

## NAP-GSP Regional Training Workshop for the Pacific Appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options for national adaptation planning

28 - 31 May 2018 | TANOA INTERNATIONAL HOTEL | NADI, FIJI

### Summary report



### Summary

The NAP-GSP Regional Training Workshop for the Pacific, focussing on the appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options for national adaptation planning (NAP) was held in Nadi, Fiji from 28 to 31 May 2018.

The workshop aimed to both enhance the technical capacity for appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options, and advance South-South collaboration to support national adaptation planning processes.

The workshop was organised by the joint UNDP-UN Environment National Adaptation Plan Global Support Programme (NAP-GSP) in collaboration with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and NAP-GSP partners. It was attended by 41 participants from 15 Pacific countries including Fiji, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Soloman Islands, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Samoa, Niue, Tonga, Tuvalu, Nauru, Vatu, Papua New Guinea, Palau, and Haiti.

Experts also attended to support the training from UN Environment, UN Development Programme (UNDP), UNITAR, SPREP, the Korea Environment Institute (KEI), the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GmbH or GIZ), the Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the World Bank (WB).

The workshop was conducted in a constructive spirit, but it was also characterised by a sense of urgency. The need for adaptation to the negative impacts of climate change is not a future threat for small island developing states (SIDS), but a daily reality.

All Pacific Islands are already experiencing the impacts of climate change. Many have recently been hit by intense tropical cyclones, devastating vital infrastructure, taking lives and leaving many people homeless.

The NAP -GSP team prepared this summary report, reflecting the discussions and learnings throughout the workshop.

---

## Opening and welcome

**Welcoming and opening remarks were given by the representatives from the Government of Fiji, SPREP, UNDP and UN Environment.**

[Mr. Manasa Tagicakibau, Commissioner Western Division](#) opened the workshop on behalf of the government of Fiji. In his address, he confirmed the commitment of Pacific Islands to the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific the Sendai Agreement and the Paris Agreement. He advised participants to take this opportunity to build new alliances to work together on finding common solutions and positively contribute to mitigating the negative impacts of climate change. He noted that “With the current leadership in Government, Fiji has been taking bold steps towards positioning the country to adapt, mitigate and prepare for climate change, building resilience into all facets of every sector. This is evident in Fiji taking up the Presidency role of COP23, as the voice for all small island development states in the international arena.”

He stated that at sub-national level, Fiji is working to incorporate risk governance as an adaptation tool into all stages of development processes and projects so that the activities are built to withstand the adverse impacts of climate change.

[Ms. Tagaloa Cooper, Director of the Climate Change Resilience Programme \(CCRP\), SPREP](#), spoke on behalf of the Director-General of SPREP. She expressed gratitude to the Government of Fiji for showing leadership in climate change dialogue and action in the Pacific, to build resilience. She informed participants of the progress of their regional initiatives, including formulating a new tool to help experts with developing project proposals and establishing a knowledge brokering center for innovation, learning and science.

[Mr. Umberto Labate, Management and Programme Analyst, UNDP](#), spoke on behalf of UNDP and the NAP-GSP. He reminded participants of the evolution from NAPAs to NAPs, and the role that the UNDP and various financial institutions and bilateral partners are playing in supporting countries around the world and in the Pacific region. He highlighted the important contributions that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) and more recently the GCF have made in supporting country-driven priorities and actions towards resilient development and growth. Mr. Labate concluded by underlining the fact that the 2030 Agenda and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) cannot be achieved without decisive investments and action to adapt to climate change. He emphasised the need for the management of climate risks through building resilience into all aspects of our economies.

Mr. Mozaharul Alam, Regional Coordinator for climate change at the Asia and the Pacific Office of UN Environment, represented UN Environment and the NAP-GSP in his welcome speech. He explained that the shortage of financial resources and the risk for negative impacts of certain activities are the primary reasons for why prioritisation of adaptation options is needed. He noted that the tools and approaches are already available, however the challenge is to empower experts to institutionalise this knowledge, and support the efforts to advance adaptation planning. Mr. Alam emphasised that collaboration is the main mode of delivery.

Mr. Sefanaia Nawadra, Head, Pacific Sub-regional Office, UN Environment, facilitated the opening session. He offered a prayer and gave a warm welcome to all participants, encouraging a systematic and integrated approach to analysing risks, prioritising adaptation options, planning and collaboration at all levels. He shared his experiences in Fiji and the Pacific in the successful mainstreaming of climate change adaptation in planning and budgeting, which all countries must undertake, to protect better their local communities.

## Format of the workshop

The workshop was interactive and participatory, providing a blend of plenary sessions and group exercises. It followed the steps of the process for appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options for NAPs, aligned with the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process.<sup>1</sup> Group stocktaking exercises and presentations highlighted the various tools, case-studies, best practices and needs for appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options and encouraged further knowledge exchange among countries. Country experiences were shared on theme of national experiences with appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options for NAPs.

## Outcome of the discussions

### **Recognition of the importance of broad stakeholder engagement in all steps of the appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options phase of national adaptation planning:**

Bringing together various stakeholder groups relevant for adaptation planning and taking into account their views in the appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options can generate understanding of the challenges and needs of specific groups, resolve misunderstandings and create broad support for the use of specific tools and methods. It can also ensure that the right priorities are selected and no one is left behind.

### **Gender is a pivotal consideration in adaptation planning and can inform other appraisal processes:**

Considering gender aspects throughout the adaptation planning process supports the sustainability and ownership of the process, by encapsulating various stakeholders' perspectives. Discussion centred around the various ways that gender can be mainstreamed into appraisal tools to reflect diverse views and values.

For Multi-Criteria Appraisal (MCA) and barrier analysis, the recommendation was to include women, men, people with disabilities and vulnerable groups, to ensure wide diversity and differing perspectives. Equitable stakeholder discussion means considering each criterion from the perspective of men, women, and understanding the various tradeoffs, vulnerabilities, roles and responsibilities. Similarly, for Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (CEA), the recommendation was to ensure different voices are represented in the decision-making process, and to consider whose priorities are included. For the nominal group (for

<sup>1</sup> LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process, 2012, [available in English, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Arabic] <http://www4.unfccc.int/nap/Guidelines/Pages/Technical-guidelines.aspx>

ranking/prioritisation), the consensus was that it is beneficial to ensure wide representation. Informed facilitation is required to ensure the consensus considers the voices of many.

**Countries are not obligated to follow the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process, or submit a National Adaptation Plan (NAP). However, it benefits each country to advance national adaptation planning and consider best practices:**

As one country example; Korea prepared their first National Adaptation Master Plan, before the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process were prepared. Korea appraised adaptation options through a unique method combining broad stakeholder consultation with expert opinion, considering the priorities of relevant ministries. In the Korean process implementation is done through vertical and horizontal integration of adaptation planning. In their experience, appraisal is a time and cost-saving exercise. In the case of Korea, the preparation of a NAP took less than a year.

There is flexibility for countries to determine the form and content of their national adaptation planning. However, an effective approach could be to look at integration with another area or joint planning. Many countries in the Pacific have integrated climate change adaptation with disaster risk management (DRM) through their Joint National Action Plans on Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change (JNAPs) – including the Cook Islands, Tonga, Samoa. Other countries have aligned their national planning together with other countries. All countries can categorise what is defined as their NAP and submit to the UNFCCC through the NAP Central. As yet, no JNAP or any other document/strategy has been submitted to the UNFCCC from the Pacific. Depending on national context, countries could also consider integrating SDGs into NAPs to ensure that climate planning helps to achieve the SDGs.

**Finetuning understanding of key concepts:**

It was recognised that it is important to have common understandings and interpretation of key concepts, such as; ‘hazard’, ‘exposure’, ‘risk’, ‘vulnerability’ and ‘adaptation deficit’, when discussing adaptation, how to conduct vulnerability assessment, and how to identify adaptation options. The difference between NAPAs and NAPs were elaborated, to understand more about their linkages to sustainable development and national development goals.

**Adaptation planning and vulnerability assessment are iterative process:**

Vulnerability assessment is vital, since the findings can help to identify adaptation targets, identify particularly vulnerable people, regions or sectors, and locate priority locations. Understanding vulnerability can also help to raise awareness of climate change amongst vulnerable groups, allocate adaptation funds to particularly vulnerable regions, sectors or groups of people, and assist in monitoring the performance of an adaptation policy or intervention. The best tools to use for assessing vulnerability depend on the practicality of the tool and the availability of reliable data and information. An expert-driven approach may be a lower-cost and less time-consuming.

**Hybrid approach may work best:**

Expert judgement and community consultation together with MCA is probably practical in the Pacific context. The result will not only address current trends but provide scenarios drawn from the current government policy context. Barrier analysis was considered to be the simplest tool for the Pacific in helping to identify long-term perspectives.

## Major challenges for appraisal and prioritisation

**Pacific Islands are working hard on adaptation planning. However, more work needs to be done to achieve resilience, whilst finance for implementation remains a challenge.**

All Pacific Islands have submitted a NAPA and many have prepared a JNAP. Yet none have submitted a NAP to the UNFCCC. Only a few are pursuing funding for NAP preparation through the dedicated GCF Readiness facility.



**National processes and procedures play a role for national adaptation planning and need to be considered.** All activities of governmental institutions need to be reflected in the national budget and must be in line with national priorities. Preparing the national budget is a rigid process with strict deadlines. Ministries of Finance conduct their own appraisals and prioritisation of all activities proposed by governments to allocate the national budget. Proposals for inclusion in the national budget, including on adaptation options, need to be well substantiated. Tools and methods to help with quantification and science-based evidence can be useful.

**When analysing current climate and future climate change scenarios, countries should look not only at available international meteorological and other data, but also at how to make best use of the national meteorological institutions:**

A WMO-representative presented the benefits of analysing current climate and future climate change scenarios in the Pacific. Climate change information about historic developments and future predictions is an important preparatory step for national adaptation planning. Climate information increases understanding of the risks a country is facing and provides a basis to identify those adaptation options that can help to address major risks.

**Need to centralise climate change information:**

One country shared that climate change information is very dispersed, which makes it difficult to find the most reliable information sources and identify the information gaps. An international organisation asked for best practices in translating climate information to support SMEs, smallholder farmers etc., who are the most affected groups.

**Ensuring climate information is available, accurate and effectively used by end users:**

Climate services need to ensure that information gathered is timely, of high quality, relevant and accessible. Challenges arise in bridging gaps between climate science, policy and practice for adaptation decision-making and building resilience. Many countries require further guidance for understanding and using climate data, to effectively communicate climate change and integrate climate information into decision-making across all levels.

**Climate migration is becoming an emerging complicated phenomenon consisting of social, economic and political ramifications:**

Adaptation may not work for everyone. Sufficient prioritisation planning and coordination between all levels of governments will therefore be essential to deal with the scope and costs of relocation including its effects on livelihoods and the surrounding environment.

**Engaging fishery departments in adaptation planning:**

Oceanic countries are largely dependent on fisheries. However, very few fishery plans contain adaptation components. Partnership and collaboration across sectors and communities is essential for prioritisation and appraisal to be successful.

**Involvement of key stakeholders:**

Selection of the right stakeholder to participate in appraisal process can pose challenges to the decision. In some cases, community consultation may work best, although it may be time-consuming. Empowerment and inclusion of key stakeholders is also vital to ensure a sustainable decision-making process.

**Gender & Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA):**

There is a need for more research in the Pacific in using the CBA tool, due to the challenges in monetising costs and benefits of social/cultural values. Data is primarily collected at the household level, and not disaggregated by gender or other socio-cultural considerations.

**Limitations of the appraisal tools:**

CEA is not designed to deal with questions of inter-generational equities. In CBA, on the other hand, it is not always easy to evaluate ecosystem services. For some the valuation is possible (i.e. if the service is to provide timber), while some are more difficult to quantify (i.e. cultural, and religious services etc.).

**Cost to adapt and prioritise across a board of sectors would be astronomical:**

It is important to recognise that required funds cannot be raised alone nor can funds be raised for all sectors. While needs are increasing, funds are decreasing. Building resilient adaptive capacity to reduce vulnerability can no longer be confined to the public sector alone. The private sector needs to be further catalysed through the NAP process, and through government initiatives that are able to stimulate the market to invest in adaptation options.

**Building a strong narrative for accessing funding:**

The Pacific is underfunded. Any funding proposal requires a clear vision of adaptation, with strong climate relevance, that also outlines a sustainable exit strategy. Whilst there are multiple entries to climate finance, articulating what the country is doing convincingly to elicit the support required is paramount.

## Key emerging issues

### Opportunities for collaboration and support

**Regional initiative to support project preparation and climate change adaptation intelligence:**

A representative from UN Environment presented a new regional initiative on enhancing climate change information and knowledge services for resilience in the islands of the Pacific Oceans to help countries with the preparation of fundable adaptation projects and collection of climate change adaptation data that can be used for planning, policy-making and budgeting. The initiative will be undertaken in collaboration with various partners, including SPREP. The project is in advanced stage of the GCF approval process and is envisaged to run for five years.

**Various support related to NAP formulation:** The support needs for developing NAPs were discussed and identified as; vulnerability assessment, identification of adaptation options and how to prioritise those options.

**Pacific Community of Practice (COP):** A representative from Tonga proposed to create a Facebook group to keep the discussion started during the workshop going, amongst the 14+1 countries and the various resource people. Facebook is the medium of choice because it is widely utilised amongst participants

---

### *Supplementary information*

For more information and to download materials, photos, videos and presentations highlighting country advances, challenges and support needs for appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options for NAPs during the three-day workshop, please visit:

<http://globalsupportprogramme.org/pacific2018>

---

## ANNEX

### ANNEX 1: Agenda

Day 1: Monday 28 May 2018		
Time	Session/Topic	
08h30 – 09h00	Registration	
<b>Session 1: Welcome and introduction</b>		
09h00 – 10h00	Welcoming and opening remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tagaloa Cooper, Director CCRP, SPREP</li> <li>- Umberto Labate, UNDP</li> <li>- Mozaharul Alam, UN Environment</li> <li>- Government of Fiji</li> </ul>	
	Participants introductions	Ana Maria Kleymeyer, UNITAR
	Training background and objectives	Tunnie Srisakulchairak, UN Environment
	Pre-training self-assessment and housekeeping	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
	Introduction to the e-tutorial	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
<b>Session 2: Necessary information for adaptation planning</b>		
<b>Objective: Participants become more familiar with information required for appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options and adaptation planning, and how to use that information</b>		
10h00-10h30	UNFCCC NAP process and how appraisal and prioritisation fits into that process	Motsomi Maletjane, UNFCCC
10h30–11h00	Setting the context: Practical application of the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP): Update on status of adaptation planning in the Pacific	Filomena Nelson, SPREP
	Plenary discussion	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
<b>11h00 – 11h30</b>	<b>COFFEE BREAK – group photo</b>	
<b>Session 3: Preparatory steps for the appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options</b>		
<b>Objective: Participants enhance their understanding of the cross-sectoral linkages relevant for the adaptation planning process, the interests of the different actors involved and the need for an inclusive, participatory process involving all stakeholders in the appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options</b>		
11h30–11h45	Korea's experiences of adaptation planning	Ju Youn KANG, KEI
11h45-12h30	Cross-sectoral links and stakeholder analysis with special emphasis on stakeholder engagement for appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options.	Peter King Tunnie S.
<b>12h30 – 13h30</b>	<b>LUNCH BREAK</b>	
13h30-14h45	Roleplay	Peter King
14h45-15h30	Report back to the plenary	Tunnie S.
<b>15h30 – 16h00</b>	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>	
<b>Session 4: Climate information for decision-making</b>		

<b>Objective: Participants become more familiar with scientific/climate information required for adaptation planning and how to use that information</b>		
16h00 – 17h30	Analysing current climate and future climate change scenarios in the Pacific	Blair Trewin, WMO
	Mapping exercise and feeding into new regional proposal on strengthening climate information from Pacific countries	Jochem Zoetelief, UN Environment
	Plenary discussion and review of the day <i>Five-minute daily assessment</i>	Ana Maria Kleymeyer

**Evening Clinic (19h00-20h00) – Climate information**  
**Jochem Zoetelief, Senior Programme Officer, UN Environment**

<b>Day 2: Tuesday 29 May 2018</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Session/Topic</b>	
09h00 – 09h15	Reflections on Day 1 (what worked, what needs more information/clarification) - <i>Country volunteer to recap</i>	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
<b>Session 5: Assessing climate vulnerabilities and identifying adaptation options</b>		
<b>Objective: Participants enhance their understanding of vulnerability assessment and how that helps to appraise and priorities adaptation options</b>		
09h15 – 10h45	Approaches for assessing climate vulnerabilities in identifying and categorising adaptation options	Peter King Tunnie S.
	Exercise	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
<b>10h45 – 11h00</b>	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>	
<b>Session 6: Appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options</b>		
<b>Objective: Participants understand the advantages and disadvantages of several appraising and prioritisation tools</b>		
11h00 – 11h20	Presentation on appraisal tools – part 1: - Barrier analysis - Multi-criteria analysis (criteria weights / weights and indicators / group perceptions / questionnaire / nominal group methods)	Lucy Naydenova, UN Environment
11h20 – 11h40	Case study: a programmatic approach to Flood Management GCF and GEF-funded projects in Samoa	Yvette Kerslake, UNDP
11h40 – 12h30	Breakout group and exercise: Four groups of ten national participants Breakout group proposed agenda - Theory behind the tool - Country experience - Exercise Group 1 Barrier analysis Group 2 Barrier analysis Group 3 Multi-criteria analysis Group 4 Multi-criteria analysis	Ana Maria Kleymeyer  Lucy Naydenova Peter King Ju Youn KANG Mozaharul Alam
<b>12h30 – 13h30</b>	<b>LUNCH BREAK</b>	
13h30 – 15h30	Breakout groups continued	Ana Maria Kleymeyer



15h30 – 16h00	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>	
16h00 – 17h00	Report back to the Plenary and review of the day <i>Five-minute daily assessment</i>	Ana Maria Kleymeyer

**Evening Clinic (19h00-20h00) – Peter King**

Day 3: Wednesday 30 May 2018		
Time	Session/Topic	
09h00 – 09h15	Reflections on Day 2 (what worked, what needs more information/clarification)	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
<b>Session 6: Appraisal and prioritisation of adaptation options (continued)</b>		
<b>Objective: Participants understand the advantages and disadvantages of several appraising and prioritisation tools</b>		
09h15 – 09h30	Gender considerations in project appraisal and prioritisation Case study	Catherine Hill
09h30 – 10h30	Discussion on integration of gender and other considerations such as human rights and indigenous people in appraisal and prioritisation	Catherine Hill
<b>10h30 – 11h00</b>	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>	
11h00 – 11h20	Overview presentation on appraisal and prioritisation tools	Mozaharul Alam
11h20 – 11h40	Case study: the Choiseul Integrated Climate Change Programme (CHICCHAP) – an integrated approach to adaptation that has been implemented in the Solomon Islands.	Lisa Buggy, SPC
12h00 – 12h30	Breakout groups: Four groups of ten national participants Breakout group proposed agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Theory behind each tool</li> <li>- Case study/application of each tool</li> <li>- Exercise</li> </ul> Group 1 Cost-effective analysis Group 2 Cost-effective analysis Group 3 Cost benefit analysis Group 4 Cost benefit analysis	Ana Maria Kleymeyer  Lucy Naydenova Herman Timmermans, SPREP Lisa Buggy Ali Akram, UNDP
<b>12h30 – 13h30</b>	<b>LUNCH BREAK</b>	
13h30 – 15h30	Exercise continued	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
<b>15h30 – 16h00</b>	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>	
16h00 – 17h00	Report back to the plenary	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
17h00 – 18h00	Discussion on experience with applying appraisal and prioritisation tools in the Pacific region and way forward	Sefanaia Nawadra, UN Environment
18h00-18h15	Review of the Day	Ana Maria Kleymeyer

**Reception dinner hosted by Korea Environment Institute (KEI)**

Day 4: Thursday 31 May 2018		
Time	Session/Topic	
09h00 – 12h00	Field trip: Aviva Farm	SPREP
<b>12h00 – 13h00</b>	<b>LUNCH BREAK</b>	
<b>Session 7: Panel discussion on emerging issues for adaptation planning</b>		
<b>Objective: Participants understand some key emerging issues for adaptation planning</b>		
13h00 – 14h30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Climate information</li> <li>- Human settlements/migration</li> <li>- Agriculture Ana Tiraa, FAO</li> <li>- Ecosystems based adaptation (EbA)</li> <li>- Private sector engagement</li> <li>- Insurance</li> <li>- Relocation</li> </ul> <p>Partners with relevant experience and expertise will share experience, stimulate thinking and provide suggestions if countries have interests in developing adaptation measures for these emerging issues.</p>	Blair Trewin, WMO Mahym Orazmuhamedova, IOM Ana Tiraa, FAO Tunnie Srisakulchairak Umberto Labate, UNDP Motsomi Maletjane, UNFCCC Hanna Sabass, GIZ  Moderated by Mozaharul Alam
<b>14h30 – 15h00</b>	<b>COFFEE BREAK</b>	
<b>Session 8: Panel discussion on project selection and country-driven processes</b>		
<b>Objective: Participants understand importance of applying appraisal and prioritisation tools, how various sources of support prioritise and appraise adaptation projects and how to make this a more effective country-driven process through improved adaptation planning.</b>		
15h00 – 16h30	Country presentation: Tonga (10 minutes) Country presentation: Samoa (10 minutes) Topics to be covered include (i) How Pacific island countries coordinate external support (ii) How technical assistance is made available (e.g. Regional Technical Support Mechanism); (iii) How donor pipelines are prepared with country input; (iv) How all infrastructure projects now need to be climate proofed; (v) Possible sources of funding for adaptation (including climate proofing).	Dr Hoon CHANG, KEI Motsomi Maletjane, UNFCCC Jason Spensley and Orville Grey, GCF (via Skype) Hanna Uusimaa, ADB (via Skype) Ms. Joeteshna, Zeno, Development Assistance Specialist at the U.S. Embassy in Suva, USAID Litea Biukoto, WB  Moderated by Peter King
<b>Session 9: Review and closing</b>		
16h30 – 17h30	Workshop review	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
	Participants feedback (plenary statements) and post-training self-assessment	Ana Maria Kleymeyer
	Certificate award ceremony Closing remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dr. Hoon Chang, Director of KACCC</li> <li>- SPREP</li> <li>- Mozaharul Alam</li> </ul>	UN Environment and UNDP

**Annex II – Include Umberto’s summary graph of the pre and post assessment excel sheet .**