



GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE: PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND STATES PROJECT

REPORT ON COOK ISLANDS PROJECT PLANNING WORKSHOP 15TH NOVEMBER 2012

Introduction

The focus of the GCCA:PSIS Project entitled “Environmental monitoring to enhance community livelihoods and build resilience to climate change in the low-lying atolls of the Cook Islands” is centred on enhancing community livelihoods and building resilience to climate change on low-lying atolls, in particular Manihiki, Rakahanga, Penrhyn, Palmerston and Pukapuka.

A Planning Workshop was held on 15th November at the Ministry of Marine Resources to:

1. Introduce to the key stakeholders a proposed climate change adaptation project.
2. Discuss and agree on the proposed activities of the project.
3. Discuss and agree on the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders.
4. Discuss and agree on the implementation arrangements (institutional, management, etc).
5. Discuss the monitoring and evaluation framework.

The workshop was organised and chaired by the Climate Change Cook Islands office.

Workshop Participants

There were 17 participants in Rarotonga and 5 in Manihiki who joined in the meeting via skype. The list of participants is presented as Annex 1.

Workshop Agenda

The workshop agenda is presented as Annex 2. At the start of the workshop participants were asked to complete a questionnaire designed to gauge key information as to the extent to which climate change is integrated into institutions in the Cook Islands and participants’ understanding of climate change issues.

Workshop Results

The workshop started with presentations and discussions about the overall GCCA: PSIS project and was followed by a detailed presentation on the history and issues with pearl farming in Manihiki. This was followed by discussion.

Participants then worked to design the project using the Logical Framework Approach. The overall objective and project purpose were agreed after some considerable discussion about the core problems. Participants were then divided into three groups to discuss key result areas and to begin to list activities.

The overall objective, project purpose and key result areas as designed by the three groups are presented as Annex 3.

Workshop Evaluation

The results of the workshop evaluation are presented as Annex 4. Most people found that using the logical framework approach for project planning was useful, and helped to guide the planning process.

Conclusion

The workshop was successful in allowing different stakeholders to play a role in the initial planning of the project. Involving the Manihiki team via skype worked well once a few logistical problems were solved. The workshop provided a good model for stakeholder involvement in project design that can be adapted for the other countries involved in the GCCA: PSIS project.

Annex 1 Participants List

Name & Organisation	Email	Phone
Gillian Cambers, SPC, GCCA: PSIS project	gillianc@spc.int	679 777 7150
Graham Sem, SPC, GCCA: PSIS project	grahams@spc.int	679 783 8938
Ana Tiraa, CCCI	Anna@pmoffice.gov.ck	
Jim Armistead, MFEM	Jim.armistead@cookislands.gov.ck	29521
Alexis Wolfgraman Pearl Support program (NZAIID)	alexis@pearlauthority.co.ck	29055
Rerekura Teaurere, CCCI	Rerekura@pmoffice.gov.ck	
Arona Ngari, CIMS	angari@met.gov.ck	20603, 25920
William Tuivaga, CCCI		25494
Vanessa Jenner, DCD	Vanessa.jenner@cookislands.gov.ck	29521
Terai McFadzien, CIPA	terai@pearlauthority.co.ck	29055
Sheena Vaetaru, CIPA	sheena@pearlyauthority.co.ck	29055
Ben Ponia, MMR	b.ponia@mmr.gov.ck	28730
Kelvin Passfield, MMR	k.passfield@mmr.gov.ck	28730
Nga Puna OPM	ngapuna@pmoffice.gov.ck	79321
Raymond Newnham	osamoana@oyster.net.ck	22317
Dorothy Solomona, MMR	d.solomona@mmr.gov.ck	28721
George Turia MFEP	George.turia@cookislands.gov.ck	29521
Georgia Langdon, MMR	G.Langdon@mmr.gov.ck	28721
Rangi Johnson, MMR	r.johnson@mmr.gov.ck	
Nimet Nimeti, National Environment Service	nimeti08@gmail.com	
Ngamata Napara, Manihiki Mayor	mhxissec@oyster.net.ck	
Justine William, Island Councillor	ricknjust@manihiki.net.ck	

Annex 2 Tentative Programme

Time	Activity/Topic	Lead Person
8:30-8.45	Introduction – prayer, remarks by reps from CIG and SPC, introduction of participants (self), objectives of the workshop	Ana (CCCI/OPM)
8.45-8.50	Global Climate Change Alliance: Pacific Small Island States Project	Gillian
8.50-9.05	Introduction to the project – “Environmental monitoring to enhance community livelihoods and build resilience to climate change on low-lying atolls of the Cook Islands”	Dorothy/Kelvin/Ben (MMR)
9.05-9.15	Q&A and general discussion focused on the project	Gillian/Graham
9.15-10.15	Proposed project activities: Define project objectives, project purpose, key results, activities, approximate costs and schedule, monitoring and evaluation	MMR/SPC
10.15-10.25	Morning Tea	Catering vendor/supplier
10.25-11.25	Proposed project activities: Define project objectives, project purpose, key results, activities, approximate costs and schedule (<i>continued</i>)	MMR/SPC
11.25-11.55	Roles and Responsibilities & Implementation Arrangements (institutional, management, etc): Who is going to do what	CCCI/MMR
11.55-12.05	Linkages to SRIC-CC project and JNAP	William and Rerekura (CCCI/OPM)
12.05-12.15	General Discussion and Close, Closing Prayer	Ana (CCCI/OPM)
12.15-	Lunch	Catering vendor/supplier

Annex 3 Results of Small Groups Discussions on Key Results

The overall objective and project purpose were agreed in plenary discussion.

Overall Objective: Build resilience to climate change in the Cook Islands

Project Purpose: Strengthening environmental monitoring and its relevance to the communities of the northern atolls

Group 1

Key Results Area 1: Education and awareness enhanced so as to improve farming management and a behavioural change.

Activity: Hold consultations and disseminate information

Key Results Area 2: Management systems strengthened including processes e.g. permitting

Activity: Review procedures and revise

Key Results Area 3: Capacity built and capability maintained

Activity: Recruit appropriately qualified person

Key Results Area 4: Appropriate equipment and resources acquired to improve robust information

Activity: Develop and use information

Group 2

Key Result Area 1: Sustainable and relevant monitoring system created for all the northern group islands.

Activity 1: Deploy a more comprehensive system in Manihiki

Activity 2: Relevant scaled down version (installed/planned?) for remaining islands

Activity 3: Prepare a maintenance plan

Activity 4: Train staff and equip them to deliver a sustainable maintenance and management Plan

Key Result Area 2: Analysis capability enhanced and communication strategy adopted

Activity 1: Build analysis capability

Activity 2: Develop and deploy communications strategy (engage with pearl management plans)

Activity 3: Build capacity in lagoon resource management

Key Results Area 3: Adaptation strategies prepared and deployed where appropriate

Activity 1: Develop plans to address issues

Activity 2: Source funds/resourcing to prepare a sustainable financing plan

Key Results Area 4: Well informed community with a continuous learning culture created

Activity 1: Review and monitor

Activity 2: Integration with other projects

Group 3

Key Results Area 1: Appropriate infrastructure in the outer islands improved to enhance/maintain livelihoods e.g. water tanks, jetties/wharfs, seeding platforms, freezers.

Justification: The reason we mention things like the wharfs etc. is because coastal erosion is a significant problem for our wharfs inside the lagoon getting washed out. To compensate, we

are bring sand and rubble from the ocean side of the lagoon which in turn creates an issue with protection from ocean swells.

Key Results Area 2: Flushing system of the lagoon improved via hydrological monitoring, biological and physical oceanography monitoring systems, widening the reef pass.

Annex 4 Workshop Evaluation

Only four people filled in the workshop evaluation form.

1. Did you find the Logical Framework Approach useful for project planning?

3 answered 'yes', one answered 'other'

Comments:

- Yes, specific, focused and results based. While the exchange and dialogue was positive, certain elements tended to dominate the discussion. Would have been useful to have provided more information.
- Laid out in a way that saved time. It made the process more anchored and guided..
- Good flow of thoughts from the strategic high level down to the activity level. I thought it was user friendly.

2. Recognising this meeting is a first stage in project planning, how could the meeting have been improved?

- Provide more information. The venue was tolerable.
- Technology worked out well beforehand
- A larger room with air conditioning
- Awesome, maybe a cooler room.