

# **Pacific Climate Change Finance Assessment Framework (PCCFAF)**

## *Lessons Learnt from RMI's national Climate Change Finance Assessment*

Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, Apia  
12 May 2015

Dr. Riyad Mucadam  
Senior Climate Change Adviser  
Office of Environment Planning & Policy Coordination, Majuro

At the request of the RMI Government, the national climate change finance assessment , using the Pacific Climate Change Finance Assessment Framework, was undertaken between Feb – April 2014.

## Key Partners for RMI Assessment



## Partners that provided input to the RMI report

SPREP, SPC, GIZ, European Union, US, Japan, DFAT etc

# What was Assessed?



- . PCCFAF builds on other existing global and regional assessment tools.
- . Explored 6 key dimensions:
  - Funding Sources of Climate Finance
  - Policies and Plans
  - Institutions
  - Public Financial Management and Expenditure
  - Human Capacity
  - Development Effectiveness

# Lessons Learnt

- RMI **is accessing** climate change finance (assessment indicated ~USD34 million between 2006 to present), but **tracking is difficult** and funds are **fragmented** at the national level.
- Most climate change related **funds accessed** have been **project based**.
- For RMI most climate change related funding (~80%) was predominantly from **bilateral sources**. Therefore, although there is an opportunity for RMI to diversify funding sources by pursuing multilateral funds, in the short term this is likely to require considerably **more effort** than **building on existing bilateral relationships**.
- A significant portion of climate related funds **fall outside** of the purview of **national systems (budget)**.
- The Ministry of Finance has not been very **pro-active** in **understanding** Climate Change Finance.
- Funds dedicated to addressing climate change objectives have been directed to both mitigation and adaptation measures, though more towards adaptation in line with Pacific priority need for adaptation.

# What worked well & challenges

## What worked well

- Multi-stakeholder partnership
- Inclusive consultation with all relevant stakeholders
- Costing of “RMI Report Action Plan” – easy to market to potential donors and partners

## Challenges

- Limited human and financial capacity at the national level to implement recommendations in a timely manner.
- No clear commitment for follow up support by development partners and CROP agencies to implement recommendations.

## What would have been done differently:

- Include aspects of Risk Governance profiling and gender and social inclusion.
- Ensure follow up support to monitor progress of the implementation of key recommendations