



Workshop report
Marshall Islands National Lessons Learnt Meeting
Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project
ICC Conference room
4th November 2015, 10am - 2pm

Workshop Objectives:

1. To share information about RMI's GCCA: PSIS project's key result areas and exit strategy.
2. To discuss successes and challenges faced in implementing the coastal protection project and technical assistance activities in RMI.
3. To develop recommendations for improving future projects and discuss ways of sharing these nationally.

Workshop Chair: Mr Ywao Elanzo, National Climate Change Coordinator – SPC GCCA: PSIS Project, OEPPC

1. Opening, Welcome and Introductions

The Chief Secretary, Mrs Justina Langidrik opened the workshop with welcoming remarks on behalf of the RMI government and reiterated the importance of having such a workshop. Dr Gillian Cambers, SPC_GCCA: PSIS Project Manager described how this workshop fits into the overall project's aim to share lessons learnt. Acting Climate Change Advisor Mr Sanivalati Tubuna then briefly went through the outline of the programme (see Annex 1).

All of the participants (listed in Annex 2) then introduced themselves and explained what they would like to take away from this workshop.

2. Viewing of RMI's Lessons Learnt Video

The workshop began with an 8 minute Lessons Learnt video showcasing the overall SPC GCCA: PSIS project activities in RMI and key lessons learnt through the project implementation process. The video highlighted challenges and community perspectives in the respective thematic areas below:

Challenges

- Land
- Infrastructure on the outer islands
- Transportation

- Equipment

Community perspectives

- Access to school was difficult prior to the causeway
- Access to health services also was difficult prior to the causeway

3. Group work session 1: What would we do the same? What would we do differently?

Group Work

Background – Woja Project

- The tender was put out for bidding and there were 2 interested bidders. But only 1 full tender was submitted
- The tender received was beyond the available budget
- It was decided that MPW would construct the causeway and the project funds would be used to build their equipment capacity (excavator, truck and compacter)

Technical assistance provide

- Proposal writing workshop (youth focus)
- Climate Change glossary in Marshallese
- Hiring a civil engineer, placed in Public Works to be the site engineer in Woja.
- EPA – community training and school-based activities
- Coastal assessment and feasibility study for Woja Causeway Project

Against this background, each group discussed the topics and then each group reported back. The following is a summary of each group's presentations:

What would we do the same?

1. Local collaboration – i.e. involvement of different government entities such as PW and OEPPC, EPA, etc. given their specific roles
2. Enhancing local capacity to carry out such projects – making maximum use of limited available funds
3. Involvement of the local communities in the soft components of the project
4. Involving communities from the start in identification, planning and design.
5. Approaching traditional leaders
6. Partnership is crucial to ensure a successful outcome
7. Feasibility study to provide appropriate project design for island setting
8. Following national financial protocols with respect to MOU's and LOA's

Technical assistance

9. Proposal writing workshops but with a wider audience
10. The National Climate Change dialogue
11. Climate change glossary in Marshallese - an excellent tool for community engagement
12. Hiring of experts such as the Civil Engineer
13. Coordination and provision of incentives
14. Maintaining the protocols as has been done

What we would do differently?

1. Involve other Ministries or partners – e.g. Min. of Internal Affairs could have used *Ailinglaplap Development Funds* for co-financing work in Woja, Ailinglaplap – this would have improved communication and involvement of the local government for additional resources.
2. Better planning (engagement of partners); better internal communication and coordination
3. Decision making in terms of priorities – which sector to address? (Initially started with water sector, then moved to coastal protection and so wasted valuable time)
4. Impact of exchange rates and fluctuation in interest rate EURO vs USD, would transfer funds to RMI in USD
5. Dedicated funds for Monitoring & Evaluation built into the budget
6. Set aside budget for Feasibility studies from the onset
7. Dealing with Ministry of Finance – follow procedures
8. Establishing a Steering Committee and active participation of Steering Committee members
9. More time to be given for implementation especially for projects in the outer islands.

Technical Assistance

10. Proposal writing focus group – change to other department /and those already involved in proposal preparation – reason being that many of the youth participants did not have the required educational background or English language skills
11. LFA Proposal writing workshop – know the background of the participants prior to the workshop so that the materials /presentation could be modified to suit the audience.
12. More community awareness on Climate Change such as radio spots
13. Get the glossary endorsed by government – there is now a new law on materials in Marshallese language – and it is necessary to get endorsement from the Language Commission. Ministry of Education has revised the science curriculum from grade 4-9 thus the glossary will be a great resource. Establish working group to avoid political interference in defining terms for the glossary.
14. National Climate Change Dialogue – great platform for Climate change awareness campaigns. Encourage more active dialogue in the local language and more remote community involvement. This should be conducted jointly with more participation from Ministry of Environment and the Language Committee.
15. Inclusion of the Coastal Management Advisory Council (CMAC)
16. Inclusion of MIMRA local government networks
17. Inclusion of NGO's and CBO's networks
18. Also need to include other populated and distant communities e.g. Ebeye, Wotje, Jalnit etc.

Discussion:

Participants were then given a few minutes to discuss the lessons learnt as mentioned above. The discussion touched on the benefits and challenges in transferring funds directly to the Ministry of Finance rather than directly to the implementing sector or agency. Though some participants argued that having the funds directed towards the Ministry of Finance sometimes causes delay and is very stringent, many agreed that this was a more transparent, efficient and accountable method for

reporting. Participants stated that the delays could be due to the Finance Ministry being under staffed.

Participants also raised the need for projects to be designed not to fit the budget, but for the budget to fit the project. This was raised in light of the two priority sites in Woja where only one priority site was constructed due to limitation in the project funding available. There could have been cost benefits if both phases were done together and now the causeway is weak because only one phase was done. RMI will now need to quickly look for alternative funding to complete the 2nd priority site. Participants then reiterated the need to have the feasibility study built into the main adaptation project fund from the onset and the need to be guided by development polices such as the JNAP.

4. Group work session 2: What are we most proud of? What did not go as planned?

These questions were discussed in the same two groups and then each group reported back. The following is a summary of each group's presentations:

What are we proud of?

1. Show of tangible outputs such as the causeway and equipment – hard engineering component; purchasing of heavy equipment to be used for future projects; completing the causeway within the project time frame.
2. The mix of soft and hard engineering components and the tangible output
3. Collaborative work amongst the various entities
4. Involvement of school children
5. Improvement of livelihoods through ease of access to education and health services
6. Building local capacity
7. Training communities in seed identification, collection and planting.
8. Community involvement shows people want to take ownership
9. Completion of the final Draft of the Climate Change Glossary.

What did not go as planned?

1. Not having a private contractor construct the causeway. Using a private contractor would have been reduced delivery time by expediting mobilisation process.
2. On time start with respect to implementation and delay in bringing in civil engineer due to the Public Service Commission recruitment policy
3. Drop in value of the EURO vs USD leading to loss of funds
4. Amount of fuel required for the operations and capacity of the ship
5. Environmental Management Plan not fully followed. Public Works or contractor need to inform EPA during the construction period especially if doing something not in the EMP.
6. Lack of monitoring from EPA's side (limited funds) – perhaps in the future EPA should have a person on site during the project
7. EPA Rehabilitation or replanting activities delayed due to lack of communication between Public Works and EPA in regards to timing of Public Works' work on the causeway. The rehabilitation/replanting activities could only be conducted after the construction of the causeway.
8. Not having more meetings with the island mayors
9. Traditional leaders and local land owners difficult to find because they live in different places.

5. Group work session 3: How to share the lessons nationally?

This question was discussed in the same three groups and then each group reported back. The following is a summary of each group's presentations:

How do we share the lessons learned nationally?

1. Take heed of these lessons in new projects especially in the project design phase (e.g. in the risk matrix)
2. Document these lessons and note the recommendations
3. Use national scheduled meetings amongst the ministries to share the lessons learnt e.g. the monthly meetings led by the Chief Secretary.
4. The need to maintain communication with the communities.
5. Ministry of Internal Affairs to brief mayors on the lessons learnt from other projects during meetings or visits.
6. Using media outlets – social media, radio, TV etc.

6. Closing and Evaluations

The chairman closed the meeting and evaluation sheets (see Annex 3) were completed.

Annex 1: Workshop Agenda



Agenda
RMI National Lessons Learnt Meeting
Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States project
Funded by the European Union &
Implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community
4th November 2015

Time	Topic	Presenter
10.00 – 10.10am	Opening and Welcome	Mrs. Justina Langdrik, Chief Secretary Dr Gillian Cambers, Project Manager, SPC GCCA:PSIS Project
10:10- 10:20 am	Introductions	
10:20- 10:30 am	Viewing of RMI's Lessons Learnt Video: "Strengthening coastal resilience in the outlying atolls of the Marshall Islands"	
10:30-11:150 am	Group work session 1: Woja Causeway Project <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What would we do the same?• What would we do differently? Report back in plenary- 3 minutes per group Discussion Technical Assistance (LFA training, Climate change glossary, National Climate Change	

	<p>Dialogue, Community training & Awareness)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would we do the same? • What would we do differently? <p>Report back in plenary- 3 minutes per group</p> <p>Discussion</p>	
11:15-12:00 pm	<p>Group work session 2: (All activities)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are we proud of? • What did not go as planned? <p>Report back in plenary- 3 minutes per group</p> <p>Discussion</p>	
12:00-12:45 pm	<p>Group work session 3: How to share the lessons nationally? (All activities)</p> <p>Report back in plenary- 3 minutes per group</p> <p>Development of Action plan</p>	
12:45-1:15 pm	Closing and Evaluations	
1:15-1:30 pm	Prayer	
1:30-2:30 pm	Lunch	

Annex 2: Participants List

RMI Lessons Learnt Meeting

4 November 2015

Participants' List

No.	Name	Ministry	Sex	Email
1	Ms Melaine Vicente	Min. Public Works-PMU	F	MelanieVicente142gmail.com
2	Mr Melvin Dacillo	MPW - PMU	M	architectpmurmi2005@gmail.com
3	Mr Joseph Maddison	MOTA/LGA	M	jojeba@gmail.com
4	Justina R. Langidrik	OCS	F	jrlangidrik@gmail.com
5	Asena Ketedromo	PSS	F	asenaketedromo@gmail.com
6	Lani Milne	EPA	F	lanimilne@gmail.com
7	Samuel Bikajle	PSS	M	sbikajle@pss.edu.mh
8	Tuvuki Ketedromo	EPA	M	ketedromo@gmail.com
9	Ywao Elanzo, Jr	OEPPC	M	Elanzo28@gmail.com
10	Linus Kebu	MPW – PMU	M	kebulinus@gmail.com
11	Jeniffer deBrum	OCS	F	Jennifer.debrum@gmail.com
12				
13				

Annex 3: Evaluation Outcomes

RMI National Lessons Learnt Meeting

Evaluation Form Analysis

Gender: Female Male

Workshop rating: 1 – Not useful; 3 – Somewhat useful; 5 - Excellent				
Using the rating system given above, indicate (with a tick) your rating for this workshop.				
1	2	3	4	5
		1	7	2

What went well? What aspects were most useful to you?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing more information with respected ministries is very important. Overall, sessions went well • The group were very useful because they gave a more in-depth description and perspective of the project. It would have been better if it was a whole day. • Sharing of ideas and information with regards to promising excellent outcome • Learn about a lot of climate change projects that have been carried out here in RMI. Team work is great, community consultations building capacity improves planned work. • Sharing of national perspective of the events taken place • The comments on the Woja Causeway and Technical Assistance. The Lessons Learnt from these both above. • Excellent information sharing. Learning about other areas of the project that I did not know or was aware of. Most useful learning about the important role of the chief secretary office. • Group work sessions – lesson learned and recommendations toward • The format/agenda is good gave us the opportunity to highlight challenges and lessons learnt. • Everything went well. It was useful for all relevant project stakeholders to meet and discuss together the successes of the project and also our short comings, which we can improve on in other projects.

What could have been done better (recommendations)?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great job! • I wish I was more involved from the beginning so I would be better at evaluating and asking from what I can gather from the workshop, so much was accomplished. • To plan early. To collaborate more on community and local officials • More involvement of government ministries with other agencies • Compare the GCCA objectives/indicators and how the RMI component features in it. • Lessons Learnt from both groups, which they are giving more perspective information about Woja Causeway project and other topics from Technical assistant, climate change glossary, national climate change dialogue. • Invite more people to participate, agencies and mayors association, especially the Woja community members on Majuro. • To invite other agencies who are currently dealing with climate change issues and adaptation measures • It's a demonstration project, therefore I fell many things could have been better, but most importantly we have all learned so that next time project implementation is efficient and effective.

Other general comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget detail for the Woja Project should be shared so we understand more. • Early planning stage/study can be useful in terms of anticipating problems • Proud of the completion of the Woja project • Great approach to gauge the local (PICT) perspective. • This was a great learning experience and was great to collaborate with the various agencies • Excellent! Let's do it again! • It can be done!! ☺ • Overall many lessons were learned in this short but also informative workshop.

