall, the Action will provide not only a platform but also a policy dialogue to build common understanding and partnership to address climate change adaptation.

1.1.2 Stakeholder analysis

The strength of **regional organisations** serves as the means of delivery of the Action to enhance national and sub-national capacity. This is an established model in the Pacific where the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) agencies has a long and successful history and well-established relationships with country partners. The Pacific Community (SPC) is the leading technical organisation in the Pacific and has been implementing activities directly and indirectly linked to climate and disaster risk for many years and building national capacity to identify and address those risks. The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) is the leading coordinating agency in climate change in the Pacific with particular strengths in mainstreaming, identifying climate change priorities and knowledge management, as well as working closely with the countries to build national negotiating skills for the UNFCCC discussions. The University of the South Pacific (USP) is the premier tertiary institution in the region, and has courses in climate change, as well as ongoing work in applied research and capacity building for climate change. All three partners have been involved in GCCA projects. SPC and SPREP have recently reviewed their strategic plans, which show that building resilience to climate change and natural disasters is a priority area. The three partners are increasingly working together to deliver regional projects e.g. the GCCA: PSIS project and the Pacific – European Union Marine Partnership Programme (PEUMP), and are working hard to improve their financial management systems (e.g. they have been positively assessed for the four pillars accounting systems, internal control systems, independent external audit and procurement).

¹⁴ JOIN(2016) 49 final

In line with the rights-based approach, rights holders and duty bearers comprise four **key target groups**: national government agencies, sub-national governance organisations, civil society organisations including the private sector, and communities. National agencies responsible for climate change and disaster risk management and national agencies responsible for sectors e.g. agriculture, health etc. have skilled, experienced professionals, but these are few in number and have extremely heavy workloads. Sub-national governance organisations, including state, local area and island governance organisations, are particularly important because they provide an important interface between the numerous scattered communities in the islands and atoll groups and the national government agencies. They have detailed knowledge and experience of local area changes, traditional knowledge and local culture, but have little understanding of how to address climate change in their areas of governance. The many different civil society groups include regional and national non-governmental organisations (NGOs), church groups, private sector groups (e.g. building contractors, insurers) and others. These groups are generally aware of climate change but have very little knowledge or experience about proactive ways to address the phenomenon. Finally, there are the communities, which are the ultimate target group and beneficiaries of this Action. While gender-responsive and rights based approaches are included in national plans and documents for climate change and disaster management, e.g. JNAPs, there is no dedicated funding for consistent intervention. The gender sensitive, rights based approach advocated in this Action will begin to address the funding issue, but only at a local level, further investment in this area will be required.

Based on the SWOT analysis (presented in Appendix 4), the Action will maximise key opportunities that build on existing strengths whilst at the same time addressing some of the weaknesses. Firstly, the Action will maximise the knowledge and experience existing at the national government level without increasing the workloads of individuals by building partnerships with other interventions. Secondly, enhancing the climate change adaptation' skills of the sub-national governance level will benefit a larger number of communities. Thirdly, the outreach capacity of some civil society groups will help to influence behaviours such that the on-the-ground measures are gender sensitive and demonstrate a rights-based approach. Finally, the technical and professional skills of the private sector together with their corporate social responsibility ethic will contribute to development that is resilient to climate and disaster risks.

Beneficiaries will be national and sub-national authorities and communities, especially in target areas/islands who will benefit from climate change adaptation/disaster risk management measures that strengthen one or more of the following sectors: agriculture, coastal zones, human health, marine resources and water. In particular, the Action will empower sub-national governments, communities and individuals in the targeted areas to adopt a gender sensitive, rights-based approach such that all individuals, including dis-advantaged persons, have better access to information, and the opportunities and skills to participate in planning and implementing climate change adaptation and disaster risk management measures. This Action will begin to address evidence from previous needs assessments undertaken during the GCCA: PSIS project, which showed that women have less familiarity and knowledge about climate change concepts than men and have different needs and skills. For example, in FSM, men were trained in the maintenance of rainwater harvesting systems, but it was subsequently found that women also need these skills, since men are often absent on fishing expeditions for several days at a time leaving women having to conduct the maintenance and repair. In outer islands, this will require use of local languages and an understanding that population dynamics are sometimes

skewed, with a preponderance of elders and children/youth. The Action will factor in the different needs and skill sets of men, including those men outside of traditional power-based positions, women, youth and seniors into the various activities.

Preparation of the Action has involved collaboration with partners preparing the Pacific component of the Intra-ACP (African, Caribbean and Pacific) GCCA+ Action, and consultation among the CROP organisations and other development partners. A thorough review of country needs and the lessons learnt from completed projects, including, but not limited to those implemented through SPC and USP in the first phase of the GCCA from 2007 and 2014 was undertaken. The countries covered by the Action contributed to the sector selection and they all expressed eagerness to build on the very successful results and lessons learnt from the two previous regional GCCA projects. In particular, the Action responds to requests made by countries participating in the completed SPC-GCCA: PSIS project, 2011-2016, (DCI-ENV 2011/269/297) and the ongoing USP-Intra-ACP GCCA project, 2010-2018, (phase I FED/2010/258-661; Phase II 2016-2018, ENV/2015/371-518).

1.1.3 Priority areas for support/problem analysis

All ten Pacific SIDS covered by this Action require urgent assistance with addressing climate change impacts at national, sub-national and community levels and in all sectors. The main priority areas for support/problems addressed by the proposed Action are described below.

1. Expanding the national planning horizon from a short term, project approach (5 years) time framework to a medium term (10+ years). There is a tendency for countries to focus on project delivery usually within a 3-5 year timeframe, without giving sufficient attention to the achievement of the longer-term goal of resilient development. The many individual climate and disaster risk initiatives supported by various development partners in the region, and the limited capacity of some of the smaller islands, drives this project-only delivery focus.

The FRDP and the SDGs focus on a longer-term planning horizon. Yet in the Pacific islands covered by this action, there are virtually no assessments of the impacts and outcomes of completed interventions in the five years following their closure. An analysis of final project evaluation reports show a concentration on the achievement of project outputs, e.g. number of trainings or number of plans prepared. Without an objective analysis of long term and sustainable impacts of project interventions, e.g. were there any measurable impacts resulting from the trainees' enhanced knowledge in the three years afterwards, or were the plans monitored and linked to budgetary processes, it is difficult for countries to advance their understanding of "what works well in the longer term". There is a need to assist the countries design, develop and utilise a clear and transparent methodology for impact analysis, especially of completed interventions, that can be applied to informed decision making for resilient development.

2. Capacity building at the sub-national and community levels in climate and disaster resilient development. Previous climate change interventions have focused at national and community levels, and while recognising that further capacity building is still needed here, the sub-national level of governance has been largely neglected and especially in outer islands where use of local languages is essential. The sub-national level of governance (state, local area and island levels) represents the important interface between the widely dispersed and scattered

individuals and communities on the one hand and centralised national governments on the other hand. Strengthening climate and disaster risk resilience at this sub-national level, and through a gender sensitive rights-based approach, will also help reduce the pressure on the existing experienced national government players since they are few in number and already stretched to capacity.

Several important efforts are building resilience and connecting communities across the Pacific. For example, the EU-Intra-ACP-GCCA project implemented by USP has established a Locally Managed Climate Change Adaptation (LMCCA) network linking together 126 communities with governments, civil society organisations and the private sector across the region to share best practices. Notwithstanding the LMCCA and other important ongoing interventions that are addressing disaster resilience, e.g. the EU Intra-ACP BSRP project, there remains an urgent need to expand such efforts to the hundreds of outer island communities living in the Pacific. Furthermore, surveys show women have a much lower understanding of climate change than men do, and other vulnerable groups such as people with disabilities and migrants are rarely included. The role of traditional knowledge and subsistence lifestyles are other important considerations. Through centuries of watching their natural environment and practicing a subsistence lifestyle, Pacific islanders hold a wealth of knowledge of the sky, land, and sea. This connection and careful long-term observations of environmental changes over centuries has played an essential role in Pacific islanders adapting to climate shifts. Yet, ‘Westernization’ that resulted in a shift away from a subsistence lifestyle has led communities to disconnect with their natural environment. Programs that reconnect communities to their natural environment are essential in strengthening communities’ resilience in the long term, e.g. islanders in Woja (RMI) requested help with continuation of their traditional copra industry and the GCCA: PSIS project responded with the provision of permanent road access for easy transportation of raw materials to the processing plant. This Action will follow a similar approach and liaise directly with remote communities, listen to their needs and work with them to design and implement climate resilient measures that will enhance their existing lifestyles.

3. Planning, implementing and scaling-up climate and disaster resilient structural/ecosystem based measures at local area levels and focusing on outer islands. There is a need to assist countries advance from a sector-based single *ad hoc* demonstration project approach to a scaling-up approach such that climate change adaptation becomes integral to the sector. A scaling-up approach to an adaptation measure could include one or all the following: (1) enhancement, (2) extension, (3) replication and (4) addition of a complementary approach. For example, a successful coastal protection measure that fully addresses climate change, could be strengthened (enhancement), extended along a coastal stretch, replicated in another location, and possibly combined with an ecosystem-based approach. This will open up opportunities for combining structural and ecosystem based approaches to adaptation (linking also to the Biodiversity for Life flagship) and opportunities for the private sector to design and deliver resilient development measures.

The private sector in the participating countries is constrained by size and capacity. Experience from past interventions has provided important lessons, in particular the need to involve the private sector from the outset. The supply and distribution sector is one of the areas requiring attention noted in other inventions. For example, in FSM there is no local availability of simple, low-cost rainwater harvesting appurtenances such as first flush diverters, which provide

automatic filtering of debris that accumulates on roofs and catchment surfaces (a first flush diverter for a 5,700 litre tank costs only EUR 185). Rather, such simple products are imported from Asia or other markets involving significant extra effort and cost.

Furthermore, outer island communities were neglected in many previous adaptation interventions. Challenges include the absence of air transportation, or very infrequent air services operating with very small passenger planes on grassed runways. Marine transportation limitations include infrequent and unreliable schedules, absence of port unloading and loading facilities, lightering of cargo in small dinghies and the vast distances involved. However, recent and ongoing interventions by the EU and other development partners are beginning to address outer islands and providing important lessons. Diplomatic representatives to the GCCA: PSIS Lessons Learnt Roadshow in Suva, Fiji, in November 2015 enthusiastically appreciated the outer island focus.

The countries require assistance to address climate risk in all sectors and in the mainstreaming of climate and disaster risk into sector plans and budgets. A preliminary analysis in February-April 2017 showed the sectors that were the focus for the GCCA: PSIS project will likely remain the sectors for this Action. The sectors and their justification are:

Agriculture: a decline in agricultural subsistence production, droughts and saltwater inundation, and a growing dependence on imported food have led to food shortages in Tuvalu

Coastal zones: increased coastal erosion, seawater flooding of coastal lands, and land loss especially during cyclones and storm surges is placing coastal communities at increased risk (RMI and Tonga)

Health: rising temperatures and changes in rainfall patterns are adversely affecting water quality and water borne diseases, food safety and vector borne diseases (Kiribati)

Marine resources: remote communities in distant atolls are dependent for their subsistence and livelihoods on nearshore fisheries resources and aquaculture (e.g. pearl farming), both of which are declining due to changing weather patterns (Cook Islands)

Water security: populated and remote atolls are dependent on rainwater harvesting and fragile freshwater lenses for their freshwater needs, and these are being impacted by rainfall variability and saltwater inundation (FSM and Palau); and in raised atolls, groundwater lenses are severely polluted (Nauru) and supplementary water sources (besides groundwater) are needed during cyclones and droughts (Niue).

2. RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The following matrix is based on the experiences and lessons learnt during the implementation of the GCCA: PSIS project.

Risks	Risk level (H/M/L)	Mitigating measures
National government uncertainty about focusing major activities from this Action at the sub-national level of government and	M	Governments to drive the project planning and prioritisation and so ensure the resilient development priorities match national and sub-national goals; governments advised of

Risks	Risk level (H/M/L)	Mitigating measures
the community level		the advantage of the approach in reducing the pressure on the existing over-stretched skilled human resources at the national level; adopt pre-conditional approaches that encourage focused and targeted investments and permit redeployment if required.
Logistical challenges of implementing activities in outer islands become overwhelming.	M	Build on lessons learnt about scheduling and logistics from previous projects; adopt flexible and back-up planning approaches such that alternatives (e.g. moving activities to a different location) can be prioritised if and when necessary.
Sustainability of activities in remote outer islands	M	Build in monitoring and maintenance of on-the-ground measures, work with line agencies to ensure that this is covered by allocated funding in sector budgets, and involve the private sector (usually located in central islands) as an implementing partner throughout the Action .
Limited number of translators skilled in local languages	M	Investigate this risk during the early design process, when the opportunity exists for the country to select other geographical areas (states/islands) for the project focus where there are more skilled translators available; use local experts for the on-the-ground activities.
Absorptive capacity for knowledge transfer at the sub-national governance level is inadequate and unsustainable	M	Assess the absorptive capacity in the identified area before committing to any interventions; maximise opportunities to employ local staff in the Action.
Natural disasters, major social and cultural events may occur during the implementation phase	M/H	The risk of natural disasters to be incorporated into all planning and scheduling throughout the implementation of the Action; major social and cultural events to be included in schedules during inception and planning.
All ten countries do not give their full support to the recently endorsed FRDP	L	Collaborate with other development partners to build awareness and support for the FRDP and adopt a “working with the willing” approach.
Cultural practices rely, almost solely, on men for decision making and there may be	L	Using experience from previous projects and programmes, and with the help of SPC’s gender advisors and the Regional Rights

Risks	Risk level (H/M/L)	Mitigating measures
reluctance to any changes in this arrangement; added to which gender based violence and land ownership conflicts, may impede the use of a participatory approach.		Resource Team, as well as experts from SPREP and USP, tried and tested ways of consulting and empowering all genders and all vulnerable groups will be applied throughout the Action.
Assumptions		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global economic conditions and national governance do not prevent economic growth. • Global support for the Paris Agreement is maintained. • Continual high-level national government commitment to prioritising climate change and disaster risk management as an integrated approach remains at the forefront of national agendas and national governments willing to provide the necessary effort and resources. • Social and political stability is maintained in each of the ten countries. • Continuous collaboration amongst development partners occurs and is documented to ensure coherence, complementarity and efficiency amongst climate change and disaster risk management interventions. 		

3. LESSONS LEARNT, COMPLEMENTARITY AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

3.1 Lessons learnt

Given the ongoing and completed climate change and disaster risk management projects in the Pacific region, it is essential that this Action builds on and applies the lessons already learnt. The following list of lessons learnt builds on the completed GCCA: PSIS project as well as ongoing Pacific GCCA projects (bilateral, multi-country and regional), and other interventions supported by the EU and other development partners:

- **Activities should be country-led and nationally owned:** ensuring there is a national, holistic approach to detailed project selection and design, involving government and non-state actors and with inclusion of vulnerable groups, during the inception phase of implementation. Previous GCCA projects have used this approach, which contributes significantly to national ownership of project activities and their sustainability¹⁵. This also provides the opportunity for countries to focus activities on their national priorities as contained in NDCs, JNAPs and other policies and plans. Nationally embedded staff and the use of national financial and management procedures further strengthen ownership.
- **Focus on strengthening climate and disaster risk resilience for a particular development sector:** the past tendency in the Pacific islands for new regional climate change projects is for each country to select a previously untested sector for an adaptation

¹⁵ Following national selection and design of project activities by Tuvalu stakeholders in 2012, agroforestry demonstration sites are still funded and maintained by government and farmers in 2016 and 2017, following cessation of the GCCA: PSIS project's support to Tuvalu in December 2015.

measure. While demonstrating the crosscutting nature of climate change adaptation, this leads to an *ad hoc* demonstration approach lacking sustainability. There is a need for countries to focus on a particular development sector of their choice and direct project funding to this end to build long lasting resilience to climate and disaster risk in that sector (a process called scaling-up). The importance of a sectoral approach to resilience building is emphasised in the FRDP. Such scaling-up may take different forms, namely (i) enhancement, (ii) expansion, (ii) replication and (iv) addition of a new approach (e.g. ecosystem based approach) to an existing measure.

- **Adoption of a rights-based, gender sensitive approach from the outset**, rather than as an add-on activity, is critical and requires the inclusion of relevant expertise in these areas in the design and throughout the implementation of the Action. The Pacific Islands Forum Leaders Declaration on Climate Change Action 2015 called for the recognition of the disproportionate impact of climate change on women, youth, the elderly, disabled, indigenous peoples and other vulnerable and marginalised groups, and acknowledgement of the contribution of these peoples to the effective implementation of the Paris Agreement.
- **Targeted formal and informal capacity building that recognises local culture:** incorporating a “learning-by-doing approach” is very important for outer island communities who may feel remote from global issues such as climate change. For example in a coastal protection intervention in the RMI, women and youth were involved in a parallel coastal planting activity, that not only strengthened the coastal ecosystem, but also provided food bearing plants e.g. pandanus. In the same project, a planning meeting with island council members involved only men, while women leaders held a parallel, separate meeting.
- **Involvement of private sector players in development initiatives:** understanding entrepreneurship and market analysis are important components of effective involvement of private sector actors in resilient development interventions. Understanding the private sector’s profit-oriented, business management approach, is critical for their effective involvement in development aid activities and requires a specific focus and dedicated expertise from the outset, and not merely as an add-on activity. For example, a Water Incentive Conservation Scheme implemented by the Palau Development Bank as part of the GCCA: PSIS activities, would have had wider uptake if begun at the project outset in 2012.
- **Capacity building in climate and disaster risk at the sub-national government level:** recognising that capacity building is required at all levels, the sub-national government level has been under-resourced in past interventions, which have, for the most part, focused on the national level and selected communities in capital islands. Island councils and local governments, especially on remote outer islands represent an important interface and conduit for sharing information and providing leadership for the scattered outer island communities. South-south cooperation through goal-oriented study visits, country-to-country attachments (short and medium term), and combining regional meetings and conferences with skills upgrading, is another important component of capacity building.
- **Attention to detailed planning and scheduling of all activities especially in outer islands:** with a complex multi-country programme and activities in remote locations,

understanding local logistics and capacity constraints and building in sufficient contingencies and flexibility to meet rigid deadlines is required. A dedicated, well-resourced project team with Pacific experience is critical to address these challenges in a project time-scale. Past interventions have shown that implementation of projects in outer islands requires double the time and double the funding as compared to similar interventions in capital islands, largely due to the transportation constraints and associated higher costs.

- **Collaboration with other climate change and disaster risk interventions** ensures sustainability of the Action beyond the project timeframe. Similarly, ensuring new interventions support and contribute to regional frameworks such as the FRDP and PRP, and that opportunities for policy dialogue with other development partners and EU Member States are maximised contributes to sustainability.

3.2 Complementarity, synergy and donor coordination

There are many regional, multi-country and bilateral projects, supported by different development partners, and focusing on climate change and disaster risk management in the Pacific region. This reflects the multi-sectoral and cross cutting nature of climate change and disaster risk management.

The EU is supporting several initiatives in the region. Under the GCCA umbrella, the SPC-GCCA: PSIS (DCI-ENV/2011/269-297), covering the nine smaller Pacific Island countries was completed in November 2016. The USP-Intra-ACP-GCCA project (phase I FED/2010/258-661 and Phase II 2016-2018, ENV/2015/371-518) covers 14 countries. There are also completed bilateral projects in Solomon Islands and Vanuatu and an ongoing bilateral project in Samoa. Furthermore, the four CROP partners (PIFS, SPC, SPREP, USP) presently designing the Pacific component of the Intra-ACP GCCA+ Action (AP/FED/137/995) have contributed to the design of this Action. During implementation, collaborations with the Intra-ACP GCCA+ Pacific Action will likely include quarterly progress/coordination meetings at a senior level, monthly progress/coordination meetings between project teams involved in the two actions, and exploration into the scheduling of joint steering committee meetings. There will also be close technical interaction between implementing team members. Results-based monitoring and evaluation tools will provide information needed to guide national decision making and funding management, and keep track of quantifiable results in the GCCA+ partner countries and regions. The Action will significantly increase visibility of the EU and its partners' climate change portfolio in Pacific SIDS by providing a clear and easy to recognize programme platform and label.

The EU is assisting 15 Pacific island countries through different projects under the 10 EU-Pacific Regional Indicative Programme and the Intra-ACP thematic programmes. The Action has been developed working closely with the different agencies responsible for their implementation and or formulation: a) Adapting to Climate Change and Sustainable Energy (ACSE) Programme; component 1, which is implemented by Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), and focuses on climate change adaptation and energy security; and Component 3, which is implemented by SPC in partnership with USP, and focuses on technical and vocational education and training; b) The Intra-ACP-EU Building Safety and

Resilience in the Pacific Region focusing on disaster risk management; c) the Pro-Resilience Special Measure in response to food insecurity in ACP countries focuses on resilience to El Niño in the three North Pacific countries (FSM FED/2016/39693, RMI FED/2016/39692, PAL FED/2016/39694) and in Fiji (FED/2016/39695) which are included in this Action.

The Action will be also closely coordinated with the various actions under the 11 EU-Pacific RIP: The inclusion and mobilisation of the private sector will be in coordination with actions under priority area 1 of the RIP (support to trade and private sector development). There will be close links to the Marine Partnership (PEUMP) project under priority area 2 of the RIP, for example in areas such as coastal protection and protection of biodiversity and marine resources. Similarly, there will be close coordination on issues related to waste management and circular economy will be established with the regional waste management programme under priority area 3. Issues related to Public Finance Management, including on climate finance, will be linked up with the regional programme on PFM (priority area 3). Gender mainstreaming and the active involvement of women and girls will be coordinated with the action on addressing root causes of violence against women and girls (priority area 3). Overall capacity building activities will be coordinated with the regional capacity building programme.

The action will also seek coordination and build on possible synergies with the work undertaken – some with EU funding – at the OCTs level in the region when relevant.

Several other development partners are supporting regional initiatives in the climate change and disaster risk management field in the Pacific. Ongoing initiatives include, but are not limited to: the World Bank Pacific Resilience Program (PREP) which focuses on disaster risk management, risk reduction and financing in four Pacific countries; the USAID Climate Ready supported initiatives which focus on building capacity to access climate funding; the USAID Pacific American Climate Fund (PACAM) which involves civil society players in climate change adaptation on-the-ground measures in different sectors; the Global Environment Facility's Ridge to Reef project which aims to enhance ecosystem goods and service through an integrated approach to land, water, forest, biodiversity and coastal resources. Other key development partners supporting regional, sub-regional and bilateral climate change and disaster risk interventions are UNDP, Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), and New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade (NZ MFAT) have recently announced a new four-year Australia-Pacific Climate Change Action intervention. There are several other bilateral projects funded by the Green Climate Fund and the Adaptation Fund implemented with the help of development partners. These initiatives provide opportunities for collaboration and benefit value for the proposed Action.

The main opportunities for identification of synergy and **donor coordination** are nationally-led annual development partner roundtables; national coordination mechanisms; steering committee meetings organised by other development partners; CROP Executive Sub-Committee on Climate Change and Resilient Development; the formal mechanisms through the FRDP and PRP (presently being developed); and informal arrangements such as the Suva-based Development Partners for Climate Change (DPCC) meetings.

3.3 Cross-cutting issues

Gender and human rights - The Action will adopt from the outset a gender-sensitive, rights-based approach to climate change adaptation at the national, sub-national and community levels. Gender equality, with women and youth as agents of change, are at the core of sustainable development. Issues affecting the region include a lack of participation by women and youth in decision-making, which is at least partly a consequence of sparse access to information and training. Gender will be mainstreamed throughout the programme in line with the EU Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016 – 2020, the 2012 Pacific Islands Forum Leaders Gender Equality Declaration (Pacific Women) supported by DFAT, and the Pacific Gender and Climate Change Toolkit. Pacific Women specifically speaks to economic empowerment measures for women and this is one of the activities addressed under Output 3 of this Action. National gender stocktakes have been conducted (or are in progress) for the ten countries by SPC and other partners and these provide a baseline. Consultations and training in climate change adaptation and disaster risk will be conducted as parallel activities for women and men. Furthermore, the scaling-up of on-the-ground interventions will include specific interventions that apply women's skills. Data on beneficiaries will be gender disaggregated. Similarly adopting a rights-based approach, which goes beyond gender to include all vulnerable groups, such as migrants and persons with disabilities will be adopted at the outset. With the help of the SPC-Regional Rights Resources Team (RRRT) a PANEL approach will be utilised (Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination, Empowering, Links to Human Rights Conventions). This will also support the 2014 - EU Rights Based Approach, Encompassing all Human Rights, for EU Development Cooperation. Opportunities for involving particular groups, such as the private sector, will be maximised where appropriate, and will commence during the inception phase. The focus will be on enhancing awareness of climate and disaster risk, market analysis, sharing information on simple, low cost climate proofing technologies, making such technologies available at the national level, and providing training in their use. These measures will build on the activities already undertaken in GCCA: PSIS project.

Environment, Biodiversity and Climate Change: The programme is designed to have a strongly positive effect on the terrestrial and marine environment, while maintaining the overall focus on the wellbeing of island communities. Adopting an ecosystem approach to adaptation will contribute to biodiversity conservation as well as incorporation of traditional knowledge. Combining an ecosystem approach with structural measures will likely enhance the specific adaptation measures (e.g. a well-planned combination of planting deep-rooting native coastal shrubs with engineering coastal protection structures can provide for improved coastal stabilisation). Technical data and knowledge will inform the design of the sector measures, and additional studies conducted to address gaps in the knowledge base. The action will adhere closely to national laws and regulations for planning and environment management including the preparation of environmental impact assessments. The Pacific islands region is one of the areas of the world most severely impacted by climate change. The focus of the action is to address the cross cutting climate change and disaster risk management issues in a comprehensive and holistic manner so as to promote and support resilient development and the FRDP. This will be achieved through scaling-up (enhancing, expanding, replicating, adding a complementary approach) existing sector-based climate change adaptation interventions (both structural and mainstreaming) within a medium term time frame at the island and sub-national level accompanied by training and capacity building.

Good governance: Improving natural resource management and addressing climate and disaster risks through institutional and individual capacity development at national, sub-national and community levels will support decentralisation of the governments’ climate and disaster risk programmes. Strengthening the local governance will assist informed local decision-making and resilience to climate change risks. This is in line with the “bottom up” approach of this Action.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION

4.1 Objectives and Results

The Overall Objective is to *enhance climate change adaptation and resilience within ten Pacific island countries. The Specific Objective is to *strengthen the implementation of sector based, but integrated, climate change and disaster risk management strategies and plans.**

This programme is relevant for the Agenda 2030. It contributes primarily to the progressive achievement of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 13 – urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts, and secondly to SDG 1 – end poverty; SDG 2 – zero hunger; SDG 3 – good health; SDG 5 – gender equality; SDG 6 – clean water; and SDG 14 – life below water. This does not imply a commitment by the countries benefitting from this programme.

The Action takes into account the Pacific island countries position to the UNFCCC for increased funds for climate change adaptation to reflect their specific characteristics and extreme vulnerability, and to address the imbalance between mitigation and adaptation funding.

The Action will achieve the following three outputs.

Output 1: Climate and disaster risk information, knowledge management, monitoring and strategic planning capacities strengthened at national and regional levels.

Impact assessment of climate change adaptation interventions, several years after their completion, is a major gap in the Pacific countries. (Standard end-of-project evaluations focus almost entirely on outputs and are usually conducted around the project end-date). Yet without this longer-term impact information, Pacific nations remain in a cycle of designing and executing new adaptation initiatives which in many cases do not fulfil their hoped-for long-term potential. Pacific countries need an objective impact assessment of past interventions so as to move their planning horizons from the short-term project approach to the medium term (10+ years) sector resilience approach.

This output will focus particularly on supporting national decision making such that new climate change adaptation interventions are designed and implemented with sustainability at the forefront of the process. Collaborating closely with three countries, Fiji, Tonga and Tuvalu, representing different conditions in Melanesia and Polynesia, and utilising an information and knowledge management approach, an impact methodology will be designed and tested. Key criteria for assessing past interventions include (i) effectiveness, (ii) sustainable social and behavioural

changes (e.g. enhanced decision making skills for women and vulnerable groups), (iii) successful lessons and practices, and (iv) overall sustainability of completed climate change adaptation interventions. The methodology will be developed into a user-friendly database and training provided so that countries can install, populate and customise the impacts database so as to inform their decision making.

The activities build on the Pacific Climate Change Portal (PCCP), which represents a sound and established foundation for knowledge management in the region (and the GCCA: PSIS project contributed to its development), the national portals being developed by SPREP through the iCLIM project (International Cooperation on Climate Change Data and Information Management) and other frameworks such as USP's community database. The national impact databases will be designed as “add-ons” to the national portals and they will become part of a wider effort to support improved national decision-making processes. The other seven countries will participate in this activity through specific training sessions at regional steering committee meetings and lessons learnt events.

Besides supporting longer-term national decision making, the impacts databases will also contribute to national and regional baselines on which to assess the FRDP and to the GCCA+ lessons learnt. Opportunities exist for collaboration with EU Member States' institutions such as the Stockholm Environmental Institute who have recently supported research work on climate finance flows in the Pacific.

Output 2: Planning and decision making capacities to address climate change and disaster risks at sub-national and community level strengthened, applying participatory, gender-sensitive and rights-based approaches

Especially in the Pacific context, where communities are spread over hundreds of widely scattered islands, sub-national, state, local and island governments provide an important interface between communities and individuals on the one hand and national governments on the other hand. This output will focus particularly on building capacity in resilient development for local area stakeholders, starting with those residing in the geographical areas selected in Output 3. In outer islands, the use of local languages is often a pre-requisite for developing capacity at the sub-national government level.

The activities will adopt a gender sensitive and rights based approach throughout, e.g. holding separate consultations with women and with men where custom dictates; inclusion of particularly vulnerable individuals, such as migrants, landless people, people with disabilities, women, and men outside of traditional power-based positions. Following a diagnostic assessment of training needs in climate and disaster risk, key change agents/champions will be identified, taking into account the needs of men and women, and capacity building undertaken through technical vocational education and training. In addition, strengthening the Locally Managed Climate Change Adaptation network (LMCCA) previously established through the EU-Intra-ACP-USP-GCCA regional project will provide a multiplier effect for communities not directly benefitting from the project's activities.

A parallel activity includes the review and revision of sub-national government's sustainable development plans to include climate and disaster risk, and ensuring that all rights holders are

fully involved in the participatory process. All users will be trained to implement and monitor the revised plans using tools such as the Pacific Islands community-based integrated vulnerability assessments: a tool for resilience management.

Output 3: Strategic and local interventions for climate change adaptation and mainstreaming scaled-up in five pre-defined sectors.

Focusing on sectors where adaptation work has already taken place and building on that existing work, will help countries focus on sector resilience and moving to a long term planning horizon for that sector. Together with output 1, this output will help countries move away from the present *ad hoc* system for selecting project sites and sectors, towards a more informed decision making process for sustainable and resilient development. During the GCCA: PSIS project, countries selected sectors for intervention based on their national plans and priorities, and then implemented climate change adaptation measures (structural and mainstreaming) in their selected sector. The sectors were agriculture (Tuvalu), coastal zones (RMI, Tonga), human health (Kiribati), marine resources (Cook Islands) and water (FSM, Nauru, Niue, Palau). Fiji was not part of the GCCA: PSIS project, but based on their focus over the past five years, the most likely sectors for scaling up resilience activities are water and food security. During this Action, countries will likely focus on the same sector, and scale-up previous intervention(s). Scaling-up a structural measure might include (i) **enhancement** e.g. strengthening a measure to withstand a category 3-5 cyclone; (ii) **expansion** e.g. increasing the measure to protect a longer length of coast; (iii) **replication** e.g. implementing a successful measure in a different location; and (iv) **addition of a new complementary approach** such as combining an ecosystem-based approach with an agricultural measure. To take one example: in Tuvalu food security was the focus of the GCCA: PSIS project; and agroforestry demonstration sites and related nurseries were developed in two islands along with women's home gardening, climate resilient crops from SPC's Centre for Pacific Crops and Trees were trialled, and an agricultural marketing plan developed. Scaling-up might include the following: **enhancement** of the use of climate ready crops beyond those already trialled; **expansion** of existing agroforestry sites and women's home gardening activities; **replication** of agroforestry sites and nurseries in other islands in Tuvalu; and **addition of a new complementary approach** such as ecosystem based management, all with a view to further strengthening food security in light of the changing climate. Ecosystem based approaches have significant potential in small islands and especially a small atoll environment such as Tuvalu, e.g. planting native pandanus along the coastal boundary of an agroforestry demonstration site provides fruit, helps stabilise the fragile coastal barrier, and reduces salt blast for the other plants and trees.

Linking specific sector-based measures to sector policies, plans and budgets is an important part of strengthening the resilience of the sector. Mainstreaming activities will build on and enhance the existing policies and plans, in relation to the following five pre-defined sectors:

Agriculture

- Tuvalu Agriculture Strategic Marketing Plan 2016-2025 (2016) (prepared under GCCA: PSIS project), and specific objectives of the Te Kakeega II: National Strategy for Sustainable Development (NSSD) 2005–2015.

Coastal protection

- RMI National Coastal Management Framework (2008) under Coast Conservation Act (1988).
- Tonga JNAP 2010-2015 - Goal 3, Tonga Land Use Policy (2014), National Infrastructure and Spatial Planning Act – 2014.

Health

- Kiribati National Environmental Health Action Plan (2015-2019) (revised by the GCCA: PSIS project).

Marine resources

- Cook Islands Fisheries Management Plans (for specific areas and specific fisheries) under the Marine Resources Act (2005).

Water

- FSM First National Framework Water and Sanitation Policy and Implementation Plan (2011).
- Nauru Water and Sanitation Master Plan 2015 – 2035 (2016) (prepared under GCCA: PSIS project).
- Niue National Drinking Water Safety Plan (2009).
- Palau Water Policy (2012).

Each country will undertake widespread national consultations to (i) define and select the existing measures for scaling-up in their pre-defined sector and (ii) the geographical focus. Then, using a participatory, gender and rights based approach at the local area level, more detailed consultations with communities, local area governments and whenever relevant with the private sector will be held to design and implement tangible on-the-ground measures that fulfil the scaling-up criteria. Parallel on-the-ground measures will be designed and implemented in some countries to empower vulnerable groups e.g. women. Training in the monitoring and maintenance of the scaled-up measures will be provided and with the long term goal to ensure that such activities are supported by line items in national and sector budgets. Ecosystem based approaches will be an important part of the tangible on-the-ground measures in agriculture (Tuvalu), marine resources (Cook Islands) and coastal protection sectors (RMI, Tonga). This will provide social benefit e.g. empowering women and vulnerable groups to take the lead with coastal planting; economic benefit e.g. marine resource stock replenishment through establishment of marine protected areas; and cultural benefit e.g. conservation of medicinal plants. Involvement of the private sector will focus on awareness raising about climate and disaster risk, consultation with suppliers and distributors of simple, low cost climate proofing technologies, market research and analysis, small trials and training of contractors. Collaboration with the Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation will be a key component (see Activity 3.2).

Mainstreaming climate change and disaster risk remains a key foundation for the sustainability of resilient development interventions. While significant mainstreaming work has already been undertaken especially at the national policy level, it is at the sector plan and sector budget level where substantial gaps still exist and capacity will be enhanced through this Action. The sectors identified for the scaling-up activities will also be the ones targeted for mainstreaming. The Action will support countries to view planning and budgeting as a continuous integrated process with policies, plans and strategies linked to budgets and forward estimates, and clear indicators showing how measures will contribute to climate change adaptation.

4.2 Main activities

The main activities as envisaged by each output are as follows:

Output 1: Climate and disaster risk information, knowledge management, monitoring and strategic planning capacities strengthened at national and regional levels.

1.1. National consultations and development of draft impact methodology: Consultations will be conducted with three countries, which are already in the process of developing national climate change portals, to design an analysis framework for an impact database that will enhance decision making. This will include a stocktake of existing information and knowledge management portals/databases and their purposes and capacity, determination of user needs; scoping of existing impact methodologies and their software needs; provision of training and capacity building. The outcome of the consultations will be a draft methodology for impact analysis of past interventions.

1.2 Impact analysis of completed climate and disaster risk interventions in three countries: An in-country inventory of past, existing and pipeline projects will be conducted. Reports and evaluations from completed projects including field observations and consultations, will be reviewed, compiled and analysed with the full involvement of national partners. The direct and indirect impact of the interventions in the five-year post project completion period will be assessed using the impact methodology developed in activity 1.1.

1.3 Impacts database designed and developed: Dependent upon user needs assessed in 1.1, a user-friendly impacts database will be designed and developed. This will build on existing regional databases e.g. Pacific Climate Change Portal (PCCP), Pacific Disaster Net, USP's monitoring and evaluation framework for community activities, and the national climate change portals being developed through the iCLIM project. A "Starter Pack" for the impacts database with features such as those in the PCCP projects database will be developed that each country can install on their server/cloud arrangement and customise according to their national branding.

1.4 Capacity building in the use of national impacts databases to inform better decision making: Through in-country installation of the impacts database on the existing national portals, uploading of the impact assessments of past projects, and training in the use of the impacts database, capacity will be enhanced in the application of the impacts database to more informed decision making. The other seven countries will be involved throughout the Action through add-on events and sessions at regional steering committee meetings and lessons learnt meetings.

Output 2: Planning and decision making capacities to address climate change and disaster risks at sub-national and community level strengthened, applying participatory, gender-sensitive and rights-based approaches

2.1 Mobilisation and outreach on climate and disaster resilience with local area stakeholders in intervention areas: In collaboration with, and expanding on, Activity 3.2., consult with the local area stakeholders, including sub-national governments and communities in the selected geographical areas to: (i) undertake a participatory diagnostic analysis of training

needs in climate change and disaster risk management, including identification of key change agents/champions and their level of understanding and knowledge about climate and disaster risk; and (ii) undertake outreach, communication, education and awareness raising focused on climate and disaster resilience using a gender sensitive, rights based approach.

2.2 Provision of training in resilient development to local area stakeholders: Using a participatory, inclusive and gender sensitive/rights based approach, and involving in particular sub-national governments and communities, facilitate the required training in resilience development through technical vocational education and training (TVET) programmes, and strengthen the “multiplier effect” of the Locally Managed Climate Change Adaptation network (LMCCA), previously established through the EU-ACP-USP GCCA regional project to involve communities not directly included in project activities.

2.3 Mainstream and integrate climate change and disaster risk management in sub-national sustainable development plans e.g. island plans: Through inclusive collaboration with the community and sub-national government representatives in the target areas/islands, develop and review community and sub-national governments’ sustainable development/action plans and integrate climate change and disaster risk management into the plans.

2.4 Enhance the capacity to implement, monitor and evaluate sub-national sustainable development plans e.g. island plans: Build capacity at community and sub-national government levels to support the implementation of the revised island and community sustainable development/action plans, as well as their monitoring and evaluation, through the delivery of climate and disaster resilience training and using community based tools e.g. Pacific Islands Community-Based Integrated Vulnerability and Assessments: A Tool for Resilience Management.

Output 3: Strategic and local interventions for climate change adaptation and mainstreaming scaled up in five pre-defined sectors.

3.1 National level consultations to select geographical focus of measures to be scaled-up in the predefined sector: Hold national consultations, involving civil society and national governments and including ministries responsible for internal affairs, to select measures to be scaled up within the predefined sector, their geographical focus (e.g. an atoll group), the mainstreaming needs within the sector and the delivery modality for the Action at the national level. Key criteria will be prepared which will consider (i) review of all on-the-ground climate change adaptation measures in that sector; (ii) location relative to centres of population at risk; (iii) review of sector policies, plans and budgets and the extent to which climate and disaster risk are mainstreamed.

3.2 Design and implement tangible on-the-ground scaling up measures, which include specific measures designed for women and vulnerable groups, and measures involving the private sector: Using a participatory and gender sensitive/rights based approach, and involving national and sub-national governments and communities, design and implement tangible on-the-ground measures that fulfil the scaling up criteria in the predefined sectors. Based on previous experience from other projects, parallel activities that are complementary to the scaling up measures, will be designed and implemented by women and vulnerable groups. This will build

their capacity and enhance leadership skills in climate change adaptation. Ecosystem based approaches will be an important part of the tangible on-the-ground measures in agriculture (Tuvalu), marine resources (Cook Islands) and coastal protection sectors (RMI, Tonga¹⁶). Consultations will also be held with the private sector as to their potential involvement in the Action such as working with the production and distribution sector to manufacture and stock simple low-cost climate proofing technologies, e.g. durable drinking water quality plastic water tanks, and first flush devices for water tanks.

3.3. Build capacity in the monitoring and maintenance of the scaled up measures: Build capacity, provide training and ensure continuity for monitoring and maintenance of the measures adopting a gender sensitive and rights-based approach. Men, women and vulnerable groups will be trained in the monitoring and maintenance of the scaled up measures with the long-term goal to ensure that such activities are supported by line items in national and sector budgets.

3.4 Mainstream climate and disaster risk into national sector-based policies, plans and budgets: Following the consultations and review in 3.1, mainstream climate change and disaster risk into the policies, plans and budgets of the pre-defined sectors and build capacity especially at national levels, and where necessary at sub-national levels. (This will be in collaboration with activities 2.3 to 2.4, which focus on mainstreaming climate and disaster risk into sub-national and island governments' sustainable development plans).

3.5 Sharing and compiling of lessons learnt and sound practices: Sharing and compiling lessons learnt and sound practices during national, local area meetings/consultations, and regional meetings will be ongoing throughout the delivery of this action, Local and regional networks and a variety of media will be utilised. This will contribute to the scaling up of sector-based climate change adaptation. Since the Action covers five different sectors, opportunities for inter-sectoral collaboration will be also be maximised.

Appendix presents an indicative overview of the activities, partners and budgets.

Inception phase (6 months), activities include: (i) national consultations to confirm the geographical areas where measures will be scaled up which will inform the revision of detailed activities, work plans, budgets, national logical frameworks, indicators and baselines; (ii) identification of specific entry points for SPC's gender programme (Social Development Programme) using the existing national gender stocktakes; and for the Regional Rights Resources Team which utilises a PANEL approach (Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination, Empowering, Links to Human Rights Conventions); (iii) staff recruitment; and (iv) detailed design of the communication strategy to ensure adequate visibility of the programme. Sharing and compiling lessons learnt and sound practices during national and regional meetings, steering committee meetings, through local and regional networks, using a variety of media, and with other development partners will be ongoing throughout the delivery of this Action and its three outputs and will contribute to the overall and specific objectives of the Action.

¹⁶ The Action will collaborate with planned coastal protection interventions in these two countries supported by the PREP in RMI and the Green Climate Funds in Tonga.

A policy dialogue will be arranged in the margin of the annual Project Steering Committee between representatives of the European Union, other development partners, and the Directors of Environment / Climate change divisions and key representatives of the ten countries: relevant issues such as Climate change, disaster risk reduction, resilience will be discussed.

4.3 Intervention Logic

The programme follows clear intervention logic, based on the problem analysis, in that it assists countries move from an existing *ad hoc* approach to climate change adaptation to strengthening climate and disaster resilience in five specific sectors, supported by improved decision making based on objective impact analyses and with capacity building playing an intrinsic role throughout the Action. The Action is in line with the FRDP, which recognises the cross cutting nature of climate and disaster risks and that action needs to take place at the development sector level. Assessing the impacts of past climate and disaster risk interventions is a key component to help countries make informed decisions for future interventions based on sustainability criteria. People lie at the centre of all such efforts to combat climate change and disasters, and capacity building at all levels – national, sub-national, social group, community, individual – is intrinsic throughout the Action, and with a particular focus on sub-national governance which provides the important interface between national government and remote outer island communities.

The programme has three closely linked outputs, which will ensure an integrated approach to delivery. The more detailed intervention logic is in the logical framework (**Appendix 1**). During the inception phase, logical frameworks will be designed for the interventions in each country, as was done for GCCA: PSIS project and they will be nested within the main logical framework.

Sustainability is addressed at two levels. Climate change and disaster risks increase the vulnerability of Pacific island people and significantly undermine the sustainable development of the Pacific region. Building resilience to these risks is the focus of the Action. Sustaining project results after implementation is completed is always challenging, but the following approaches are envisaged:

- Ownership of project activities by the countries increases the likelihood of their continuation after project activities cease. Following a similar approach to the successful GCCA: PSIS project, extensive consultations will facilitate countries' leadership in the detailed design, siting and implementation of the activities, and this creates ownership and commitment.
- The emphasis on capacity building at the community, sub-national and national levels should in the long term reduce dependence on regional projects.
- Adopting a gender sensitive/rights based approach will contribute to fairer sharing of livelihood benefits and improved resilience to shocks and stresses.
- Strengthening sector resilience to climate and disaster shocks and stresses will contribute to economic prosperity and will improve national capacity to access funding from international climate funds, e.g. Green Climate Fund and Adaptation Fund.
- Partnerships with other projects, programmes and groups provide opportunities for the continuation of key activities.

- Policy dialogue with the Pacific Resilience Partnership, which is tasked to coordinate the FRDP, will contribute to strengthen and sustain the Action's outputs in the long term.
- Partnership with Private sector: five of the countries involved in the Action have populations of 20,000 people or less, four have populations around 100,000 and only Fiji has a population of 900,000. In the smaller islands the private sector is very small and the main opportunities lie with the banking and insurance sector, the construction and distribution industries. In Fiji, with its larger population, there are more opportunities for public private partnerships and these will be explored in this Action such as with the Fiji Business Disaster Resilience Council, launched in 2016 and linked to the UNDP Connecting Business initiative (CBI), and through the regional Pacific Island Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO) based in Fiji.

The exit strategy will focus on the transference of knowledge and application of climate change adaptation measures to: (i) the longer term planning strategies for each of the five sectors and especially facilitating national budget support for their continuation; (ii) the sub-national governance level and (iii) to the communities. Other exit measures will focus on facilitating other sources of funding for follow-on activities, involvement of the private sector, and efficient and effective project closure to capture the benefits and lessons learnt.

5 IMPLEMENTATION

5.1 Financing agreement

In order to implement this action, it is foreseen to conclude a Financing Agreement with the Duly Mandated Regional Organisation (DMRO) for the Pacific, i.e. the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS), referred to in Article 17 of Annex IV to the ACP-EU Partnership Agreement.

5.2 Indicative implementation period

The indicative operational implementation period of this action, during which the activities described in section 4.1 will be carried out and the corresponding contracts and agreements implemented, is 66 months from the date of entry into force of the financing agreement.

Extensions of the implementation period may be agreed by the Commission's authorizing officer responsible by amending this decision and the relevant contracts and agreements; such amendments to this decision constitute technical amendments in the sense of point (i) of Article 2(3)(c) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014.

5.3 Implementation Modality

5.3.1 Indirect management with international organisations

This action may be implemented in indirect management with the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in accordance with Article 58(1)(c) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012.

This implementation entails a co-delegation agreement with Pacific Community (SPC) as lead and coordinating organisation and SPREP as co-delegatee.

Should the University of the South Pacific (USP) be recognized as an International Organisation at the time of the signature of the co-delegation agreement, it could join the agreement as a co-delegatee. Should USP not be recognized as an International Organisation, a separate grant

agreement will be signed between the European Commission and USP, the main regional capacity-builder established in 1967 and the only Pacific regional university with campuses in 12 Pacific island countries, which will bring a long term and sustainability perspective to the capacity building component.

This implementation is justified because of (i) the regional organisations' specific mandate and technical expertise in climate change and disaster risk coordination, mainstreaming and adaptation implementation. SPC is the oldest regional technical organisation established in 1947 and is specialised in all the development sectors impacted by climate change. Its 26 members (22 Pacific Islands Countries and Territories plus Australia, France, New Zealand and the United States of America) approve on a yearly basis its strategic frameworks and work plans including climate change programmes. The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) has delivered high level expertise in climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem management since 1982. On an annual basis, its 26 members (including 21 Pacific Islands Countries, Australia, France, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United State of America) approve its strategic frameworks and work plans; (ii) these co-delegatees demonstrated efficient technical management of previous climate change projects (including GCCA projects) in the Pacific region whilst ensuring local ownership.

The entrusted entities would carry out the following budget-implementation tasks: launching calls for tenders (such as services, studies, trainings, technical expertise, etc.) and for proposals (to be defined at the inception phase); evaluation of tenders and proposals; award of contracts; concluding, monitoring and managing contracts; assessment and acceptance of deliverables; carrying out payments; recovering moneys due; and any other relevant aspects of the project management cycle of the GCCA+ SUPA project.

5.3.2 Fall-back option – Grant to USP and indirect management with SPC and SPREP

This option applies if USP is not timely recognised as an international organisation.

5.3.2.1 Grants: direct award (direct management) – Standard Grant Agreement to USP

(a) Objectives of the grant, fields of intervention, priorities of the year and expected results

To objective of the grant is to provide specialised expertise to achieve the output 2 - Planning and decision making capacities to address climate change and disaster risks at sub-national and community level strengthened, applying participatory, gender-sensitive and rights-based approaches. USP will be in the lead to build capacity in resilient development for local area stakeholders.

Following a diagnostic assessment of training needs in climate and disaster risk, USP will lead the identification of key change agents/champions, taking into account the needs of men and women, and capacity building undertaken through technical vocational education and training. The Locally Managed Climate Change Adaptation network (LMCCA) previously established through the EU-Intra-ACP-USP-GCCA regional project will be strengthened and will play a key role providing a multiplier effect for communities not directly benefitting from the project's activities.

(b) Justification of a direct grant

Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the grant may be awarded without a call for proposals to University of the South Pacific (USP). Under the responsibility of the Commission's authorising officer responsible, the recourse to an award of a grant without a call for proposals is justified because USP is well positioned to deliver the objectives of the grant through provision of expertise. USP has the highest level of regional and international expertise within its fourteen campuses. While USP is not the only University in the region, it's the only one that is regional in nature, with twelve member countries support its core existence and operations.

(c) Essential selection and award criteria

The essential selection criteria are the financial and operational capacity of the applicant. The essential award criteria are relevance of the proposed action to the objectives of the call; design, effectiveness, feasibility, sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the action.

(d) Maximum rate of co-financing

The maximum possible rate of co-financing for this grant is 100%.

In accordance with Articles 192 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable by virtue of Article 37 of (EU) regulation n° 323/2015 if full funding is essential for the action to be carried out, the maximum possible rate of co-financing may be increased up to 100 %. The essentiality of full funding will be justified by the Commission's authorising officer responsible in the award decision, in respect of the principles of equal treatment and sound financial management.

(e) Indicative trimester to conclude the grant agreement: second trimester of 2018.

(f) Exception to the non-retroactivity of costs

The Commission authorises the eligibility of costs prior to the submission of the grant application as of 1 February 2018.

The entrusted international organisations (SPC and SPREP) are currently undergoing the ex-ante assessment¹⁷ in accordance with Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 applicable by virtue of Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 323/2015.

The Commission's authorising officer responsible deems that, based on the compliance with the ex-ante assessment based on Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 1605/2002 and long-lasting problem-free cooperation, the international organisations can be entrusted with budget-implementation tasks under indirect management.

¹⁷ The final report of the current pillar assessment of SPC will be submitted in June 2017 to the DEVCO/R2 for approval. The final report of the current pillar assessment of SPREP has already be submitted to DEVCO/R2 and the approval is on-going. These two reports revealed that for both organisations, the four pillars (accounting systems, internal control systems, independent external audit and procurement) have been positively assessed. USP has been positively assessed for 5 pillars (the three core pillars plus procurement and grants). USP is not recognized as an International Organisation, its management consider starting the recognition process in the upcoming months. Therefore, it is suggested to implement this action through a PAGODA co-delegation agreement considering the substantial level of budget implementation tasks it requires for the mobilisation of training, technical assistance, visibility and dissemination events, etc.

This is preferred option due to: i) these organisations have strong mandates in climate change and disaster risk management and education/capacity building; ii) technical expertise in climate change adaptation and disaster risk management/environment/biodiversity/and capacity building; iii) obtained excellent results/outputs under previous and above-mentioned 10th EDF intra-ACP GCCA and DCI-ENV GCCA as well as 10th EDF regional ACSE projects (for a total value of EUR 27.4 million); iv) demonstrated efficient financial and operational management of above-mentioned projects in the Pacific region, and with the full support of country partners, as demonstrated by final evaluations.

5.4 Indicative budget

An indicative budget for the Action is given in the table below.

Objective/Results and Funding Modality	EU contribution (EUR)
5.3.1 Indirect management with international organisations through a co-delegation agreement with SPC (lead Organisation), SPREP and USP (co-delegatees). Objective: <i>Enhance climate change adaptation and resilience within ten Pacific island countries.</i>	14 890 000 indicatively divided as follows ¹⁸ : SPREP : for <u>Output 1</u> ; 1 620 000 USP : for <u>Output 2</u> ; 1 650 472 SPC : for <u>Output 3</u> 8 266 672 Project management 2 935 856 Contingencies 417 000
Total	14 890 000 (inclusive of <u>contingencies</u>) ¹⁹
Evaluation, 5.8 – Audit 5.9	110 000
Total cost of the Action	15 000 000

Different models for country allocations will be discussed during the inception phase and will likely be based on the following criteria: (i) country preferences; (ii) practices implemented by other development partners in completed and ongoing interventions; (iii) nature of the proposed scaling-up interventions; and (iv) specific location of the Action’s activities (e.g. if based on a remote outer island where past experiences and lessons learnt from the GCCA: PSIS project show costs are much higher).

5.5 Scope of geographical eligibility for procurement and grants

¹⁸ Please note these amounts are indicative and subject to Delegation Agreement negotiations.

¹⁹ Contingencies estimated at 417,000 EUR will be included in the co-delegation agreement.

The geographical eligibility in terms of place of establishment for participating in procurement and grant award procedures and in terms of origin of supplies purchased as established in the basic act and set out in the relevant contractual documents shall apply, subject to the following provisions.

The Commission's authorising officer responsible may extend the geographical eligibility in accordance with Article 9 (2) (b) of Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 on the basis of urgency or of unavailability of products and services in the markets of the countries concerned, or in other duly substantiated cases where the eligibility rules would make the realisation of this action impossible or exceedingly difficult.

5.6 Organizational set-up and responsibilities

A programme steering committee will meet annually to review progress and provide overall guidance of the programme. It will be chaired by a Pacific ACP representative, and co-chaired by the DMRO (PIF) and EU Delegation. It will comprise: one representative from each country; one senior representative from each of the three implementing partners (SPC, SPREP and USP); and the Project Manager for SPC. Other organisations may be invited to attend as observers. A nominated representative from the Intra-ACP GCCA+ Action will be a permanent observer to facilitate complementarity between the two Actions. These annual regional meetings also provide opportunities for policy dialogue with development partners and EU Member States. The steering committee will meet at least once a year, and more often as required. The main role of the steering committee is to advise on the delivery of the project activities. The Project Manager for the SPC components will be responsible for coordination, the preparation of the agenda, all meeting documents and official minutes. The steering committee will be chaired by countries in rotating order. Wherever possible regional steering committee meetings will be combined with regional training activities.

In addition to the steering committee representation mentioned above, collaboration with the Intra-ACP GCCA+ Action will likely include (i) quarterly progress/coordination meetings at a senior level and with the participation of the EU Delegation representative, and (ii) regular progress/coordination meetings between complementary project teams involved in the two Actions. These meetings will be telephone conferences; although wherever possible face-to-face meetings will also be held depending on individual travel schedules. As the activities of the two Actions are confirmed and finalised, there will be closer technical interaction between implementing team members. Various mechanisms will be used to collaborate with other partners' interventions, including nationally-led annual development partner roundtables; steering committee meetings organised by other project partners; the still-to-be-developed formal mechanisms for the FRDP and PRP; and informal arrangements such as the Development Partners for Climate Change (DPCC) meetings. The day-to-day delivery and coordination will be the responsibility of each of the implementing partners (SPC, SPREP and USP). It is envisaged that there will be monthly coordination meetings (face-to-face and teleconference) to ensure the smooth delivery of the activities. In the first instance and recognising the complexity of the Action, weekly meetings within and between the SPC, SPREP and USP teams will be necessary to ensure coordination and effective delivery of activities. The SPC team will include a communications professional, who will work with all implementing partners to ensure that whole-of-project outcomes are effectively communicated and with full donor visibility. SPC will

draw on its Social Development Programme (including gender specialists) and its Regional Rights Resource Team (RRRT) to guide the implementation of gender-sensitive, rights based approaches and its Strategy, Monitoring and Learning Programme to support results based monitoring.

5.7 Performance monitoring and reporting

The day-to-day technical and financial monitoring of the implementation of this action will be a continuous process and part of the implementing partner's responsibilities. To this aim, each implementing partners shall establish a permanent internal, technical and financial monitoring system for the action and elaborate regular progress reports (not less than annual) and final reports. This will include quarterly reporting for each country, six-monthly and annual narrative and financial reporting. Every report shall provide an accurate account of implementation of the action, difficulties encountered, changes introduced, as well as the degree of achievement of its results (outputs and direct outcomes) as measured by corresponding indicators, using as reference the logframe matrix. The report shall be laid out in such a way as to allow monitoring of the means envisaged and employed and of the budget details for the action. The final report, narrative and financial, will cover the entire period of the action implementation.

The Commission may undertake additional project monitoring visits both through its own staff and through independent consultants recruited directly by the Commission for independent monitoring reviews (or recruited by the responsible agent contracted by the Commission for implementing such reviews).

Appendix 3 shows an indicative GCCA+ SUPA results framework which is in line with the GCCA+ Results Framework²⁰. This will be further detailed during the inception phase.

5.8 Evaluation

Having regard to the importance of the action, a final evaluation will be carried out for this entire action via independent consultants contracted by the Commission. The final evaluation will be carried out for accountability and learning purposes at various levels. It is anticipated that the annual Results Oriented Monitoring (ROM) missions will continue and so provide regular oversight and guidance.

The Commission shall inform the implementing partner at least 5 months in advance of the dates foreseen for the evaluation missions. The implementing partners shall collaborate efficiently and effectively with the evaluation experts, and inter alia provide them with all the necessary information and documentation, as well as access to the project premises and activities.

The evaluation reports shall be shared with the partner country and other key stakeholders. The implementing partner and the Commission shall analyze the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluations and, where appropriate, in agreement with the partner country, jointly decide

²⁰ Global Climate Change Alliance Plus Results Framework, December 2016 <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/gcca-community/document/gcca-results-framework-v20161223>

on the follow-up actions to be taken and any adjustments necessary, including, if indicated, the reorientation of the project.

Indicatively one contract for evaluation services shall be concluded under a framework contract four months before the end of the implementation period.

5.9 Audit

Without prejudice to the obligations applicable to contracts concluded for the implementation of this action, the Commission may, on the basis of a risk assessment, contract independent audits or expenditure verification assignments for one or several contracts or agreements.

In accordance with sound fiducial practice, SPC, shall commission three end-of-year independent project audits and a final independent project audit.

Indicatively one contract for audit services shall be concluded under a framework contract two months before the end of the implementation period.

5.10 Communication and visibility

Communication and visibility of the EU is a legal obligation for all external actions funded by the EU.

This action shall contain communication and visibility measures which shall be based on a specific Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action, to be elaborated and approved by the contracting authority and the Commission at the start of implementation and supported with the budget indicated in section 5.4 above.

A communications officer will be hired by SPC at the start of the Action and will work with the other two partners to ensure smooth and consistent communication of the various activities. An operational budget for communications across the action has been included in the SPC budget.

In terms of legal obligations on communication and visibility, the measures shall be implemented by the Commission, the partner country, contractors, grant beneficiaries and/or entrusted entities. Appropriate contractual obligations shall be included in, respectively, the financing agreement, procurement and grant contracts, and delegation agreements.

The Communication and Visibility Manual for European Union External Action shall be used to establish the Communication and Visibility Plan of the Action and the appropriate contractual obligations.

List of Appendices:

- Appendix: Indicative Logframe Matrix

APPENDIX - INDICATIVE LOGFRAME MATRIX

The activities, the expected outputs and all the indicators, targets and baselines included in the logframe matrix are indicative and may be updated during the implementation of the action, no amendment being required to the financing decision. When it is not possible to determine the outputs of an action at formulation stage, intermediary outcomes should be presented and the outputs defined during inception of the overall programme and its components. The indicative logframe matrix will evolve during the lifetime of the action: new lines will be added for including the activities as well as new columns for intermediary targets (milestones) for the output and outcome indicators whenever it is relevant for monitoring and reporting purposes. Note also that indicators should be disaggregated by sex whenever relevant.

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2017)	Targets (2022)	Sources Means of verification	Assumptions
	<i>To enhance climate change adaptation and resilience within ten Pacific island countries.</i>	OO Number of people benefitting from scaled up measures. <u>(** EU RF Level 1, 20, 22, 24)</u>	Local area population benefitting from the existing adaptation measure in 2017 in each country. (To be determined during inception phase).	OO) An average 10% increase from the baseline in number of people benefitting	National census data 2015; GCCA: PSIS final report and evaluation; USP-GCCA annual reports; Final reports from SPREP-PACC project; Reports from other national and regional projects undertaking specific on-the-ground measures; Pacific Climate Change Portal; Pacific Disaster Net.	

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2017)	Targets (2022)	Sources Means of verification	Assumptions
	<i>To strengthen the implementation of sector based, but integrated, climate change and disaster risk management strategies and plans.</i>	<p>SO) Number of countries with new climate and disaster risk sector plans</p> <p>(a) in place, (b) endorsed, and (c) being implemented.</p> <p><u>(** EU RF Level 2 # 23 – as many matches as many countries – based on the real improvements / results)</u></p>	SO) (a) (b) (c) To be verified during Inception Phase.	<p>SO)</p> <p>(a) 4 countries with new plans</p> <p>(b) 2 countries with new plans endorsed</p> <p>(c) 2 countries with new plans actively implemented.</p>	<p>Institutional reviews for each country (USAID climate finance project);</p> <p><u>Review of sector policies, plans and budgets in line ministries;</u></p> <p>Project reports;</p> <p>Project evaluations;</p> <p>National climate and disaster risk policies, plans and budgets;</p> <p>Consultation reports;</p> <p>GCCA: PSIS final report and evaluation.</p>	<p>New funding continues to be made available to the Pacific island countries;</p> <p>National focus on climate and disaster resilient development is maintained.</p>

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2017)	Targets (2022)	Sources Means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>Output 1: Climate and disaster risk information, knowledge management, monitoring and strategic planning capacities strengthened.</p>	<p>1.1) <u>Status of Pacific-specific methodologies for objective assessment of longer term impacts of past climate and disaster risk interventions.</u></p> <p>1.2) Number of countries (a) with an impacts database and (b) applying the impacts database to inform decision making</p> <p>1.3) Status of reporting on analysis of impact of the CC and DRM actions in the target countries</p>	<p>1.1) No Pacific-specific methodology exists.</p> <p>1.2) 0</p> <p>1.3) No reporting on the impact exists.</p>	<p>1.1) A Pacific-specific methodology in place by 2020</p> <p>1.2) (a) 3 countries by 2020 (b) 2 countries by 2022</p> <p>1.3) Report on the analysis of impact of CC and DRM in 3 countries by 2022</p>	<p>1.1) Pacific Climate Change Portal; Pacific Disaster Net; Government documents; Project preparation documents; Project reports and evaluations from completed interventions.</p> <p><u>1.2) (a) Review of database portals instructions, functionality and visibility, (b) Monitoring of database usage and data extraction.</u></p> <p>1.3) Project reports on the impacts database.</p>	<p>Natural and man-made hazards do not adversely affect project implementation and delivery.</p> <p>Development partners and governments support an objective review of long term impacts of past interventions.</p>

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2017)	Targets (2022)	Sources Means of verification	Assumptions
	<p>Output 2: Planning and decision making capacities to address climate change and disaster risks at sub-national and community level strengthened, applying participatory, gender sensitive and rights-based approaches.</p>	<p>2.1) Number of countries with local area stakeholders/champions with enhanced capacity in resilient development.</p> <p>2.2) % of communities networked and sharing experiences on a regular basis through the Locally Managed Climate Change Adaptation (LMCCA) network.</p> <p>2.3) Number of countries with sub-national, local area development plans with climate and disaster risk mainstreamed (a) developed and (b) implemented.</p> <p>2.4) Status of diagnostic assessment of the local area climate and disaster risk capacity needs in the countries.</p>	<p>2.1) Baseline to be established during needs assessment in inception phase</p> <p>2.2) 126 communities linked across 15 countries, to be disaggregated by country in Inception phase</p> <p>2.3) Baseline to be established in Inception phase.</p> <p>2.4) Baseline to be established in Inception phase.</p>	<p>2.1) 8 countries</p> <p>2.2) 20 % increase <u>from the baseline for each country by 2022</u></p> <p>2.3) (a) 7 countries (b) 5 countries.</p> <p>2.4) Diagnostic assessment of capacity needs in place by 2019.</p>	<p>2.1) Training needs diagnostic analysis to be conducted in 2018; <u>Capacity scorecard reports;</u> Progress and annual reports from this project; 2.2) Logs and documents relating to use of LMCCA; <u>2.3) Review of sector plans, national plans</u> and programs associated with ministries responsible for local government; b) Business plans, budgets of ministries responsible for local government. 2.4) Project reports. Integrated vulnerability assessments; Community plans; Island plans; Minutes of official meetings.</p>	<p>Sub-national government stakeholders receptive to climate risk and rights-based concepts;</p> <p>National government endorse focus on outer islands.</p> <p>Natural and man-made hazards do not adversely affect project implementation and delivery.</p>
		[38]				

	Results chain	Indicators	Baselines (2017)	Targets (2022)	Sources Means of verification	Assumptions
	Output 3: Strategic and local interventions for climate change adaptation and mainstreaming scaled up in five pre-defined sectors	<p>3.1) List of scaling up measures to be implemented based on national and local consultations.</p> <p>3.2) Number of countries with adaptation scaling-up measures implemented</p> <p>3.3) Number of sectors with adaptation scaling up measures implemented.</p> <p>3.4) Number of countries with new on-the-ground climate and disaster risk interventions empowering women and vulnerable groups.</p> <p>3.5) Number of countries with new ecosystem-based approaches.</p> <p>3.6) Number of sectors with new ecosystem-based approaches.</p> <p>3.7) Number of private sector interventions.</p>	<p>3.1) Review of existing measures during Inception</p> <p>3.2) To be confirmed during inception.</p> <p>3.3) To be confirmed during inception</p> <p>3.4) to be confirmed during inception</p> <p>3.5) To be confirmed during inception.</p> <p>3.6) To be confirmed during inception</p> <p>3.7) To be confirmed during inception</p>	<p>3.1) List to be finalised by 2019</p> <p>3.2) 8 countries</p> <p>3.3) 3 sectors</p> <p>3.4) 5 countries</p> <p>3.5) 2 countries</p> <p>3.6) 2 different sectors</p> <p>3.7) 2 interventions</p>	<p>3.1) Pacific Climate Change Portal; Pacific Disaster Net; Progress and evaluation reports from other projects; Results of consultations.</p> <p>3.2) – 3.7) Progress, annual reports, evaluations from this project; Regional meetings and conferences; all data disaggregated by sex</p>	<p>Natural and man-made hazards do not adversely affect project implementation and delivery.</p> <p>Governments and communities have the capacity and time to proceed with project implementation;</p> <p>Sufficient local resources and skills available to implement and maintain the interventions especially in view of the number of other interventions supported by development partners.</p>

