

Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Report

Holiday Inn Hotel, Suva, Fiji 02 -03 October, 2017



SPREP
9-28-2017

Contents

Acknowledgements	6
Executive Summary.....	7
Introduction	12
Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Opening	13
Session 1: Overview of the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP).....	13
Session 2: Country Priorities, Lessons Learned and Challenges	14
Adaptation.....	14
Mitigation.....	15
Knowledge Management.....	17
Loss and Damage.....	17
Resource Mobilisation.....	18
Session 3: Emerging Priorities and Opportunities	19
Pacific Islands Leaders Forum Communiqué.....	19
Pacific Meteorological Council and Honiara Ministerial Statement.....	19
UN Oceans Outcomes	20
Paris Agreement	20
Sustainable Development Goals	20
Pacific Climate Change Centre.....	21
Tuvalu Pacific Islands Climate Change Insurance Facility.....	22
PCRAFI Facility.....	23
Day Two: Summary of Proceedings	23
Recap of Day One	23
Pre-Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Feedback Survey Results	23
Session 4: Breakout Sessions for the PCCR Thematic Working Groups.....	24
Session 5: Report back to plenary: Updates from the Working Groups	24
Loss and Damage Working Group.....	24
Adaptation Working Group	25
Knowledge Management Working Group.....	25
Mitigation Working Group	26
Resource Mobilisation Working Group.....	27
Session 6: Climate Finance	28
Session 7: Turning Climate Science into Services, Products and Decisions.....	32
Session 8: Preparations for COP 23.....	33
Session 9: Outcome Statement for the Joint Platform.....	33

Annex 1: Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Outcome Statement..... 34

Annex 2: PEBAACC Side Event 36

Annex 3: Agenda 37

Annex 4: Participants List..... 42

List of Acronyms

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AF	Adaptation Fund
AFAC	Australasian Fire and Emergency Service Authorities Council
BMUB	German Government Federal Ministry of Environment and Buildings
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCDRM	Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management
CDCRM	Community Disaster and Climate Risk Management Programme
COP	Conference of the Parties
COP21	21st session of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties
COP23	23rd session of the UNFCCC Conference of the Parties
COSPPac	Climate and Ocean Services Program in the Pacific
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
CSO	Community Sector Organisation
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EbA	Ecosystem-based Adaptation
EDF	European Development Fund
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ENSO	El Niño–Southern Oscillation
EU	European Union
EU-GCCA	European Union – Global Climate Change Alliance
EWS	Early Warning Systems
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FRDP	Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific
FSM	the Federated States of Micronesia
GCCA: PSIS	Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFCS	Global Framework for Climate Services
GHG	Green House Gas
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ICZM	Integrated Coastal Zone Management
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IMO	International Maritime Organization
INDC	Intended Nationally Determined Contributions
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JNAP	Joint National Action Plan
KM	Knowledge Management

KMWG	Knowledge Management Working Group
LDWG	Loss and Damage Working Group
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
MECDM	Solomon Islands Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology
MHEWS	Multi-Hazard Early Warning Systems
MNRE	Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSP	Marine Spatial Planning
MWG	Mitigation Working Group
NAMA	Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Options
NAPA	National Adaptation Programs of Action
NCCCT	National Climate Change Country Team
NDC	Nationally Determined Contributions
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NEMS	National Environment Management Strategies
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NIE	National Implementing Entity
NIWA	New Zealand Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research
NMS	National Meteorological Service
PACCSAP	Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning
PCCC	Pacific Climate Change Centre
PCCP	Pacific Climate Change Portal
PCCR	Pacific Climate Change Roundtable
PCCSP	Pacific Climate Change Science Program
PCDF	Partners in Community Development Fiji
PCRAFI	Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative
PDNA	Post Disaster Needs Assessment Sendai Framework Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015 – 2030
PEBACC	Pacific Ecosystems-based Adaptation to Climate Change
PFM	Public Finance Management
PHP	Pacific Humanitarian Platform
PHP	Pacific Humanitarian Platform
PIANGO	Pacific Island Association of Non-Governmental Organisations
PICAN	Pacific Island Climate Action Network
PICOF	Pacific Islands Climate Outlook Forum
PIEMA	Pacific Islands Emergency Management Alliance
PIFACC	Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PIGGAREP	Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project
PIPSO	Pacific Island Private Sector Organisation
PMC	Pacific Meteorological Council
PRP	Pacific Resilience Partnership
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
RTSM	Regional Technical Support Mechanism

RTSM	Regional Technical Support Mechanism
SAMOA Pathway	SIDS Accelerated Modalities Of Action Pathway
SCOPIC	Seasonal Climate Outlooks for Pacific Island Countries
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SIDS	Small Islands Developing States Environment Programme
SOE	State of Environment
SPC	Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TC	Tropical Cyclone
TSF	Tuvalu Climate Change and Disaster Survival Fund of Tuvalu Survival Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment
UNESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USP	University of the South Pacific
WASH	Water, sanitation and hygiene
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WWF	Worldwide Fund for Nature

Acknowledgements



The Pacific Climate Change Roundtable 2017 was made possible with the collaborative support, coordination and financial assistance of the following key partners:

- Federal Republic of Germany Foreign Office
- Government of Australia
- CSIRO
- The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)

The success of the PCCR belongs with the participants which represented Pacific island government focal points, national and sub-national government representatives, key stakeholders including civil society, non-government organisations, private sector and those integrated across cross-cutting sectors involved in climate change and resilient development in the region.

The 2017 PCCR will be the last such meeting in its current format and will be succeeded in 2018 by the Pacific Resilience Meeting. Acknowledgment of the Government of Switzerland is duly noted for its past generous support towards the PCCR from 2008 to 2015.

Executive Summary

1. The Pacific Islands Framework Action on Climate Change (2006-2015) was the regional climate change policy endorsed by Pacific Leaders in 2005. The Framework's vision was "Pacific island people, their livelihoods and the environment are resilient to the risks and impacts of climate change".
2. In 2015 the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR) sought to share 'lessons learnt' as well as what is 'new and unique' to ensure the region's smooth transition to the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2017-2030 (FRDP) and its implementation approved by Pacific Leaders in 2016.
3. The lessons learned from the PCCR process has been incorporated in the body of knowledge guiding the implementation of the FRDP through the Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP). Therefore the 2017 PCCR aimed to enhance participants understanding of the new FRDP and its PRP and to provide guidance on the transition of the PCCR Working Groups under the Framework.

Overview of the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific

4. Key messages of the FRDP include:
 - a. Framework is to enhance resilience for sustainable development and is complementary to the SDGs;
 - b. Advocating integration of action wherever possible as there is an overlap between disaster risk and climate change;
 - c. Mainstreaming CCDRM into sectors and development processes;
 - d. Genuine and active stakeholder participation inclusive of a human rights approach; and
 - e. Advocates for an inclusive approach to climate resilience and disaster risk approach.
5. Implementation of the FRDP is through the Pacific Resilience Meeting which shall include a Taskforce of multi-stakeholders. The FRDP through the Forum Leaders leads the resilience agenda and enables engagement of existing governance mechanisms through the CRGA and SPREP Meeting. The practical work for the FRDP is to be undertaken by technical working groups.
6. It was noted that the monitoring process is a very important part of the work and should not create additional reporting requirements but will align with reporting requirements of the Paris Framework and Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction. In addition there is a mechanism for reporting to Pacific Leaders.
7. The PRP is a means to connecting existing governance structures, technical knowledge sharing and advancing priorities. There will also be specific working groups which may build on from PCCR working groups. The key issue is about connecting, coordinating, collaborating ensuring development partners consider joint funding, sharing knowledge, and reporting.
8. The Forum Secretariat noted the FRDP identifies actions, and provides guidance that will support existing actions rather than being top-down. While the FRDP has been endorsed by Pacific Leaders, voluntary means not imposed upon countries but rather a guide that will evolve.

9. Tokelau requested clarification as to whether the PCCR will still exist and how the FRDP will address the fact that Sendai and Paris are entirely separate processes. Also greater clarity was requested on low carbon aspects of the FRDP. The Forum Secretariat responded that the FRDP is not about negotiating positions, the objective is to support national decisions and positions not override them. No other region has sought to bring these two policy areas into a single framework to encourage regional initiatives and support for national implementation. The FRDP is about building partnerships rather than building a single negotiating position vis-à-vis global policy frameworks.
10. On the FRDP goal two low carbon development, this is one area where more work is needed and it is not expected to replace the existing energy strategy.
11. With respect to the existing round tables for the DRM Platform and the PCCR they will cease to exist. The Pacific Resilience Meeting will bring together the DRM Platform and PCCR, as well as finance and others areas of work in a single forum with the first meeting to convene in 2018.

Pre-Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Feedback Survey Results

12. The results of the five question survey were shared, which aimed to provide a snapshot of country preferences and priorities for the 2017 PCCR agenda and for direction from countries and partners on the transition of the PCCR to the FRDP/PRP. All of the respondents were government representatives and the majority had participated in previous PCCR. The majority of respondents viewed the working group break-out sessions as the most useful aspect of the PCCR followed by presentations and panel discussions.
13. The majority of those surveyed ranked equally of highest priority understanding of the FRDP, its function and how it will be used as a guide in the integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction at the national level; and learning more about climate finance modalities available. The majority of respondents noted preference for the climate change dialogue in the region to continue in the format of a dedicated climate change space and through the existing working groups.

Loss and Damage Working Group

14. The key messages from the LDWG:
 - a. L&D is a critical topic. There is benefit in maintaining the LDWG which has evolved since it was established in 2015.
 - b. There is a lack of understanding around L&D and there is a need for a definition for Pacific islands. Reference was made to the NELD website on what L&D covers.
 - c. LDWG noted their interest in the review and research on the current work on L&D.
 - d. LDWG will also consider the work of other working groups especially mitigation, adaptation and climate finance.
 - e. Explore the development of why it is important for PSIDS.
15. The LDWG recommended:
 - a. L&D is such a critical topic that it should be a technical working group under the PRP.
 - b. As practitioners the LDWG see the benefit of maintaining technical discussions under the PRP.

- c. In the transition phase, a network of practitioners should remain. The LDWG urge SPREP to continue to support it.
- d. The TOR should be revised and developed, including but not limited to:
 - i. Definition including non-economic loss examples from NELD and UNFCCC;
 - ii. Scope of work done including but not limited to the USP pilot project; Tuvalu climate risk insurance; Kiribati overseas land-food security;
 - iii. Develop guidance to support the community of practice; and
 - iv. Identify key issues including climate change finance, risk insurance, migration.

Adaptation Working Group

- 16. The rationale and need for improved connections between disaster risk reduction and adaptation in the context of the FRDP was viewed strongly.
- 17. The AWG noted there was a need for a working group going forward but it would need to focus on the very practical challenges of improving connections between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
- 18. The issue of different funding requirements was acknowledged and whether it was possible for full integration, which may not be desirable. The importance of maintaining DRR and CCA lenses was raised.
- 19. There was a strong focus on national level, practical responses, lesson learning and streamlining.
- 20. It was noted the importance of identifying sub-themes and communities of practice where there is an opportunity to connect climate change adaptation at a practical level.
- 21. The facilitation during the future Pacific Resilience Meeting was viewed with great importance to enable dialogue and share experiences including a common space.
- 22. The AWG agreed that there is work needed to illustrate what better integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction looks like on the ground:
 - a. Streamlined guidance for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
 - b. Guidance on how to navigate the large number of tools and resources that might be relevant when connecting disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
 - c. Use the JNAP implementation plans as an opportunity to share knowledge and ideas.
- 23. The PRP needs to acknowledge the coordination challenges at the national level and provide cross-cutting support on coordination / resource issues to ensure working groups are free to focus on technical issues.
- 24. It was agreed to support the improved use of science and traditional knowledge to inform decision-making including at the sector level.

Knowledge Management Working Group

- 25. The KMWG made the following recommendations:
 - a. KMWG will provide networking and expertise to active membership from interested parties, particularly aiming to include members from the climate data and science,

mitigation and DRR communities as well as sector representatives from e.g. Food Security, Fisheries, Health and Water. Task teams will be formed to implement specific tasks.

- b.** KMWG will provide methods, standards and best practices for voluntary sharing of documents and data, including advice on information sharing needs and requirements.
- c.** It is recommended that the KMWG continues and meets more regularly by means of quarterly video conferences possibly coordinated by SPREP; the KMWG should aim to have at least one annual in-person meeting.
- d.** KMWG recommends ensuring the continued support of partners in maintaining the sustainability of existing portals – through assistance with human resources, capacity building and technical infrastructure on both the national and regional levels.
- e.** KMWG recommends maintaining institutional mechanisms and relationships but to review and potentially adjust existing IKM solutions provided by the CROPs (PCCP & PDN) to ensure they adequately reflect the FRDP and its proposed integration of Climate Change and DRR work.

26. Expansion of the technical working group may include members of the PDM.

27. The importance of climate services was acknowledged.

Mitigation Working Group

28. There are three key sectors of mitigation in the region: energy, waste and forestry. MWG has often focused on energy largely due to representation. It was noted that the energy security framework and climate change framework are complementary. Energy sector focuses primarily on energy security. The FRDP goal two of low carbon development is aligned with the energy security framework. There are challenges in getting waste and forestry sectors engaged as largely CROP coordination group.

29. Disaster in the FRDP will largely focus on risk noting there is room to combine mitigation with disaster. There are also cross-sectoral areas such as waste and forestry, etc. The mitigation components of disaster are cross-sectoral:

- a.** Linkage of biofuels to waste – important, but not much has been done.
- b.** Mitigation section of the FRDP is largely separate from other sections.
- c.** This is the first roundtable that many participants have attended, so are new to meeting and WG.
- d.** Weakness in reporting in regards to forestry and inventories.
- e.** Composition of WGs notes subregional groupings, and space for French territories as well as focusing on technical aspects.
- f.** 2015 priorities – still relevant.

30. Currently there is a lack of integration with waste and forestry and hence a future opportunity.

31. The MWG only meets during the PCCR due to lack of budget, as side meetings are held on the edges of other meetings.

32. It was viewed as important to maintain the current MWG, and further discuss how to include disaster. There is also a need for:

- a.** Task/output orientation
- b.** Continuity of involvement of members
- c.** Need representatives from technical groups, as there are challenges due to nature of meeting which are very broad

- d. MWG members should focus on technical issues, challenges in that meeting representatives are broadly focused
- e. Advancing enabling actions
- f. Guidance regarding priorities and emerging issues
- g. More intercessional meetings

33. The key messages of the MWG:

- a. WGs as a general principle need a cross-sectoral approach
- b. Advise countries in advance of PCCR to allow representatives to be fully briefed
- c. Need for continuation of support and work on mitigation issues, noting short-comings of project based model

Resource Mobilisation Working Group

34. The key messages from the Resource Mobilisation Working Group was noted as follows:

- a. Acknowledged the importance of the work undertaken by the RMWG so far but now seeks an opportunity to engage with higher functions under the PRP structure.
- b. Maintain the existing PCCR format of the resource working group under the two year transition period of the FDRP PRP until more information on the terms of reference of the TWGs are finalised and shared with the group for further discussion in determining the scale and scope of engagement.
- c. TWG membership should be inclusive and selection process should be transparent.
- d. The RMWG will submit a draft terms of reference as its input into the process of developing the terms of reference for the TWG.

35. In the transition period for the PRP the RMWG should remain and continue their work. The name would have to change and reflect climate change and disaster risk management. The main issue however is function.

Outcome Statement

36. At the conclusion of the PCCR the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Outcome Statement was adopted by consensus. As the last meeting of the PCCR the statement would provide guidance and input into the PRP process for implementation of the FRDP.

Introduction

The Pacific Islands Framework Action on Climate Change (2006-2015) was the regional climate change policy endorsed by the Pacific Leaders in 2005. The Framework's vision was "Pacific island people, their livelihoods and the environment are resilient to the risks and impacts of climate change".

In 2015 the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR) sought to share 'lessons learnt' as well as what is 'new and unique' to ensure the region's smooth transition to the new integrated strategy the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2017-2030 (FRDP) and its implementation approved by Pacific Leaders in 2016. The FRDP combines three of the main pillars of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction; the Paris Agreement on Climate Change; and the Sustainable Development Goals – in a region-specific pathway to resilient development.

Much of the lessons learned from the PCCR process has been incorporated in the body of knowledge guiding the implementation of the FRDP through its proposed Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP).

Objectives:

The 2017 PCCR objectives:

1. To share lessons learnt in the context of climate change implementation in the region since 2015 PCCR, and to facilitate discussions on replicating such actions in the Pacific Region;
2. Raise awareness of climate change officials and partners on the approved FRDP and its PRP; to facilitate discussions and understanding of the PCCR transition arrangements to the FRDP and PRP;
3. Establish baseline information on climate change and disaster risk management activities at the national level and capture best practices approach for replication;
4. Provide a platform for information exchange on key regional and international outcomes on climate including the Paris Agreement and disaster related initiatives.

Outcomes:

1. Sharing lessons learned from Climate Change work in the Pacific Region. Awareness of processes and tools used in successful adaptation and mitigation projects and how to be replicated in new activities.
2. Clear understanding of the new FRDP and its PRP.
3. Guidance on the transition of PCCR Working Groups under the FRDP Pacific Resilience Partnership.
4. Awareness and understanding of new initiatives and opportunities to build capacity to access climate change finance.

The PCCR 2017 outcomes fed into the Joint Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and Platform for Disaster Risk Management Meeting 2017 which served as a landmark meeting that confirmed the region as a global leader of coherent and integrated development. The combined roundtable/platform theme 'Pathways to a Resilient Pacific' focused on the lessons learned and opportunities towards the implementation of the FRDP.

Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Opening

1. The Pacific Climate Change Roundtable 2017 opened with a prayer from Pastor Salesi Koroi. Opening remarks were delivered by Mr. Kosi Latu, Director General of SPREP; the Honorary Consul of Germany Mr. David Vaughan Aidney and the Permanent Secretary for Local Government, Housing and Environment for the Government of Fiji Mr. Joshua Wycliffe.
2. The Director General of SPREP acknowledged the Government of Fiji as the host of the meeting and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for the generous financial support provided to the PCCR. The Director General highlighted the PCCR as a meeting for climate change practitioners to share experiences and lessons learnt. The meeting provides an opportunity to consider how the PCCR can feed into the implementation of the FRDP and the specific role it will play for the Pacific that integrates climate change and disaster risk reduction efforts in the region.
3. The Honorary Consul of Germany, Mr David Vaughan Aidney noted the significance of the PCCR as an important regional climate change meeting for the Pacific. Gratitude was conveyed to SPREP for the preparation and organisation of the PCCR and the significance of the outcomes for the region in the lead up to COP23 with the Government of Fiji as the incoming President of COP.
4. The Permanent Secretary for Local Government, Housing and Environment and Chair of the meeting Mr. Joshua Wycliffe called upon delegates to address climate change resilience in the spirit of cooperation, in order to preserve the region's unique cultural identity and its peoples' livelihoods that are deeply intertwined with the Pacific's environmental assets. The Chair encouraged delegates to use the PCCR platform of climate change dialogue to demonstrate partnerships for climate action.
5. It was noted the FRDP is a mechanism to achieve important climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction goals for the region, and is an example of Pacific countries proactively developing strategies for the region. The Chair concluded that 2017 is a significant year for the region as it is the first time that a Pacific small island developing state will lead the COP and encouraged all Pacific countries to support Fiji in the spirit of sailing towards a climate friendly future in one Pacific canoe.

Setting the Scene

6. A brief overview was provided on the expectation of the PCCR and the thematic work that had been undertaken since the last PCCR in 2015.

Session 1: Overview of the Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific

7. Dr. Scott Hook of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat provided an overview of the FRDP. Pacific Leaders endorsed the FRDP in 2016 as the successor agreement to the PIFACC and the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action (RFA). The FRDP provides voluntary guidance on climate change and disaster risk management and facilitates engagement at the national level including the sharing of lessons learnt.
8. Key messages of the FRDP include:
 - a. Framework is to enhance resilience for sustainable development and is complementary to the SDGs;
 - b. Advocating integration of action wherever possible as there is an overlap between disaster risk and climate change;

- c. Mainstreaming CCDRM into sectors and development processes;
 - d. Genuine and active stakeholder participation inclusive of a human rights approach; and
 - e. Advocates for an inclusive approach to climate resilience and disaster risk approach.
9. Implementation of the FRDP is through the Pacific Resilience Community Meeting which shall include a Taskforce of multi-stakeholders. The FRDP through the Forum Leaders leads the resilience agenda and enables engagement of existing governance mechanisms through the CRGA and SPREP Meeting. The practical work for the FRDP is to be undertaken by technical working groups.
 10. RMI sought advice on implementation of activities on the ground in terms of capturing what countries are doing, the monitoring processes and whether they can expect more from the FRDP. It was noted the monitoring process is a very important part of the work and they should not create additional reporting requirements but will align with reporting requirements of the Paris Framework and Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction. In addition there is a mechanism for reporting to Pacific Leaders.
 11. Niue requested more insight into what the PRP entails. The Forum Secretariat responded that the PRP is a means to connecting existing governance structures, technical knowledge sharing and advancing priorities. There will also be specific working groups which may build on from PCCR working groups. The key issue is about connecting, coordinating, collaborating (ensuring development partners consider joint funding), sharing knowledge, and reporting.
 12. FAO sought clarification on what the term 'voluntary' means with respect to the FRDP. The Forum Secretariat noted the FRDP identifies actions, and provides guidance that will support existing actions rather than being top-down. While the FRDP has been endorsed by Pacific Leaders, voluntary means not imposed upon countries but rather a guide that will evolve.
 13. Tokelau requested clarification as to whether the PCCR will still exist and how the FRDP will address the fact that Sendai and Paris are entirely separate processes. Also greater clarity was requested on low carbon aspects of the FRDP. The Forum Secretariat responded that the FRDP is not about negotiating positions, the objective is to support national decisions and positions not override them. No other region has sought to bring these two policy areas into a single framework to encourage regional initiatives and support for national implementation. The FRDP is about building partnerships rather than building a single negotiating position vis-à-vis global policy frameworks.
 14. On the FRDP goal two low carbon development, this is one area where more work is needed and it will not replace the existing energy strategy.
 15. With respect to the existing round tables for the DRM Platform and the PCCR they will cease to exist. The Pacific Resilience Meeting will bring together the DRM Platform and PCCR, as well as finance and others areas of work in a single forum with the first meeting to convene in 2018.

Session 2: Country Priorities, Lessons Learned and Challenges

Adaptation

16. An update of the PCCR Adaptation Working Group was provided by Mr. Espen Ronneberg, SPREP Climate Change Adviser. Highlights included:

- a. The Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) project completed in 2015. 'PACC experiences' provided outputs in more accessible format. As a result of the PACC work has taken place developing further projects in the region. A number of countries have been developing concepts. Examples from Micronesia climate-proofing (critical infrastructure) and (climate services) were provided.
- b. The increasing recognition of the role of ecosystem based adaptation in building resilience.
- c. A brief update on the Pacific Climate Change Portal including the development of Climate Adaptation Tool and plans for a visualisation tool.
- d. The Adaptation Working Group recommendations from 2015 which have nearly been all actioned.

Adaptation: Country Presentation from Tonga

17. National experiences on adaptation were presented by Mr. Robert Vivili, EU GIZ Project Officer through an overview of various projects being implemented in Tonga which included specific insights on Coastal Protection Trials Project in Western Tongatapu and the Joint National Action Plan II (JNAP).
18. The Coastal Protection Trials Project focussed on six low lying villages where coastal inundation is a major problem. Two worst affected villages were the initial focus. In these locations adaptation measures were developed to combine hard and soft adaptation interventions (drainage, flushing, green belt, sandbags).
19. The key lessons learnt included:
 - a. The importance of community ownership;
 - b. Targeted education programmes in the vicinity proved valuable;
 - c. Establishment of a single community committee a useful single point for engagement; and
 - d. That consistent contact and engagement with communities is essential.
20. The challenges of the Coastal Protection Trials Project included: land ownership issues; lack of local expertise; time frame delays; the political climate; having to clean up communities' own effort to construct a sea wall; the removal of coastal forest and mangrove; sand mining; and unplanned development in high risk locations.
21. Tuvalu asked how the EIA processes affected the project implementation. It was noted that the EIA was undertaken on the project site. It was acknowledged there will be impacts such as on the surrounding shell fish, localised loss on mangrove habitat. These issues however will be factored into the sea wall design. For the four other villages a combination of a green buffer (likely to be mangrove) and groynes will be used. Land issues also still need to be resolved.

Adaptation: Tonga Joint National Action Plan II

22. The process of developing the JNAP highlighted the need for continued engagement with civil society. Some of the challenges included finding national entry points, limited human and finance resources and issues of coordination and communication. The need for improved engagement of the private sector was emphasised as well as targeted communications to the private sector.

Mitigation

23. Mr. Solomon Fifita, Manager of the Pacific Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency (PCREEE), for SPC provided an update on work in the mitigation field by highlighting the role of low carbon development in the FRDP and the Framework for Action on Energy Security in the

Pacific, as well as the current status of mitigation progress in the region and key decisions which are likely to influence progress.

24. It was noted that mitigation is a key part of the FRDP under goal two on low carbon development. The FRDP identifies 35 'low carbon development' key actions. SPC illustrated the range of approaches used to provide a baseline of NDC progress at the national level. These reveal a wide range of metrics and methods across Pacific countries as well as different target years being applied. The PICs NDC commitments were also illustrated. These suggest that considerable funding will be needed to reach these renewable energy targets.
25. Improvements in access to electricity and grid connection levels were illustrated. Affordability of electricity spiked in 2012 but has now stabilised. Fossil fuel prices have also reduced since 2012. Some significant increases in the contribution of renewable energy as a proportion of all energy produced is evident for some smaller islands.
26. The key outcomes of the 3rd Pacific Regional Energy Ministers Meeting were used to show the key regional decisions that will influence regional energy/NDC approaches. More specifically, the Ministers:
 - a. Reaffirmed the need for high ambition
 - b. Acknowledged the commitment of the region to demonstrate leadership
 - c. Endorsed the vision for 100% renewable energy generation for the region
 - d. Acknowledged the pivotal role of the energy and transport section in the sustainable development and their contribution to GHG emissions.
27. It was highlighted that in Europe and the Caribbean regional mitigation targets had been established which might be of relevance to the Pacific. Discussions highlighted mixed views on the issue of regional targets and the appropriateness of such an approach in the Pacific. The key role of the private sector was also highlighted.
28. On mitigation, the role of a regional target was mentioned and further information on this was requested by Tuvalu. Fiji further noted that at the national level there needs to be better understanding of what the real issues and challenges are that each country faces in monitoring mitigation targets first before exploring the issue of regional targets. SPC responded that within the context of climate change negotiations the issue of 'one (regional) voice' has often been expressed at the leadership levels and this is where the single target comes from. As there are NDCs for many countries, even with differences in metrics and dates, the Pacific Community views that a single target can be developed for Ministerial endorsement.
29. Fiji stressed the significance of HFCs in meeting NDCs. SPC agreed that the NDCs need to be broken down by the emissions sources.
30. Tokelau noted that there is a need to pay close attention to shipping emissions. Tokelau is currently undergoing this process which they acknowledged the challenges of quantifying sectoral emissions. Tokelau elaborated on the ICAO resolution which highlighted the need for a global market based target for reducing emissions in the airline sector. This resolution stated the need for a voluntary carbon offsetting scheme whereby participants (airlines) offset on specific routes. This may present an opportunity for the Pacific to benefit from renewable energy efforts funded as a consequence of this mechanism. SPC acknowledged transport to be a key sector for considering NDC responses.
31. SPREP informed the meeting they are developing a GEF project to develop MRV systems for national level whereby sectoral targets and objectives might be tracked.

Knowledge Management

32. Mr. Timo Baur of GIZ summarised work on Information Knowledge Management (IKM). GIZ noted the high level of ambition of the Knowledge Management Working Group and the extensive scope of IKM across the region. The wide range of topics covered by IKM for climate change and disaster risk reduction and the very wide range of stakeholders. A starting point for understanding regional IKM issues is to look at the range of networks where information is made available, especially online portals. Portals are regional, national and also exist as outputs of current and expired projects. This means there are a wide range of information sources that need to be connected. One of the challenges is finding the resources and information. These resources need to be integrated and accessible. There are also excellent known data sources which have not yet been connected to portals.
33. Ms. Makelesi Gonevalu of SPREP provided an update on the Pacific Climate Change Portal (PCCP) including:
- a. The development of two decision support tools the climate finance navigator and decision support tool and subsequent user-testing
 - b. National level roll-out of national portals for a further four countries of Fiji, Tonga, Vanuatu and Palau
 - c. Development of IKM guidelines
34. An overview on the development of the Vanuatu national portal was presented on behalf of Vanuatu. The role of the National Portal Starter Pack was highlighted as this enables a consistent template which can then be adapted to specific needs. It was illustrated how they have been able to successfully initiate a system to index and tag information sources to enable connectivity between the PCCR and national portals. In terms of challenges, limited bandwidth in outer Provinces hinders access and remains a challenge, as well as limited capacity to track project progress (M&E).
35. The issue of internet access is an issue for many islands, where solutions are sought. Tuvalu noted with such challenges of access to internet, should portals be the priority for IKM in places where internet is still a significant barrier? Other participants supported Tuvalu in highlighting the issue of communications and internet access. GIZ responded it is a very valid question. Good service needs to consider its users. It may start with a national portal but this should provide a central point for further distribution but it needs to have someone in that paid role.

Loss and Damage

36. Mr. Hudson Kauhiona of Solomon Islands and Dr. Morgan Wairiu of USP jointly presented on research undertaken in the region on loss and damage titled '*Towards climate change resilience: Minimising loss and damage in Pacific SIDS communities*'. The objective of the research to generate and share new knowledge and raise awareness on loss and damage caused by the adverse impacts of climate change in PSIDS. Countries included the Cook Islands, Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Timor Leste. The project components included:
- a. Review of existing knowledge on L&D
 - b. Development of Community L&D Assessment toolkit
 - c. Pilot toolkit in five PSIDs focusing on agriculture & Tourism
 - d. Data and information dissemination
37. The research identified four different perspectives on loss and damage:
- a. **Existential** - L&D is a debate about how to address the inevitable harm climate change will cause for vulnerable populations, cultures and ecosystems.

- b. Limits to Adaption** - L&D refers to climate-related impacts which cannot be avoided through mitigation or adaptation.
- c. Risk Management** - L&D frameworks are an opportunity to promote integrated climate risk management, building on existing efforts under disaster risk reduction, adaptation and humanitarian work.
- d. Adaptation and Mitigation** – All climate change impacts are potential L&D and these can be avoided through mitigation and adaptation

- 38.** Based on the research undertaken Tuvalu sought advice on a definition to be considered for the region. The response noted that there are differing views on loss and damage from the climate change community and the disaster risk management community. At the community level, there is no distinction at the village level about loss and damage relating to climate change and disaster risk management. Continuous monitoring may yield better answers to this particular question.
- 39.** It was noted by Australia and Samoa the 2013 decision on the need for building the technical knowledge and capacity for the work that is needed to be done on loss and damage. It was suggested that SPREP go through that report and see if the loss and damage definition matches that of the 2013 PCCR report.

Resource Mobilisation

- 40.** Mr. Exsley Taloiburi, Climate Finance Adviser of PIFS provided a joint presentation with Mr. Meapelo Maiiai, GEF Support Adviser on resource mobilisation in the region.
- 41.** It was noted the list of accredited entities is available on the GCF website and maybe accessed through the Climate Finance navigator tool as well as the Adaptation Fund website.
- 42.** To date, nine out of 14 PICs have undertaken the PFM assessments etc. The benefit of undertaking the assessment is that it helps to clarify the landscape of national policies and climate financing and also assesses PFM, gender and social inclusion. It is a very comprehensive assessment and can help inform policy decisions and to negotiate with development partners.
- 43.** In terms of support to country NIE applications, CROP agencies such as SPREP would have the capacity to build NIE capacity. It should be noted that the NIE application process is time consuming and costly and does not guarantee improved access to climate finance.
- 44.** Samoa noted the decision taken by the GCF board meeting in July – ‘board taken action to avoid delays in disbursements to approve funding proposals’. Accredited Entities who have signed AMA and FAA can work with countries to prepare future proposals under a two stage proposal option which reduces timeframe by speeding up concept note approval before moving straight to the development of a full funding proposal for Board consideration.
- 45.** New Zealand acknowledged the assistance of partners such as USAID, GIZ etc to support the RTSM. New Zealand informed the meeting that it is involved in helping countries to prepare proposals and workshops including support given for the SPREP PCU.
- 46.** SPREP and UN Environment is collaborating to formulate a regional proposal to the GEF under the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency funding window. This will help countries set up their national monitoring, verification and review procedures/methodology and using tools develop specifically for the Paris Agreement to meet their reporting obligation to the Paris Agreement.
- 47.** The Cook Islands which is an NIE noted that they have recently submitted an AF proposal through MFEM which will be considered in the board meeting in October.

Session 3: Emerging Priorities and Opportunities

Pacific Islands Leaders Forum Communiqué

48. Mr. Exsley Taloiburi, Climate Finance Adviser of PIFS outlined relevant climate change aspects of the 48th Pacific Islands Leaders Forum Communiqué (2017).
- a. Climate change and fisheries to be standing agenda items for Forum Leaders requiring Leaders' close oversight.
 - b. The FRDP partnership arrangements are for a trial period of two years.
 - c. FRDP to be fully elaborated to reflect outcomes of Paris Agreement;
 - d. Reiteration from Leaders that the definition of fragility should be expanded to include vulnerability to climate change which would require close collaboration with agencies, to provide science-based advice.
 - e. Leaders reaffirmed commitment to the Paris Agreement.
 - f. Leaders expressed support towards Fiji's COP 23 Presidency.
 - g. Fiji's five key priorities namely: (i) facilitative dialogue; (ii) implementation guidelines and the Paris Agreement Rule Book; (iii) Gender, local communities and indigenous peoples platform; (iv) Adaptation and loss and damage; and (v) Oceans pathway through 2020 that strengthens the ocean-climate change nexus.
 - h. Urgent, ambitious action from global community to address climate change, including the provision of finance to implement the NDCs, finalising the Paris Agreement Guidelines by 2018, and launching an inclusive process to elaborate the Facilitative Dialogue.
 - i. Recognised the role of the ONE CROP support team for COP23 under technical leadership of SPREP.
 - j. Considered the concept of a PICCIF to cover the impacts of climate change and noted a taskforce would be established to further elaborate the concept.

Pacific Meteorological Council and Honiara Ministerial Statement

49. Mr. David Hiba, of Solomon Islands, and Chair of the PMC presented an update on the recent meeting. The first PMC was held in 1993 in response to a study conducted in 1991 'Changing Climate in Paradise'. The recent PMC in Honiara gave 171 recommendations from which 58 of these were action items.

50. Relevant PMC issues relating to the PCCR include:

- a. Endorsement of the PIMS 2017-2026 (Pacific Islands Meteorological Strategy) with 11 priority areas at the national and regional level; some areas that have been added recently are climate change, hydrology, and oceans, and a linkage to the SDGs (missed one endorsement).
- b. Pacific Climate Change Centre and how it will support meteorological community in the region was discussed –as an opportunity for capacity building which is one of the priorities in the regional strategy.
- c. Endorsed the implementation of the Regional Climate Centre – looking at using climate information.
- d. IPCC emphasised that there is a lack of authors from the region and that the IPCC would like to encourage local focal points to enhance research focus and foster contributions from PICs.
- e. Honiara Ministerial Statement on Sustainable Weather, Climate, Ocean and Water Services recognises the vital importance of national and regional services as stated in the WMO convention.

UN Oceans Outcomes

51. Mr. Taholo Kami provided a brief update on the five priorities of the COP Fiji presidency and the linkages to the UN Ocean Conference which the Government of Fiji co-chaired with the Government of Sweden in June. Oceans remains a major priority – and it is hoped as a long-term legacy for Fiji and the Pacific that within the due processes of the UNFCCC the outcomes of the UN Oceans Conference be acknowledged.
52. Fiji propose an oceans pathway and oceans pathway partnership to enable alliances and platforms on oceans at COP in Bonn. The long term goal is to try and embed oceans work within the negotiation process. At the Pre-COP in October, Fiji will discuss other areas including: oceans and transportation such as sustainable shipping; oceans and the special case for coastal cities, settlements and communities which is usually about reducing emissions but in this context it needs to be emissions, related to ocean health and adaptation; and embedding oceans in the NDCs.

Paris Agreement

53. Mr. Espen Ronneberg, Climate Change Adviser of SPREP noted the ambitious targets of the region leading into COP21 in 2015. Up to eight statements were made within the region in the lead up to COP21. There was a One CROP Team assisting the region in preparation, including negotiations training and development of detailed briefing papers on adaptation, ambitions temperature target, mitigation. NDCs will be updated every five years, and is an opportunity to raise ambition.
54. Flexibility for small islands is built into the Paris Agreement – however it remains to be seen whether and how this will be leveraged. Countries in the region have been saying they want to take active roles in mitigation and adaptation. Global Stocktake is an important element under the new regime, which allows for periodic overview of how the region is progressing, and potential to enhance ambition. There is also now a global adaptation goal which is not very well defined.
55. Loss & Damage was included in the Paris Agreement, but it has a specific reference that no liability will be considered.
56. On the area of Finance most of the key asks acknowledged – however only recognition of the most valuable rather than specifically SIDS or LDCs.
57. Implications for the region:
- a. Must reduce emissions
 - b. Must develop NDCs
 - c. Must take actions towards resilience; and
 - d. Flexibility provided for SIDS NDCs development, implementation and reporting.

Sustainable Development Goals

58. Mr. Iosefa Maiava, of the Pacific Sub-Regional Office, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) presented on the Pacific Sustainable Development Roadmap which is a map of goals, targets and indicators. Each country, region, sub-region may develop their own pathways within that format.
59. It was acknowledged that the PMC have done a good job for a roadmap on climate services.

- 60. The Pacific Roadmap for Sustainable Development endorsed at the 48th Forum Leaders Meeting provides a narrative and indicator framework of the results that the Pacific want to achieve and how the Pacific want to pursue sustainable development.
- 61. The Pacific's four yearly report on sustainable development focused on the cross-cutting issue of climate change and disaster risk management and oceans; non communicable diseases and cervical cancer; and poverty reduction.
- 62. It was emphasised the importance of linking with the greater Asia region on common issues such as plastics and oceans.

Pacific Climate Change Centre

- 63. Mr. Roger Cornforth, SPREP Director General provided a brief overview of the PCCC to be built at SPREP as a follow-up to PALM5. The PCCC will be a regional resource and a potential place to support the PRP under the FRDP. The Government of Japan which will build the PCCC through bilateral grant aid to the Government of Samoa in 2018 is also providing funding support for capacity building which will be conducted in the PCCC once construction is completed in 2019.
- 64. The Chair (Fiji) noted the reference of the PCCC as a conduit for climate change activities in the region and venue to support the FRDP, and potential partnerships as a Centre of Excellence. The Chair (Fiji) encouraged participants to share the concept of the PCCC with governments as a Centre of Excellence for the Pacific that will be accessible for the region.

GCCA Plus

- 65. Mr. Adrian Nicolae, from the EU Delegation for the Pacific provided an overview of EU support for the region. At the global level, the GCCA+ aim is to boost the efficiency of its response to the needs of vulnerable countries and groups. To date, €234 million have been committed to support national programmes. The GCCA supports the mainstreaming of climate change into national development planning. Support is being provided to adaptation programmes in climate-sensitive sectors such as agriculture, coastal zone protection and land and water management. The GCCA is also active in the fields of forest management, disaster risk reduction, and clean energy. New programmes that are in the pipeline include €15 million for Scaling-up Pacific Adaptation Program (SUPA), Intra-ACP GCCA+, and Intra-ACP programme on Climate Services.
- 66. Dr. Gillian Cambers provided insight on the GCCA+ programmes. All programmes adopt from the outset gender sensitivity and private sector engagement. SUPA looked at the impact of past activities, and developed a methodology to evaluate the lasting impact of finished projects which included: Intra-ACP GCCA+ focus on negotiations; FRDP; south-south co-operation; strengthening capacity of regional organisations; involving the private sector; capacity building; innovation and research.
- 67. Tuvalu sought advice on the GCCA+, on the UNESCAP climate migration. Inclusion of Tuvalu and requests for continuation of a second phase, and PCCR phase two. No detailed information as of yet. It was noted that previous GCCA activities will initially be scaled up as an activity in the agriculture sector in the new phase, as guided by the country.
- 68. The Chair (Fiji) sought clarification on whether there is a cap on the cost of scaling up projects that a country can access. Dr. Cambers responded in scaling up, the budget is 100 million for current projects which will not meet that and new projects will just be a start, building on past successes instead of starting new projects and moving towards a sector based and regional approach. SUPA to be finalised by the end of year/first quarter 2018. From the EU side they

want to see absorption capacity for new funds, regulatory frameworks, sustainability, etc. NGOs will be included, especially in the case of the SUPA project.

69. Tokelau urged the inclusion of territories.

Tuvalu Pacific Islands Climate Change Insurance Facility

70. Ms. Pepetua E. Latasi, Department of Climate Change & Disaster Government of Tuvalu provided an overview of the Pacific Island Climate Change Insurance Facility (PICCF). The PICCF initiative was developed by the Government of Tuvalu and presented by the Prime Minister during the signing of the Paris Agreement in New York in 2016 and launched in Istanbul at the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016.

71. The notion of climate change linked to insurance is not new as the 1992 UNFCCC includes a reference to insurance in Article 4.8. The Paris Agreement on Climate Change, Article 8 makes reference to risk insurance facilities, climate risk pooling and other insurance solutions. The Warsaw Mechanism on Loss and Damage which serves the Convention and the Paris Agreement has established a clearinghouse for risk transfer.

72. The role of the PICCF is to gather more information to better serve needs in the region. It is aimed at creating a regional Facility that will be able to investigate and develop risk transfer products to suit the individual needs of Pacific Island countries. Various products will be developed so as to be fit for purpose. It is anticipated the PICCF will develop the following arrangements as:

- a. Index/parametric based risk transfer/insurance scheme
- b. Indemnity insurance
- c. Clearinghouse for product options
- d. Industry monitoring
- e. Coordination

73. Whilst the PICRAFI has been established and it is now operational there are gaps with respect to climate change. The 48th Forum Communiqué considered the concept of the PICCF to cover the impacts of climate change and that a taskforce will be established to further elaborate it.

74. The Chair (Fiji) noted the costs of insurance schemes and the inclusion of the private sector and sought advice as to whether insurance stakeholders had been consulted. It was noted that various private insurance groups had been consulted with feedback and suggestions used to frame the facility.

75. Climate Analytics noted that they are not treating cyclones as natural events anymore and asked how this impacted discussions. Tuvalu responded that the PCRAFI covers natural disasters and that cyclones are being influenced by climate change and has been noted by the IPCC, which is an important area to support.

76. Tokelau referenced evidence based on the review of storm intensity and the need for a good baseline as current results are skewed by the differences between US and Australia cyclone intensity observations (1 minute vs. 10 minute average wind speeds). In terms of costs the amount of damages have gone up due to the nature of development, and lack of data which makes it hard to quantify impacts, especially lack of data regarding storm surge, etc. Attributions and challenges therein. Tuvalu responded that there are gaps in the PCRAFI and there is an urgent need to address the issue now, noting that work is ongoing.

77. On the PCRAFI Samoa noted there are complications because of barometric issues as some countries do not meet the thresholds and hence have pulled out. There is a need for evidence and other ways to quantify aside from barometric pressure.
78. FSM sought advice on what the premiums would be for countries. It was noted that it would depend on what a country would like to insure, and that they are still working on appropriate indexes and options. It was acknowledged the difficulties in regards to the cost of high premiums.

PCRAFI Facility

79. Ms. Litea Biukoto of SPC provided a presentation on the PCRAFI Facility which is a multi-country risk pool for Pacific Island Countries, which offers 5 PICs \$38 million in tropical cyclone, earthquake, and tsunami coverage. One of the key issues regarding the timeline and development of the facility was the need to understand what the region were insuring against and how to quantify them. It was acknowledged the importance of evidence to support decisions such as the collection of data on topography, where people live, agriculture etc.
80. The PCRAFI does not treat climate change separately. There have been payouts for Tonga in 2014 for Tropical Cyclone Ian of US\$1.27 million and in 2015 Tropical Cyclone Pam in Vanuatu of US\$ 1.9 million. Key aspects of the PCRAFI is the Institutional capacity building on hazard and exposure database and development of disaster risk insurance products that cover frequent events and catastrophic events.

Day Two: Summary of Proceedings

Recap of Day One

81. Mr. Espen Ronneberg, Climate Change Adviser provided a recap of Day One of the PCCR as follows:
- a. Recognised the importance and significance of the presidency role of Fiji for COP23 and for the Pacific region.
 - b. Noted the importance of ongoing data collection to provide sound scientific evidence to inform policy and decision making.
 - c. Acknowledged the importance of development partners to address the challenges of climate change resilience in the Pacific.
 - d. Expressed deep appreciation to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for their support of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable.
 - e. Noted the vast body of knowledge and expertise that exists in the Pacific region which has informed decision making and shaped policy.
 - f. Reaffirmed the critical importance of a dedicated forum for the Climate Change Community dialogue to continue for climate action in the Pacific.

Pre-Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Feedback Survey Results

82. Ms. Azarel Mariner-Maiai shared the results of the five question survey which aimed to provide a snapshot of country preferences and priorities for the 2017 PCCR agenda and for direction from countries and partners on the transition of the PCCR to the FRDP/PRP. All of the respondents were government representatives and the majority had participated in previous PCCR. The majority of respondents viewed the working group break out sessions as the most useful aspect of the PCCR followed by presentations and panel discussions.

83. It was noted that the majority of those surveyed ranked equally of highest priority understanding of the FRDP, its function and how it will be used as a guide in the integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction at the national level; and learning more about climate finance modalities available. The majority of respondents noted preference for the climate change dialogue to continue in the format of a dedicated climate change space and through the existing working groups. Respondents to the survey included representatives from American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

Session 4: Breakout Sessions for the PCCR Thematic Working Groups

84. The meeting participants divided into the five thematic working groups with the main objective of discussing the critical issues for transitioning to the PRP.

Session 5: Report back to plenary: Updates from the Working Groups

Loss and Damage Working Group

85. The key messages from the LDWG:

- f. L&D is a critical topic. There is benefit in maintaining the LDWG which has evolved since it was established in 2015.
- g. There is a lack of understanding around L&D and there is a need for a definition for Pacific islands. Reference was made to the NELD website on what L&D covers.
- h. LDWG noted their interest in the review and research on the current work on L&D.
- i. LDWG will also consider the work of other working groups especially mitigation, adaptation and climate finance.
- j. Explore the development of why it is important for PSIDS.

86. The LDWG recommended:

- e. L&D is such a critical topic that it should be a technical working group under the PRP.
- f. As practitioners the LDWG see the benefit of maintaining technical discussions under the PRP.
- g. In the transition phase, a network of practitioners should remain. The LDWG urge SPREP to continue to support it.
- h. The TOR should be revised and developed, including but not limited to:
 - v. Definition including non-economic loss examples from NELD and UNFCCC;
 - vi. Scope of work done including but not limited to the USP pilot project; Tuvalu climate risk insurance; Kiribati overseas land-food security;
 - vii. Develop guidance to support the community of practice; and
 - viii. Identify key issues including climate change finance, risk insurance, migration.

87. Tuvalu noted the proposed revision on the terms of reference particularly the scope of work to be broadened to include the UNFCCC process on L&D.

88. With respect to resourcing it was noted that SPREP was part of the LDWG and was committed to the process.

Adaptation Working Group

89. There was a very positive view on the existing AWG but activity tended to be ad-hoc and reliant on projects and associated resources. It was often viewed as a community of practice as much as a WG. The rationale and need for improved connections between disaster risk reduction and adaptation in the context of the FRDP was viewed strongly.
90. The AWG noted there was a need for a working group going forward but it would need to focus on the very practical challenges of improving connections between disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
91. The issue of different funding requirements was acknowledged and whether it was possible for full integration, which may not be desirable. The importance of maintaining DRR and CCA lenses was raised.
92. There was a strong focus on national level, practical responses, lesson learning and streamlining.
93. It was noted the importance of identifying sub-themes and communities of practice where there is an opportunity to connect climate change adaptation at a practical level.
94. The facilitation during the future Pacific Resilience Meeting was viewed with great importance to enable dialogue and share experiences including a common space.
95. The AWG also considered the best ways to share knowledge outside of the Pacific Resilience Meeting.
96. The AWG agreed that there is work needed to illustrate what better integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction looks like on the ground:
 - d. Streamlined guidance for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
 - e. Guidance on how to navigate the large number of tools and resources that might be relevant when connecting disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
 - f. Use the JNAP implementation plans as an opportunity to share knowledge and ideas.
97. The PRP needs to acknowledge the coordination challenges at the national level and provide cross-cutting support on coordination / resource issues to ensure working groups are free to focus on technical issues.
98. It was also important to allow for a networking aspect of the working group to enable the informal processes.
99. It was agreed to support the improved use of science and traditional knowledge to inform decision-making including at the sector level.

Knowledge Management Working Group

100. The KMWG made the following recommendations:
 - f. KMWG will provide networking and expertise to active membership from interested parties, particularly aiming to include members from the climate data and science, mitigation and DRR communities as well as sector representatives from e.g. Food Security, Fisheries, Health and Water. Task teams will be formed to implement specific tasks.

- g. KMWG will provide methods, standards and best practices for voluntary sharing of documents and data, including advice on information sharing needs and requirements.
- h. It is recommended that the KMWG continues and meets more regularly by means of quarterly video conferences possibly coordinated by SPREP; the KMWG should aim to have at least one annual in-person meeting.
- i. KMWG recommends ensuring the continued support of partners in maintaining the sustainability of existing portals – through assistance with human resources, capacity building and technical infrastructure on both the national and regional levels.
- j. KMWG recommends maintaining institutional mechanisms and relationships but to review and potentially adjust existing IKM solutions provided by the CROPs (PCCP & PDN) to ensure they adequately reflect the FRDP and its proposed integration of Climate Change and DRR work.

101. It was noted with feedback received the expansion of the technical working group may include members of the PDM.

102. Tonga shared their view that there was no place for climate services in the working groups. Climate services is very important and requires recognition. Recommendation when transitioning into the PRP that climate services comes out on its own as it is a big area or be considered as it is deeply involved with the climate change community and the disaster risk management. Climate services needs to have more visibility when talking about resilience.

103. SPREP noted that the PMC is a subsidiary of the SPREP Meeting and has a higher level entry than a technical working group.

104. The importance of climate services was acknowledged.

Mitigation Working Group

105. There are three key sectors of energy, waste and forestry. MWG has often focused on energy largely due to representation. It was noted that the energy security framework and climate change framework are complementary. Energy sector focuses primarily on energy security. The FRDP goal two of low carbon development is aligned with the energy security framework. There are challenges in getting waste and forestry sectors engaged as largely CROP coordination group.

106. The Pacific Energy Advisory Group provides advice in implementation of energy security framework, made up of national and regional organisations, government and private sector. Heads of forestry meeting meet every two years. Clean Pacific strategy and regional waste coordination group.

107. Disaster in the FRDP will largely focus on risk noting there is room to combine mitigation with disaster. There are also cross-sectoral areas such as waste and forestry, etc. The mitigation components of disaster are cross-sectoral:

- g. Linkage of biofuels to waste – important, but not much has been done.
- h. Mitigation section of the FRDP is largely separate from other sections.
- i. This is the first roundtable that many participants have attended, so are new to meeting and WG.
- j. Weakness in reporting in regards to forestry and inventories.
- k. Composition of WGs notes subregional groupings, and space for French territories as well as focusing on technical aspects.
- l. 2015 priorities – still relevant.

- 108.** The outcomes statement from the energy ministers meeting had been noted – including the phasing out of subsidies for fuel.
- 109.** Currently there is a lack of integration with waste and forestry and hence a future opportunity.
- 110.** The MWG only meets during the PCCR due to lack of budget, as side meetings are held on the edges of other meetings.
- 111.** Working groups are useful in establishing key issues, if they are not already there and allows countries to find out what CROP agencies are doing.
- 112.** It was viewed as important to maintain the current MWG, and further discuss how to include disaster. There is also a need for:
- h.** Task/output orientation
 - i.** Continuity of involvement of members
 - j.** Need representatives from technical groups, as there are challenges due to nature of meeting which are very broad
 - k.** MWG members should focus on technical issues, challenges in that meeting representatives are broadly focused
 - l.** Advancing enabling actions
 - m.** Guidance regarding priorities and emerging issues
 - n.** More intercessional meetings
- 113.** The key messages of the MWG:
- d.** WGs as a general principle need a cross-sectoral approach
 - e.** Advise countries in advance of PCCR to allow representatives to be fully briefed
 - f.** Need for continuation of support and work on mitigation issues, noting short-comings of project based model
- 114.** Palau noted the regional and global priorities on oceans and whether it was timely to explore the nexus between oceans and climate change. It was also viewed as relevant to adaptation as well and is gaining traction in the region and globally.

Resource Mobilisation Working Group

- 115.** The key messages from the Resource Mobilisation Working Group was noted as follows:
- e.** Acknowledged the importance of the work undertaken by the RMWG so far but now seeks an opportunity to engage with higher functions under the PRP structure.
 - f.** Maintain the existing PCCR format of the resource working group under the two year transition period of the FDRP PRP until more information on the terms of reference of the TWGs are finalised and shared with the group for further discussion in determining the scale and scope of engagement.
 - g.** TWG membership should be inclusive and selection process should be transparent.
 - h.** The RMWG will submit a draft terms of reference as its input into the process of developing the terms of reference for the TWG.
- 116.** In the transition period for the PRP the RMWG should remain and continue their work. The name would have to change and reflect climate change and disaster risk management. The main issue however is function.
- 117.** It was noted that for the TWG it is very important to have technical experts included.

118. New Zealand noted that as part of the constituency for the GCF Board it welcomed the updates from the working group and taking key issues to the GCF Board on behalf of the region. Priorities should incorporate the views of the constituency and hence must be an inclusive process as espoused in the FRDP.
119. It was also considered important in transitioning to the new PRP to also expand membership to include other sectors.

Session 6: Climate Finance

120. A presentation was shared by Ms. Jean Viliamu of the Ministry of Finance on the experience of Samoa coordinating Climate Finance through the Aid Coordinating Committee. The key purpose to protect the population from climate change impacts. Many development partners provide assistance to Samoa and coordination is critical to ensuring that Samoa complies with different funding requirements and manages contacts with line ministries. It is an opportunity to align donors with country priorities.
121. The Climate Finance Forum was recently held in Samoa which included: USAID Climate Ready; USAID Institutional Strengthening in Pacific Island Countries to Adapt to Climate Change (ISACC); and DFAT/GIZ Climate Finance Readiness for the Pacific.
122. The Government of Samoa manages the development assistance through a coordinated system that connects climate investment funds through the World Bank, GEF, GCF and other donors with MNRE, Land Transport Authority and the Civil Society Support Programme (CCSP).
123. The approach of Samoa has strengthened and mainstreamed coordination; formalised and enhanced institutions; allocated resources efficiently; and strengthened information sharing. Other measures taken include the establishment of the Climate Resilience Investment Coordination Unit in the Ministry of Finance and the Climate Public Expenditure & Institutional Review (CPEIR) was conducted in Samoa in 2012.
124. On sector coordination and civil society integration Samoa noted that coordination at sector level should be managed through steering committees including all stakeholders, development partners, and civil society. For any external funding assistance applicable to the sectors, this would need to be endorsed and approved by the relevant steering committees. There are 30 sectors in Samoa and coordination is critical for ensuring opportunities are captured, coordinated and accounted for. Samoa is also in the process of seeking accreditation to the GCF and AF.
125. Mr. Xavier Matsuro shared the national experiences of Palau in accessing climate finance through two examples of how Palau is developing proposals for submission to the GCF. At the project level a food security concept note with UNDP focused on a marine sanctuary which is integrated with agriculture and aquaculture. At the institutional level the ISACC project and Climate Ready includes assisting staffing of the newly formed Office of Project Management. The function of the office to develop proposals and to conduct M&E. It will also focus on training and technical assistance as well as finalising a manual for the office which is a requirement for GCF accreditation.
126. Key challenges identified: the development of the food security concept note loosely aligned with the Palau climate change policy, appeared more of a development than a climate change project; limited ability to move concept notes forward due to capacity constraints; understaffing and lack of experience of existing staff impacted on the benefits of the

institutional strengthening aspects; and a learning by doing approach as the manual has yet to be finalised.

- 127.** Lessons learnt include: ensure concept note is aligned with national policy and framed accordingly; all moving parts need to work effectively together; and it is important to set minimum competency criteria. On accessing climate finance it is important to have the ability to access GCF nationally which is work in progress. Working with partners is still key and essential to access climate finance; as well as synchronising all moving parts internally and with partners.
- 128.** On the duration of capacity building it was noted the time frame is until 2019. In reference to the ISACC Climate Ready Project representative Ms. Lisa Buggy noted the capacity support by ISACC was identified through consultations at the beginning of the project to ensure added value and that the position was specifically identified by Palau as a priority. Working with other partners to set the groundwork for the project was important and demonstrating to Palau the continued value of the position after the initial funding. The Climate Change Finance Assessment for Palau was recently completed which is an important component in terms of identifying further assistance that can be provided.
- 129.** Mr Andrew Yatilman of FSM shared national experiences in accessing climate change finance. It was noted that the national overseas development assistance policy guides FSM on how to address overseas development assistance. The policy is very broad and not specific to climate finance. Since the GCF became operational it was identified nationally the need for a different or additional mechanism. The Ministry of Finance is the NDA and a linking mechanism has been established. The key challenge is the Ministry of Finance staff have no background on climate change. The Climate Change and Sustainable Development Council now links the work of the different ministries.
- 130.** FSM is a nation of four autonomous states with some reluctance on the side of the states to receive orders from the federal level. Coordination is at the state level and this is a critical challenge.
- 131.** FSM supported SPREP to become an RIE for the AF. FSM took advantage of the AF situation and submitted a proposal for US\$ 10 million which was approved in May 2017. The process for development and assessment of the proposal was long and arduous. National consultations and consultancy inputs to support the development of the proposal were undertaken. The assessment process included technical aspects that had to be addressed, which FSM worked closely with SPREP to address.
- 132.** FSM are now working towards implementation which will commence after the administrative aspects have been completed with the AF and SPREP.
- 133.** The process for the development of the proposal was a burden to FSM noting the limited resources and technical capacity available, especially within the context of smaller countries and territories.
- 134.** SPREP as a partner in the process noted its understanding of the situation and informed the meeting that with the help of New Zealand SPREP is adding two project design specialists to the PCU which will help countries like FSM in the proposal and implementation phases.
- 135.** Mr Exsley Taloiburi, Climate Finance Adviser of PIFS presented on behalf of the GIZ and ISACC and shared the experiences of supporting PICs to strengthen capacity to access climate finance in Palau, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. Key challenge for PICs is there are many players engaging with countries. It was noted that as the global goal approaches to US\$ 100 billion annual funding by the 2020 target many commitments come into place including

reporting requirements. It was noted that 50-60% of climate finance is falling out of national budgets. It is critical for support to be tracked or reported by national coordination bodies.

- 136.** There are tools available and adapted to build readiness to access and manage climate finance. In order to achieve a good outcome there is a need for a whole of government approach.
- 137.** Key observations across the region:
- a. almost all countries have National Adaptation Plans (NAPs), strategies or equivalents;
 - b. key improvement is the development of proper indicators to track progress against NAPs; and
 - c. most all countries have national level climate change or disaster risk management policies but do not clarify specific responsibilities.
- 138.** A good case study is Palau. Consultations and assessment process includes stakeholders raising awareness and ownership of the policy development. Many countries have undertaken reforms to access climate finance and engage with their bilateral partners. However there is a lack of political will to implement PFM roadmaps.
- 139.** There have been several examples in the region of the realignment of national agencies which include MEIDECC in Tonga; MECDM in Solomon Islands; integration into the Ministries of Finance in Samoa and Fiji; and the National Advisory Board on Climate Change in Vanuatu. There are still gaps with regards to horizontal and vertical information sharing at the regional level.
- 140.** Lessons learnt include:
- a. region is accessing finance but amounts not adequate to fully implement and address NDC targets;
 - b. significant portion not tracked;
 - c. 5-8% of expenditure from domestic resource;
 - d. need to develop absorptive capacity to implement large-scale projects such as for the GCF;
 - e. accessing international climate finance still complicated and expensive;
 - f. limited technical capacity to engage with the global climate finance architecture;
 - g. project development and NIE accreditation are costly and time consuming;
 - h. climate funds not directly accessible to NGOs/CSOs and territories; and
 - i. private sector engagement is limited.
- 141.** In response to the lessons learnt a multi-stakeholder response has included joint missions and work plans of the USAID/SPC Institutional Strengthening in Pacific Island Countries to Adapt to Climate Change (ISACC) project; DFAT/GIZ climate finance readiness of the Pacific project; and UNDP Poverty Reduction Policies and Programme (PRPP); as well as the Climate Finance Navigator.
- 142.** Next steps include:
- a. Importance of remaining flexible;
 - b. Building and supplementing capacity must remain a priority;
 - c. Continuing to implement PFM reforms will not only enable fast access to climate finance but benefit broader development goals;
 - d. While pursuing NIE accreditation importance of using existing support in the region; and
 - e. Need to forge public-private sector partnerships.

143. The Cook Islands shared their experience with the AF the SGP was included which allowed CSOs/NGOs to access finance.
144. With respect to policies for vulnerable communities it was noted that it is strongly recommended as a priority. Global funds such as the GCF want countries to demonstrate their gender policy and also their environmental and social safeguards. It is also prioritised in the SDG roadmap approved by Pacific Leaders that countries must report on.
145. Mr. Meapelo Maiai, SPREP GEF Support Adviser presented on the experience and opportunities in accessing finance for the GCF, AF and GEF. It was noted that SPREP has provided support to PICS for accessing climate financing from the GEF, GCF and AF since 1996. SPREP is also an accredited RIE for the AF and GCF.
146. On the GEF it was noted there are specialised funds such as the LDCF or the SCCF that cover mitigation and adaptation specifically. A key challenge is limited country capacity; mandatory co-financing from countries; and some operational focal points are more active than others. There are also other aspects regarding the baseline budget versus incremental costs.
147. With respect to the AF it is open only to NIE and RIE. Issues that can create a challenge are the environmental and social safeguards requirements and the availability of staff.
148. On the GCF it can be complicated navigating templates and requirements; as well as determining country priorities to progress. There are also issues regarding regional coordination, capacity and resources.
149. Opportunities for the GEF include GEF 7 which starts 1 July 2018. There will be LDCF and SCCF funding windows for adaptation and opportunities for blending climate finance. There is an appetite for projects supporting the Blue Economy theme via healthy oceans, sustainable fisheries and economy. There is also a regional project on CBIT reporting to the Paris Agreement.
150. It was noted that adaptation priorities need to be in line with GCF priorities in terms of meeting eligibility criteria.
151. In terms of the phasing of proposals at SPREP the newly established PCU is assisting this area through a project pipeline where every project and proposal needs to be approved by the SPREP senior management. There is however a need to balance this with country requests.
152. Support was requested for countries in the transition phase to an NIE. Assistance required in the form of putting together proposals, templates, workshops for capacity building and what is needed in detail. SPREP noted with other agencies they can assist countries.
153. While much attention had focused on proposal development, it was also expressed the importance of helping countries with implementation which is critical.
154. An online demonstration of the Climate Finance Navigator was presented by Ms. Makelesi Gonelevu, SPREP Knowledge Management Officer. The Climate Finance Navigator is based on Information Knowledge Management (IKM) principles. The tools are the result of a desktop review and consultations in Fiji, Tonga and Vanuatu. The prototype was developed in June 2016 and has gone through testing and scoping since then.

- 155.** During the consultation process feedback included difficulties with distinguishing between entities and finding templates online as well as various and incomplete guidance. Navigation of which tools to use in adaptation was also identified as a challenge.
- 156.** As a follow-up to the Forum Secretariat presentation on capacity building in the area of climate finance USP informed the meeting they are finalising a post graduate diploma in climate finance to be offered in 2018.
- 157.** New Zealand requested advice on how the proposals could be phased to distribute the work load at SPREP and in the region. SPREP responded that a PCU has been established at SPREP to manage the portfolio of work.
- 158.** Tuvalu noted that SPREP has an important role in helping NIE and their respective country perspectives.

Session 7: Turning Climate Science into Services, Products and Decisions

- 159.** Dr. Penehuro Lefale, consultant of Tokelau informed the session that science is embedded in Article 4.1 paragraph g in the UNFCCC. Another key Article is 5 on research and the systematic observations with policy. As an observation, it was shared that officials at the policy level often want immediate answers however the critical issue is data collection for scientists to help inform policy to guide decision making.
- 160.** Mulipola Ausetalia Titimaea, Assistant Chief Executive Officer for Meteorology of MNRE for the Government of Samoa presented on the PACCSAP programme and tools developed. As a priority it is important to train staff to be able to carry out the detailed analyses provided under PACCSAP as well as having the capacity to downscale global models. Good science is critical to understanding climate change impacts on the region. It was also acknowledged the importance of ongoing support for effective communications and for NMHSs to engage with sectoral stakeholders. Samoa Meteorological Services is currently focusing on outreach and developing multi-decadal scales.
- 161.** Mr. Patrick Pringle, Climate Analytics Specialist who is working on the IMPACT Project discussed previous experience working at the science and policy interface and understanding the many challenges involved. The IMPACT Project targets LDC and SIDS representatives from high-level segment to regional experts and aims to improve capacities to cope with the increasing implementation requirements at international, regional and national level and to improve access to international climate finance. The global project is supported by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry and the Pacific component is based at SPREP. The core objectives and target outcomes of the three year project include:
- a.** SIDS and LDCs' capacities to plan and implement science-based climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies at national, regional and international levels are improved.
 - b.** Access to international climate finance to implement climate strategies is improved in SIDS and LDCs.
 - c.** The participation and influence of SIDS and LDC negotiators at the international level (UNFCCC, Paris Agreement, GCF and associated fora) is improved and leads to more ambitious goals and the recognition of the special circumstances of SIDS and LDC.
- 162.** With respect to the Pacific component of the IMPACT project the next steps and emerging outputs include:
- a.** Full time regional presence in the region since Mid-August at SPREP

- b. Detailed regional work plan under development, building on inception workshop and broader consultation
- c. More specific details on 'national level requests' mechanism in progress
- d. Inception workshop in Apia, Samoa in August 2017
- e. Science brief on Climate Change and Cyclones in Caribbean and Pacific
- f. Climate negotiations workshop in Nadi, 12 to 14 October 2017
- g. Support at regional level on adaptation indicators and M&E planned

- 163.** Mr. Philip Marsden, Climate Information Knowledge Specialist with GIZ SPREP presented the iCLIM Decision Support Tool. It was emphasised the importance of shifting from knowledge storage to knowledge applications and tools that can be meaningfully accessed. A demonstration of the tool was presented.
- 164.** An observation was shared from the floor on the similarity between programmes and how much coordination efforts there are especially between PACCSAP and IMPACT. Climate Analytics noted being based at SPREP and through the IMPACT project they are keen to coordinate and not repeat what has been done, but only to add value and identify gaps.
- 165.** WHO emphasised the importance of not reinventing tools, and to make these tools for regional platforms available to other sectors including non-climate change such as health. Samoa noted that in the health sector, much work has been done regarding climate and health in Samoa and the Solomon Islands.
- 166.** The Chair (Samoa) noted the advantages of having policy people in groups based on feedback from earlier discussions on working groups and that there is a broad need for both technical and policy perspectives to be engaged.
- 167.** The partnership between SPREP and CSIRO was shared from the floor which includes rolling out communication tools. Also having Climate Analytics at SPREP enhances the support being provided directly to countries.
- 168.** The session noted that there are uncertainties no matter the best science. The importance of effective communication and the critical role of science to inform policy and decision making, which should be considered in the next steps for the PRP.

Session 8: Preparations for COP 23

- 169.** Due to time constraints a copy of the presentation was to be distributed to participants.

Session 9: Outcome Statement for the Joint Platform

- 170.** The draft outcome statement for the PCCR with amendments was adopted by consensus.
- 171.** The meeting closed with remarks from the Chair (Fiji) and the Deputy Director General of SPREP.

Annex 1: Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Outcome Statement

The Pacific Climate Change Roundtable

Outcome Statement

We, the representatives of and participants from countries and territories in the region, civil society organisations; Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP), other regional and international agencies; and development partners attending the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable in Suva, Fiji 02-03 October, 2017:

1. Recognised the importance and significance of the Presidency role of Fiji for COP23 and for the Pacific region.
2. Expressed deep appreciation to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for their support of the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable 2017.
3. Met to share lessons learned from climate change and related work in the Pacific region.
4. Built awareness of processes, practices and tools used in successful adaptation and mitigation projects which may be replicated in new activities.
5. Have gained greater understanding of the new Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP) and its implementation by the Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP).
6. Recognised and acknowledged the role and value that the PCCR has had as a dedicated forum on climate change to support capacity building, awareness, and understanding, and sharing of lessons learned.
7. Recognised the ongoing need to build capacity to access climate change finance and exchange knowledge on new initiatives and opportunities, and on emerging issues.
8. Noted the importance of ongoing climate monitoring and observation, climate data management, modelling and application to provide sound scientific evidence, information, and its effective communication, to inform policy, decision making and development.
9. Noted the importance of traditional knowledge in supporting the development of appropriate regional climate change actions and engaging with communities.
10. Acknowledged the important roles of countries and communities in addressing the climate change challenges in the Pacific, as well as the collaboration from development partners.
11. Noted the vast body of knowledge and expertise that exists in the Pacific region which has informed decision making and shaped policy.
12. Reaffirmed the importance of supporting work under the themes of Adaptation, Mitigation, Information Knowledge Management, Loss and Damage, and Resource Mobilisation, and noted they have a critical role to ensure the FRDP be fully elaborated to reflect alignment to the Paris Agreement.

Further noted the opportunity to align the themes of the Disaster Risk Management Community with those above and to consider the inclusion of a Climate and Early Warning Services theme.

13. Reaffirmed the critical importance of ongoing dialogue and support to Pacific island countries in climate change, in support of the PRP.
14. Reaffirmed the role of the PRP in bringing together the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable and the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management stakeholders to advance the integration of climate change and disaster risk reduction.
15. Recognised the value of collaborative regional meetings for bringing together climate change stakeholders, particularly Pacific country representatives and acknowledged the support of development partners for these meetings.
16. Reaffirmed the dedication and contribution of Pacific Island countries and territories as well as partners to enhancing climate resilience.

03 October 2017

Annex 2: PEBACC Side Event

1. The Permanent Secretary of Fiji Mr. Joshua Wycliffe gave opening remarks and spoke briefly about the Pacific Ecosystem-based Adaptation to Climate Change Project (PEBACC) and its relevance to development challenges in the Pacific.
2. Mr. Herman Timmermans, Project Manager of the PEBACC Project provided an overview of the Project and noted the project is funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) through the International Climate Initiative (IKI) and highlighted the benefits of ecosystems-based-adaptation (EbA). The EbA approach in communities also recognises external challenges other than climate extreme events. There are eight Staff in the project supporting the six pilot sites in Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. The project will be completing its activities in mid-2020. ESRAMs and detailed implementation plans have been developed. It was acknowledged that the project will not be able to implement all the projects and welcomed other partners who are interested in this area of work to use the tools and documentation developed.
3. Ms. Filomena Serenia, PEBACC-Fiji Officer discussed the project process including collection of information and the prioritisation of activities and costings. Taveuni, Fiji has also been chosen at the site for implementation of the Pacific Ocean Acidification project to support relevant coastal activities.
4. Dr. Tim Carruthers from the Water Institute of the Gulf, Louisiana presented the coastal wave attenuation modelling approach being used in Taveuni to assist Somosomo and Naselesele communities plan ecosystem based adaptation actions to limit shoreline erosion.
5. A representative of the Cakaudrove District, Provincial Council of Taveuni, Mr. Vatili Tiko emphasised that communities are observing changes in their environment, including changes in crop behaviour. They have also observed changes in their rainy and dry seasons. Mr. Tiko acknowledged the efforts of the project by SPREP and the Government of Germany for the funding support.
6. WHO commented that this is a great example that should be promoted to a wider audience. WHO linked this work to observations on the impact of the 2004 tsunamis on the island of Aceh that claimed 250,000 lives. Some of the survivors came from communities with better coastal mangroves on their foreshore.
7. SPC commented on the project and in particular the wave modelling work that SPC is also applying including coastal wave attenuation models in different locations.
8. Tonga commended the project for working with communities and asked if there are opportunities for this to be extended to other countries and if a guideline will be developed. SPREP responded that a guideline is being developed by the IUCN. SPREP also as an RIE to the GCF is submitting a joint proposal worth US\$ 100 million with IUCN to the GCF to extend the project to other countries.

Annex 3: Agenda



Pacific Climate Change Roundtable

Holiday Inn Hotel, Suva, Fiji

2-3 October 2017

PATHWAYS TO A RESILIENT PACIFIC: THE FUTURE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CLIMATE CHANGE COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

The Pacific Islands Framework Action on Climate Change (2006-2015) was the regional climate change policy endorsed by the Pacific Leaders in 2005. The Framework's vision was "Pacific island people, their livelihoods and the environment are resilient to the risks and impacts of climate change".

The 2015 Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR) sought to share 'lessons learnt' as well as what is 'new and unique' to ensure the region's smooth transition to the new integrated strategy - Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP) and its implementation.

Much of the lessons learned from the PCCR process has been incorporated in the body of knowledge guiding the implementation of the FRDP through its proposed Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP). However, there is still scope for the climate change communities of practice (for example the PCCR working groups) that were formed under the PCCR to provide practical views on how best to capitalise on what has already been achieved by these groups.

Objectives:

The 2017 PCCR has the following objectives:

1. To share lessons learnt in the context of climate change implementation in the region since 2015 PCCR, and to facilitate discussions on replicating such actions in the Pacific Region;
2. Raise awareness of climate change officials and partners on the approved Framework for Resilience Development in the Pacific (FRDP) and its Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP); to facilitate discussions and understanding of the PCCR transition arrangements to the FRDP and PRP;
3. Establish baseline information on climate change and disaster risk management activities at the national level and capture best practices approach for replication;
4. Provide a platform for information exchange on key regional and international outcomes on climate (e.g Paris Agreement) and disaster related initiatives.

Outcomes:

5. Sharing of lessons learned from Climate Change work in the Pacific Region. Awareness of processes and tools used in successful adaptation and mitigation projects and how to be replicated in new activities.
6. Clear understanding of the new Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific (FRDP) and its Pacific Resilience Partnership (PRP).
7. Guidance on the transition of PCCR Working Groups under the FRDP Pacific Resilience Partnership.
8. Awareness and understanding of new initiatives and opportunities to build capacity to access climate change finance.

Day 1: Monday 2nd October 2017			
	Agenda Items	Speakers	Guidance and Responsible
8.00 – 9.00	Registration		<u>Coordinator:</u> Azarel Maiai (SPREP)
9.00-9.30	Opening Prayer Welcoming Remarks Opening Remarks	SPREP Director General, Mr. Kosi Latu Honorary Consul of Germany, H.E. David Vaughan Aidney	<u>Coordinator:</u> Espen Ronneberg (SPREP)
9.30-10.00	Introduction Setting the Scene and Presenting an Overview of PCCR Group Photo	All Espen Ronneberg (SPREP)	<u>Coordinators:</u> Espen Ronneberg (SPREP) & Nannette Woonton (SPREP)
10.00-10.30	MORNING TEA		
	Session 1: Overview of FRDP <i>Facilitator: SPREP</i>		
10.30-10.45	Presentation on the FRDP, PRP and Governance Plenary Question and Answer	Scott Hook (PIFS) on behalf of CROP	FRDP, PRP & Governance and Timeline (noting that the potential role of the PCCR WGs will be discussed later) Presentation will be prepared jointly by SPREP, PIFS, SPC, ISDR and USP <u>Coordinator</u> Espen Ronneberg (SPREP)
	Session 2: Country Priorities, Lessons Learned and Challenges <i>Facilitator: Samoa</i>		
10.45-12.00	Progress of the PCCR thematic areas and Country Presentations 1) Adaptation 2) Mitigation 3) Knowledge Management Plenary Question and Answer	1) Espen Ronneberg (SPREP) & Tonga 2) Solomone Fifita SPC & Fiji 3) Timo Baur (GIZ), Makelesi Gonelevu (SPREP) & Salesa Nihmei (SPREP)	This session will include introduction from chair/co-chairs from each of the working groups followed by country presentations. <u>Coordinators</u> Tagaloa Cooper (SPREP) and Nannette Woonton (SPREP)
	Session 2 Cont: Country Priorities, Lessons Learned and Challenges <i>Facilitator: Samoa</i>		
12.00 – 1.00	Progress of the PCCR thematic areas and Country Presentations 4) Loss and Damage 5) Resource Mobilisation	4) Espen Ronneberg (SPREP) Morgan Wairiu (USP) & Hudson Kauhiona (Solomon Islands)	This session will include introduction from chair/co-chairs from each of the working groups followed by country presentations. <u>Coordinators</u>

	Questions and Answer	5) Exsley Taloiburi (PIFS) & Meapelo Maiai (SPREP)	Tagaloa Cooper (SPREP), Nannette Woonton (SPREP) Meapelo Maiai (SPREP)
1.00-2.00	LUNCH		
	Session 3: Emerging Priorities and Opportunities		
2.00-3.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Pacific Islands Leaders Forum Communiqué ii. Pacific Meteorological Council (PMC), Honiara Ministerial Statement & IPCC Updates iii. UN Oceans Outcomes iv. Paris Agreement v. Sustainable Development Goals <p>Plenary Question and Answer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Exsley Taloiburi (PIFS) ii. David Hiba, Solomon Islands, Chair of PMC iii. Taholo Kami (Fiji) iv. Espen Ronneberg (SPREP) vi. Iosefa Maiava (UNESCAP) 	<p>This session will provide an update on key international and regional outcomes relevant to the transition of WGs to FRDP</p> <p>Each panellist will provided with guidance to discuss opportunities and key next steps.</p> <p><u>Coordinators</u> Espen Ronneberg SPREP, Tommy Moore (SPREP) and Salesa Nihmei (SPREP)</p>
3.00-3.30	AFTERNOON TEA		
	Session 3 Cont: Emerging Priorities and Opportunities		
3.30-4.30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Pacific Climate Change Centre ii. GCCA Plus iii. Tuvalu Pacific Risk Mechanism (PICCIF) iv. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment <p>Plenary Question and Answer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Roger Cornforth, SPREP ii. Dr. Gillian Cambers, SPC & Adrian Nicole EU iii. Tuvalu iv. Litea Biukoto, Forum Secretariat 	<p>This session will provide an update on some of the projects, tools and mechanisms to support implementation of climate change initiatives in the region.</p>
5.00	Recap of Day 1 and Closing (SPREP)		

Day 2: Tuesday 3 rd October 2017			
	Agenda Items & Presenters	Speakers	Guidance and Responsible
8.30 – 9.00	Recap of Day 1		Espen Ronneberg SPREP
	Session 4: Breakout Sessions for the PCCR Thematic Working Groups <i>Facilitator: SPREP</i>		
9.00-10.00	<u>Breakout Group 1</u> Adaptation SPREP Mitigation SPC	Espen Ronneberg (SPREP) Solomone Fifita (SPC)	Based around the 5 working groups (<i>adaptation, mitigation, knowledge management,</i>

	<p>Information and Knowledge Management GIZ/SPREP (Venue: Lali 1)</p> <p><u>Breakout Group 2</u> Loss and Damage Resource Mobilisation PIFS/SPREP (Venue: Banyan Room)</p> <p>Survey Monkey</p>	<p>Makelesi Gonelevu (SPREP) & Timo Baur (GIZ)</p> <p>Ana Tiraa (FAO) Exsley Taloiburi (PIFS) & Meapelo Maiiai (SPREP)</p> <p>Azarel Maiiai (SPREP)</p>	<p><i>loss and damage and resource mobilisation</i>) to discuss how they would like to see future work of the WGs in the FRDP and PRP</p> <p>Each of the WGs will be provided with the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Term of Reference for WGs 2) Recommendation from PCCR 2015 3) PRP/FRDP materials 4) Notes from Session 2 & 3 from Day 1 and 5) Guiding questions
10.00-10.30	MORNING TEA		
10.30-11.00	Session 4 Cont: Breakout Sessions for the Working Groups		
11.00-12.00	Session 5: Report back to plenary: Updates from the Working Groups <i>Facilitator: SPC</i>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Adaptation 2) Mitigation 3) Knowledge Management 4) Loss and Damage 5) Resource Mobilisation <p>Present Survey Monkey Results</p> <p>Plenary Question and Answer</p>	<p>Thematic dialogue to specific issues and outline findings of Survey Monkey</p>	
12.00 – 1.00	Session 6: Climate Finance <i>Facilitator: SPREP</i>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. National experiences and lessons learnt with accessing climate finance. ii. Regional experience and key lessons learnt on accessing climate finance iii. Regional experience and opportunities in accessing finance (GCF, AF, GEF) iv. Demonstration Climate Finance Navigator Tool <p>Plenary Question and Answer</p>	<p>Jean Viliamu (Samoa), Xavier Matsutaro (Palau) Andrew Yatilman (FSM)</p> <p>Exsley Taloiburi (PIFS)</p> <p>Meapelo Maiiai (SPREP)</p> <p>Makelesi Gonelevu (SPREP)</p>	<p>Climate Finance Support session will include country presentations to identify milestones, challenges, lessons learnt and key priorities.</p> <p><u>Coordinators:</u> Tagaloa Cooper (SPREP), Meapelo Maiiai (SPREP) & Exsley Taloiburi (PIFS)</p>

1.00-2.00	LUNCH		
	SIDE Event: Showcasing the Pacific Ecosystem-based Adaptation to Climate Change (PEBACC) project		
2.00-3.00	Session 7: Turning Climate Science into Services, Products and Decisions <i>Facilitator: Tokelau</i>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Pacific- Australia Climate Change Science Adaptation Program ii. IMPACT iii. Adaptation Planning Tool: Demonstration Plenary Question and Answer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mulipola Ausetalia Titimaea (Samoa) ii. Patrick Pringle, Climate Analytics/SPREP iii. Philip Marsden, GIZ/SPREP 	Using science based information to support decision making for sectors and policy makers. <u>Coordinators</u> Azarel Maiiai (SPREP) and Salesa Nihmei (SPREP)
3.00-3.30	AFTERNOON TEA		
	Session 8: Preparations for COP 23		
3.30-4.00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the key issues • Key events leading to COP • Activities at COP • Implementation of the Paris Agreement Plenary Question and Answer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Espen Ronneberg (SPREP) 	Provide participants with an update on the preparation for COP and key events.
4.00-4.45	Session 9: Outcome Statement for the Joint Platform		
4.45-5.00	Wrap Up and Next Steps	PCCR Outcome Statement will be presented at the joint platform. Meeting Chair Roger Cornforth (Deputy Director SPREP)	
	Close		

Annex 4: Participants List

Name	Country	Position	Organisation	Emails
Adrian Nicolae		Team Leader	Climate Change, Energy, Circular Economy Section EU	Adrian.nicolae@eeas.europa.eu
Alisi Vosalem	Fiji	Climate Change Officer	Ministry of Economy	alisi.vosalem@gmail.com
Ana Tiraa		Natural Resources Management (Climate Change) Officer	FAO	Anna.tiraa@fao.org
Anais Rouveyrol		Team Leader Members and Partners Services	PIDF	arouveyrol@pacificidf.org
Andrea Stewart	NZ	Development Manager	NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	andrea.stewart@mfat.govt.nz
Audrey Brown-Pereira		Executive Officer	SPREP	audreyp@sprep.org
Azarel Mariner		COSPPac Capacity Development Officer	SPREP	azarelm@sprep.org
Bismarck Crawley	Samoa	Chief Executive Officer	Ministry of National Resource and Environment	brfcrawley@gmail.com ; bismarck.crawley@mnre.gov.ws
Celine Barre	New Caledonia	Project Manager	Directorate of Civil Security and Risk Management New Caledonia	celine.barre@gouv.nc
Choi Yeeting	Kiribati	National Climate Change Coordinator	Office of the President	choi@ob.gov.ki
Clarence Samuel	Marshall Islands	Director	Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination	clarencesam@gmail.com
Clinton Chapman		EU-GIZ ACSE Project Technical Adviser	GIZ	clinton.chapman@giz.de
Daniel Lund	UK	Head of Climate Change & Regional Affairs	British High Commission	daniel.lund@fco.gov.uk
Daniell Cowley		Program and Partnerships Manager, Pacific	IFRC	daniell.cowley@ifrc.org
David Hiba Hiriasia	Solomon Islands	Director for Meteorology	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology	david.hiba@met.gov.sb

Name	Country	Position	Organisation	Emails
Erbai Xavier Matsutaro	Palau	National Climate Change Coordinator & Focal Point to the UNFCCC	Office of Climate Change	erbai.oerc@palaugov.org
Espen Ronneberg		Climate Change Adviser and Acting Director for Climate Change Division	SPREP	espenr@sprep.org
Exsley Taloiburi		Climate Change Finance Advisor	PIFS	exsleyt@forumsec.org
Felicia Talagi	Niue	Donor Development Project Manager	Project Management & Coordination Unit	felicia.pihigia@mail.gov.nu
Frank Vukimoala		Energy Officer	Pacific Community (SPC)	frankv@spc.int
Gabor Sasvari		Advisor	GIZ ACSE	gabor.sasvari@giz.de
Gillian Cambers		Project Manager EU GCCA PSIS	Pacific Community (SPC)	gillianc@spc.int
Hudson Kauhiona	Solomon Islands	Acting Director for Climate Change Division	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology	hkhiona@gmail.com
Ileana Miricescu		Programme Manager	Climate Change, Energy, Circular Economy Section (EU)	ileana.miricescu@eeas.europa.eu
Ilisapeci Vakacegu	Fiji	CB2 Project: MEA Officer - UNFCCC	Climate Change Division, Ministry of Economy	ilisapeci.vakacegu@economy.gov.fj
Ioanna Mokeaki	Kiribati	Sector Economist	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development	ioanamoakeaki@finance.gov.ki ; ioannamoakeaki@gmail.com
Iosefa Maiava		Head of UNESCAP	UNESCAP	maiava@un.org
Jean Viliamu	Samoa	Principal Climate Resilient Investment and Coordination Officer	Ministry of Finance	jean.viliamu@mof.gov.ws
Jennifer M deBrum	Marshall Islands	JNAP Coordinator	Office of the Chief Secretary	Jennifer.debrum@gmail.com
Jenny Brown		Programme Manager	Climate Change, Energy, Circular Economy Section EU	Jenny.BROWN@eeas.europa.eu
Joanna Akritidu		Climate Change Adaptation Adviser	GIZ	joanna.akritidu@giz.de
Joe Zenos		Development Specialist, USAID/Pacific Islands	USAID	zenos@usaid.gov
Jutta May		IKM Consultant	RMI/NCL	jutta.may@gmx.net
Karen Lummis		A/g Director, Disaster Resilience and Recovery Section	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	karen.lummis@dfat.gov.au

Name	Country	Position	Organisation	Emails
Kathryn Clarkson		Head of Pacific Office	IFRC	kathryn.clarkson@ifrc.org
Kilateli Epu Falenga		Tuvalu BSRP Project Coordinator	Climate Change Policy & Disaster Coordination Unit	kilateli@gmail.com
Kimberly McGuire	American Samoa	Climate Change Coordinator	Department of Marine and Wildlife Resources	kim.a.mcguire@crag.as
Kosi Latu		Director General	SPREP	kosil@sprep.org
Lauren Babuik		Climate Change Officer	British High Commission	Lauren.Babuik@eco.gov.uk
Ledua Vakaloloma		Climate Finance Officer	PIFS	Leduav@forumsec.org
Lee Baker		Team Leader	USAID Climate	lbaker@pacificclimateready.org
Lisa Buggy		Climate Change Adviser – USAID ISACC Project	Pacific Community (SPC)	Lisab@spc.int
Litea Biukoto		PREP Project Manager	Pacific Community (SPC)	liteab@spc.int
Makelesi Gonelevu		Knowledge Management Officer	SPREP	makelesig@sprep.org
Makereta Komai		Editor PACNEWS	PACNEWS	pacnews1@pina.com.fj
Manasa Katonivualiku		Programme Associate Officer	UNESCAP	manasa.katonivualiku@un.org
Manon Brasseur	New Caledonia	Previsionnist Technological and Natural Risk Planning Service	Directorate of Civil Security and Risk Management New Caledonia	manon.brasseur@gouv.nc
Mariam Matthew		Regional Influencing Advisor	Oxfam in the Pacific	mmathew@oxfampacific.org
Mason Smith		Regional Director	IUCN	Mason.smith@iucn.org
Meapelo Maiiai		GEF Support Adviser	SPREP	meapelom@sprep.org
Melina Tuiravakai	Cook Islands	Project Business Development & Communications Coordinator	Office of the Prime Minister	melina.tuiravakai@cookisland.gov.c.k
Mere Nailatikau		Media and Communication Coordinator	Oxfam in the Pacific	mnailatikau@oxfampacific.org
Moana Kioa	Tonga	Assistant Secretary for Disaster Risk Management	Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change, Communication	mokioa2017@gmail.com
Morgan Wairiu		Deputy Director	PaCE-SD/USP	morgan.wairiu@usp.ac.fj
Mulipola Ausetalia Titimaea	Samoa	Assistant Chief Executive Officer	Meteorology Division, MNRE	ausetalia.titimaea@mnre.gov.ws

Name	Country	Position	Organisation	Emails
Nanette Woonton		Media and Public Relations Officer	SPREP	nanette@sprep.org
Nila Prasad		Program Officer	JICA	NilaPrasad.fj@jica.go.jp
Ofa Faanunu	Tonga	Director for Meteorology	Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change, Communication	ofaf@met.gov.to
Patrick Pringle		Climate Analytic Consultant	SPREP	patrickp.ext@sprep.org
Patrina Dumar		Consultant	IISD/USP	pdumar@gmail.com
Pedro Basabe		Senior Regional DRR and RR advisor	SDC Humanitarian Aid	pedro.basabe-rodriquegz@edu.admin.ch
Penehuro Lefale	Tokelau	Tokelau Climate Change Advisor	Climate Change Agency, Tokelau Government	pene.lefale@outlook.com
Pepetua Latasi	Tuvalu	Director for Environment	Department of Climate Change and Disaster	pepetua@gmail.com
Philip Marsden		Climate Information Knowledge Specialist (GIZ)	GIZ/SPREP	philipm.ext@sprep.org
Ray Bojczuk		First Secretary Resilience, Climate Change and Humanitarian Affairs	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Raymond.bojczuk@dfat.gov.au
Regan Moses	Nauru	PIR Climate Change	Department of Commerce Industry & Environment	reagan.moses@mail.com
Richard Bontjour		Director, Environment & Fisheries Section	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Richard.bontjer@dfat.gov.au
Rima'ati Moeka'a	Cook Islands	Third National Communications Project Coordinator	Office of the Prime Minister Climate Change Cook Islands	rima.moekaa@cookisland.gov.ck
Rina Kurumisawa		JICA Assistant Resident Representative	JICA	kurumisawa.Rina@jica.go.jp
Robert Vivili	Tonga	EU GIZ Project Officer	Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change, Communication	robbievivili@gmail.com
Roger Cornforth		Deputy Director General	SPREP	rogerc@sprep.org
Salesa Nihmei		Meteorology and Climate Officer	SPREP	salesan@sprep.org

Name	Country	Position	Organisation	Emails
Scott Hook		Resilience Team Leader	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat PIFS	scoth@forumsec.org
Semi Qamese	Fiji	GEF Project Coordinator	Ministry of Environment	sgamese@gmail.com
Shirleen WAPNA		Programme Manager	Climate Change, Energy, Circular Economy Section EU	Shirleen.swapna@eeas.europa.eu
Solomone Fifita		Manager – Pacific Centre for Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency	Pacific Community (SPC)	solomonef@spc.int
Stuart Chape		Director Biodiversity Ecosystem Management Division	SPREP	stuartc@sprep.org
Susana Sulu		Pacific Islands Development Forum		susans@forum.org
Sylvie Goyet		Director Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability	Pacific Community (SPC)	sylvieg@spc.int
Tagaloa Cooper		Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Adviser	SPREP	tagaloac@sprep.org
Tim Carruthers		Director of Coastal Ecology	The Water Institute of the Gulf	tcarruthers@thewaterinstitute.org
Timo Baur		Technical Advisor Knowledge Management, Monitoring, Social Science	GIZ	timo.baur@giz.de
Tommy Moore		Pacific Island Global Ocean Observing System Officer	SPREP	tommym@sprep.org
Vuki Buadromo		Project Manager – USAID ISACC Project	Pacific Community (SPC)	VukiB@spc.int
Wilson Waguk	FSM	Deputy Chief of Mission		fsmsuva@fsmsuva.org.fj
Wulf Killmann		Programme Director	GIZ	Wulf.killmann@giz.de