

strategic development group



DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND TRADE

AUSTRALIA PACIFIC CLIMATE PARTNERSHIP

MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT

16 JUNE 2021



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **Australia Pacific Climate Partnership (the Partnership)** is a four year (2018-19/2021-22) regional program. It seeks to strengthen the climate and disaster resilience of Pacific peoples, and has the following intended end of program outcomes:

- Australian aid investments in the Pacific are climate and disaster risk informed.
- Australian supported climate change information is relevant and influential; and
- Australia is valued as a partner in climate change action in the Pacific.

The Partnership consists of various subprograms, including: The Support Unit (SU, \$22.6m 2018-19 to 2021-22), the Climate and Oceans Support Program in the Pacific, Phase 2 (COSPPac2, \$23.3m, 2017-18 to 2021-22), and Governance for Resilient Development in the Pacific (Gov4Res \$10.4m 2018-2019 to 2021-22).

The purpose of the mid-term review is twofold:

1. to generate an independent perspective on how the Partnership is tracking against the intended end of program outcomes, and
2. assessing the Partnership model, specifically the extent to which the Partnership has helped the subprograms to be greater than the sum of their parts.

The mid-term review is not intended as an appraisal of each sub-program or implementing partner's performance. The assessment of the sub-programs recognises that they are at different stages of implementation and have different histories.

KEY FINDINGS

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT – THE PARTNERSHIP MODEL

In its current form, the Partnership model will not achieve its intended outcomes by the end of the program. Despite good intentions and some isolated examples, it has not yet been able to demonstrate its benefits in the Pacific beyond the three sub-program components. The Partnership model has been unable to overcome structural and historical differences and is adding another layer of organisation that is diverting effort from achieving sub-program objectives. In the eye of many stakeholders, the Partnership has come to mean the Support Unit only.

The focus for the sub-programs has been on delivering results under their individual program frameworks rather than a shared overarching strategy. Much of the success achieved by the Partnership has been through the individual programs and the relationships they have made in the Pacific. Where the Programs are responding to specific needs of Pacific stakeholders and working in tandem with them to address those gaps or challenges, they are demonstrating the strongest value.



There is a lack of dedicated resources for coordination of the partnership and the role of the different sub-programs in relation to the partnership was poorly articulated in the original design and service agreements between DFAT and the subprogram partners. DFAT's role in supporting the Partnership has shifted over the course of the Partnership which has created further uncertainty about the roles of the partners in relation to the Partnership. Partners recognised the need to revisit roles and responsibilities to reset expectations and review the unmet needs of the Partnership model if it is to be effective.

The sub-programs do see opportunities for collaboration in the future. This would require dedicated time and resources to identify, assess and implement such collaborative activities which sit outside the current scope of all three program's current resourcing. The purpose of such activities would be to pilot potential joint activities and test the effectiveness of the proposed Partnership synergies.

OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT – PROGRESS TOWARDS THE PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES

OUTCOME 1

There has been sustained improvement in the integration of climate change and disaster risk resilience in Australian aid investments in the Pacific over recent years. Evidence and feedback suggest that APCP Support Unit (SU) has been instrumental in achieving these gains in integration. Consultations with Post/DFAT staff and implementing partners confirmed that, for the most part, assistance from the SU and Expert Panels¹ was flexible, responsive and of high quality. Data, however, to support a more comprehensive and qualitative assessment of integration is not available.

While integration has improved, there remain significant opportunities to strengthen the coverage and depth of climate and disaster resilience in Pacific aid investments. Time pressures and varying capacities of DFAT staff, inconsistent leadership on the priority afforded to climate change integration, and system weaknesses hinder integration efforts. Further, in some rare instances, technical assistance provided through the Expert Panels has not been fit for purpose and some knowledge brokering efforts have not had the desired results.

Integration efforts are also constrained by the lack of dedicated climate expertise within DFAT. Internally, there is no bridge between the SU and the broader DFAT institutional environment – hence that technical expertise is not present in policy and operational discussions within DFAT, nor are lessons disseminated across divisions. Externally, it means that the technical face of climate change integration in the region is not DFAT and is not present to advance Australia's credentials as a climate change partner at high level political and technical discussions.

OUTCOME 2

Progress towards achievement of this outcome has been variable across the Partnership. The three sub-programs play distinctly different roles in supporting climate information and have progressed to

¹ Expert Panels are specialists contracted to provide climate and disaster risk advice across eight sectors including health and infrastructure.



different degrees in their ability to deliver influential climate information for the Pacific. However, the breadth of climate information being produced, and the number of pathways developed to facilitate better utilisation of this information is considerable.

COSPPac2 continues to provide important, relevant, and influential information to Pacific Island national meteorological services partners. There is acknowledgement by Pacific partners that Australia's contribution through COSPPac2 fills a unique, critical need in the Pacific, particularly in generating short-term seasonal forecasts and building capacity of national meteorological services. While this phase of COSPPac2 is the first to extend beyond national government support and reach out to community level actors, developing climate knowledge products at this scale is still in its early stages and achievements remain unclear at the community level. **There remains a gap in the Partnership's ability to provide long-term climate projections that can inform DFAT investments, particularly in infrastructure.** Australia has previously supported this work through CSIRO in the Pacific.

The Partnership SU is beginning to fill a gap in the Pacific between the production of climate science information and the understanding and utilisation of that information beyond technical partners. Most of this work has been prioritised through DFAT investments and opportunities to integrate climate and disaster risk information, however there are some emerging success stories relating to the Partnership SU knowledge brokering activities. Emerging success stories are evident where the SU is helping to connect Australian climate science investments (see COSPPac2 above) with downstream partners to localise information to the PIC or sectoral context. **Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) integration with climate and disaster resilience is an area of impact that has also been well-received by partners** and has demonstrated a niche where Australia can provide a significant value-add in leveraging local knowledge in combination with traditional climate science-based information.

Knowledge brokering activities have primarily prioritised enhancing the integration of climate and disaster risks through DFAT investments in a way that aligns with PIC needs. While it is not possible to say from the evidence viewed whether the investments in knowledge brokering have been the 'right' investments given the context, there does not appear to be a clear decision-making framework for how knowledge brokering activities are identified and selected. This has also raised some concerns among Pacific stakeholders that the climate information is not grounded in the region and misses the connections with Pacific Islands traditional knowledge on climate and disasters.

OUTCOME 3

To a large extent, **implementing the sub-programs effectively and in a way which closely partners with Pacific stakeholders will be the driving factors in enhancing Australia's climate credentials.** Increasing the involvement of Pacific expertise will enhance Australia's standing in the Pacific as an enduring climate partner by embedding the work in the Pacific context and enhancing incorporation of local knowledge and practices. Communicating what the Partnership is achieving also has an important role to play. Communications is also central to achieving other Partnership and sub-program objectives, particularly in informing governments and communities on climate and disaster risk.



At the operational level, the APCP is promoting Australia as a valued partner on climate change action. It is difficult to know, however, whether this is turning the dial on public and political perceptions more broadly in the Pacific. The review did not have the time or resources to critically assess this perception or how widely it is held, or how that may have changed because of the Partnership.

Efforts to communicate key messages have been stymied by draft material not linking in with relevant policy contexts, slow clearance processes and an unwillingness by DFAT to use dissemination platforms outside of those run by DFAT. That DFAT takes a cautious approach to communications is understandable given the high political profile of climate change in Australia's relations with the Pacific. This risk-aversion however comes at a cost as the SU is unable to fully utilise the communication tools at its disposal to promote Australia's achievements and support. Further, there appears to be a lack of clear agreement around the roles and responsibilities of the SU, DFAT Posts and DFAT Canberra.

RECOMMENDATIONS

STRATEGIC

1. Wind down the partnership approach and allow the sub-programs to continue independently
2. Enhance engagement with Pacific partners
3. Develop DFAT internal expertise on climate change

OPERATIONAL

4. Strengthen the Support Unit to ensure it is fit-for purpose as its role evolves
5. Enhance integration by strengthening internal incentives
6. Sharpen the focus of communications to promote Australia as a valued climate partner



CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| E X E C U T I V E S U M M A R Y | 1 |
| A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S | 6 |
| A B B R E V I A T I O N S | 7 |
| I N T R O D U C T I O N | 8 |
| BACKGROUND | 8 |
| PURPOSE AND SCOPE | 8 |
| REPORT STRUCTURE | 9 |
| METHODOLOGY | 10 |
| K E Y F I N D I N G S | 11 |
| STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT - THE PARTNERSHIP MODEL | 12 |
| OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT - PROGRESS TOWARDS THE PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES | 14 |
| OUTCOME 1. AUSTRALIAN AID INVESTMENTS ARE CLIMATE AND DISASTER RISK INFORMED | 15 |
| OUTCOME 2. AUSTRALIAN SUPPORTED CLIMATE CHANGE INFORMATION IS RELEVANT AND INFLUENTIAL | 18 |
| OUTCOME 3. AUSTRALIA IS VALUED AS A CLIMATE CHANGE PARTNER IN THE PACIFIC | 22 |
| C O N C L U S I O N A N D R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S | 24 |
| STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS | 24 |
| OPERATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS | 25 |
| A N N E X U R E S | 27 |
| ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference | 27 |
| ANNEX 2: Mid-Term Review Plan | 27 |
| ANNEX 3: Consultation List | 27 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The review team comprised of Melissa Bungcaras (Team Leader and Climate Change Specialist) and Peter Versegi (Strategic Evaluation Specialist) from Strategic Development Group. The team was supported by Claire Harris (Strategic Development Group). The team brought to this review climate change, program management, partnership brokering, and monitoring and evaluation expertise alongside a strong understanding of the context and corporate knowledge of DFAT's systems and processes.

The review team would like to express sincere thanks to the DFAT staff, implementing partners and Pacific stakeholders for their time and valuable insights which informed the findings and recommendations made in this report. Special thanks to Emi Tagi, Justin Ferris, Kate Duggan and the team at the Partnership support unit (Palladium) in their responsiveness to providing additional information and documentation to the review team and supporting the arrangement of consultations.



ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| AIFFP | The Australian Infrastructure Financing Facility for the Pacific |
| APCP | Australia Pacific Climate Partnership |
| AQC | Aid Quality Criteria |
| COSPPac2 | Climate and Oceans Support Program in the Pacific, Phase 2 |
| CSIRO | Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation |
| DFAT | Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australia |
| DRR | Disaster risk reduction |
| GA | Geoscience Australia |
| GEDSI | Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion |
| Gov4Res | Governance for Resilient Development in the Pacific Program |
| IMR | Investment Monitoring Reports |
| MEL | Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| ODE | DFAT Office of Development Effectiveness |
| P4R | Partnerships for Recovery Strategy, DFAT |
| PIC | Pacific Island Country |
| PIF | Pacific Islands Forum |
| PNG | Papua New Guinea |
| SU | Australia Pacific Climate Partnership Support Unit |
| SPC | The Pacific Community |
| SPREP | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UTS ISF | University of Technology Sydney, Institute for Sustainable Futures |



INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Australia Pacific Climate Partnership (the Partnership) is a four year (2018-19/2021-22) regional program. It seeks to strengthen the climate and disaster resilience of Pacific peoples, and has the following intended end of program outcomes:

- Australian aid investments in the Pacific are climate and disaster risk informed;
- Australian supported climate change information is relevant and influential; and
- Australia is valued as a partner in climate change action in the Pacific.

The Partnership also seeks to strengthen the focus on gender equality, disability access and social inclusion within the parameters of climate change and disaster risk reduction programming.

The Partnership consists of various subprograms, including: The Support Unit (SU, \$22.6m 2018-19 to 2021-22), the Climate and Oceans Support Program in the Pacific, Phase 2 (COSPPac2, \$23.3m, 2017-18 to 2021-22), and Governance for Resilient Development in the Pacific (Gov4Res \$10.4m 2018-2019 to 2021-22). The subprograms have different implementing partners and unique contributions to the Partnership's intended end of program outcomes. The subprograms have been brought together under the Partnership to provide a framework for the management and coordination of Australia's regional climate and disaster resilience activities. This is intended to help connect climate and disaster information with Australian aid investments and Pacific decision makers.

This review is timely for three key reasons: first, Australia's work relating to climate and disaster risk resilience in the Pacific has continued in various forms for over a decade;² the original partnership design may no longer be fit-for-purpose. Second, the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly changed ways of working in the Pacific that may require a different approach or delivery modality. Third, Australia is considering further support for climate change beyond the Pacific region and the Partnership investment may help shape Australia's future work.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of the mid-term review is twofold:

1. to generate an independent perspective on how the Partnership is tracking against the intended end of program outcomes, and

² Australia Pacific Climate Change Program Framework Design, November 2017



2. assessing the Partnership model, specifically the extent to which the Partnership has helped the subprograms to be greater than the sum of their parts³.

The mid-term review is not intended as an appraisal of each sub-program or implementing partner's performance. The assessment of the sub-programs recognises that they are at different stages of implementation and have different histories.

The recommendations of this mid-term review are forward looking with a focus on strengthening the Partnership throughout the remaining implementation period and informing DFAT decision making about an extension or recalibration of the Partnership in 2022.

REPORT STRUCTURE

This document sets out the findings of the ACP Mid-term Review conducted over February – April 2021. While the primary audience is DFAT, it is a short, concise report intended for wide readership by ACP Partners. It responds to the key evaluation questions below, and features recommendations for future investment in strengthening climate and disaster resilience in the Pacific and beyond. The Review findings and recommendations are presented from both a strategic and an operational viewpoint, and case studies have been included to further illustrate the findings.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

1. To what extent are the sub programs supporting achievement of the partnership's end-of-program outcomes?
 - a. How successful is the Partnership in influencing the integration of climate change and disaster resilience considerations in Australia's aid investments?
 - b. To what extent is the integration of resilience within Australia's aid investments helping Pacific Island countries to take action on climate change and disaster risk reduction?
 - c. To what extent is gender equality, disability access and social inclusion (including traditional knowledge) being addressed within the parameters of climate change and disaster risk reduction programming in Australia's aid investments?
 - d. To what extent is information produced by the Partnership supporting Pacific decision makers to strengthen climate and disaster resilience?
 - e. To what extent is the Partnership supporting DFAT to communicate Australia's support for climate change action in the Pacific, and helping to influence Pacific perceptions of Australia as a valued partner on climate action?
2. What lessons have been learned about the relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the partnership approach?
 - a. What cases illustrate strengths or significant results achieved by the Partnership, rather than the sub programs? What worked well (and for whom), what hasn't worked well, and why?

³ Terms of Reference – Annex 1



- b. Are the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning arrangements of the Partnership fit for purpose? To what extent are these arrangements supporting DFAT's priorities and information needs?
- c. What are the benefits of joining the three subprograms under the Partnership? What are the emerging strengths and weaknesses of this model? Is this model still relevant?
- d. How can the Partnership be more effective, efficient, relevant, and sustainable moving forward?

METHODOLOGY

The review was conducted by two independent consultants whose Terms of Reference are set out in Annex 1.

Approach to Data Collection

To answer the evaluation questions, the methodology featured a mixed-methods approach involving: review of project documentation and other relevant policy and aid program documents from the Pacific region; 35 semi-structured interviews with project partners and stakeholders conducted via videoconferencing; and validation meetings/communications to test findings and clarify details with select stakeholders.

Limitations and Reliability of the Data Obtained

The main limitations of the data collected are: (1) the review team was only able to interview a limited number of representatives from Pacific Island Countries (mainly through regional organisations), although a greater number of government representatives were invited to participate; (2) the lack of in-country consultations (due to the COVID-19 pandemic) limited the information able to be collected from local stakeholders; (3) Gaps in quantitative and qualitative data to support assessments of progress towards the outcomes.

Ethical Considerations

The review team started each interview with a clear description of the purposes of the evaluation and noted that participation was voluntary. The review team emphasised that information provided would be treated confidentially, and that there would be no direct attribution of views to any individual. Attribution of information shared by specific countries was also minimised. Given that most stakeholders were very open about their views and were prepared to provide a critical assessment of the project, the review team consider that this approach was successful.



KEY FINDINGS

During the review consultations, stakeholders were asked about the relevance of the project to the needs of PICs, and whether there are any new issues, challenges or priorities that have emerged over the past three years that any future support should consider. Their responses show universal agreement that the Partnership (often construed as the Support Unit) is highly relevant to the needs of the region and there is a clear rationale for continued Australian investment. Over the course of the investment, climate change, the COVID-19 pandemic, and other contextual impediments to the completion of outstanding work have emerged as key challenges prompting a shift in ways of working.

The rationale for providing support for climate and disaster resilience in Pacific is set out in the Investment Design: with research, resilience and response the focus in addressing current and future climate and disaster impacts. PICs are highly vulnerable to climate change and disasters, and failure to address the risks of climate change is likely to undermine current and future social and economic development in the region. Australia is committed to supporting the Pacific with a commitment of \$500 million in climate finance over the period 2020-2025⁴.

PICs continue to be actively engaged in influencing climate change policy internationally and have signalled addressing climate change and disasters as a high priority through broad national policy and regional declarations. Pacific island countries reaffirmed that climate change poses the single greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and wellbeing of the peoples of the Pacific through the 2019 Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) *Kainaki II Declaration for Urgent Climate Change Action Now*⁵, and continue to take a leading role in the region advocating for climate action.

In the context of global disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, Australia has sought to redefine its international development policy and aid program priorities through the *Partnerships for Recovery: Australia's COVID-19 Development Response Strategy 2020*⁶ (*Partnerships for Recovery Strategy*). The P4R strategy recognises the role of climate change adaptation in supporting resilience and stability within the Indo-Pacific region to support a sustainable recovery from the economic impact of the pandemic. It also reinforces Australia's Pacific Step-Up priorities, where climate and disaster resilience are critical to the shared security and economic prosperity of the region.

However, the challenges associated with the COVID-19 pandemic in the Pacific are enormous and the region's path to protecting livelihoods and building back better will require innovative and transformative solutions that prioritise climate and disaster resilience. The World Bank⁷ estimates the

⁴ Prime Minister of Australia, Media Release – *Stepping up Climate Resilience in the Pacific*, 13 August 2019. Accessed at: <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/stepping-climate-resilience-pacific>

⁵ Pacific Islands Forum (2019) *Kainaki II Declaration for Urgent Climate Action Now*, 15 August 2019, Funafuti, Tuvalu. Accessed at: <https://www.forumsec.org/2020/11/11/kainaki/>

⁶ DFAT (2020) *Partnerships for Recovery: Australia's COVID-19 Development Response*

⁷ The World Bank (2021) *Uneven Recovery: East Asia and Pacific Economic Update*, April 2021. Accessed at: <https://www.worldbank.org/en/region/eap/publication/uneven-recovery-east-asia-and-pacific-economic-update-april-2021>



number of poor people in the region in 2020 increased for the first time in twenty years, and that PICs' GDP in 2020 declined by 11.3% from the previous year. A potential return to growth is only expected once travel restrictions ease; however, this is tempered by the threat of climate induced hazards in the region, a high probability in the coming years that may limit longer-term growth. Promoting a green recovery in the region is seen as one way to balance the needs for economic growth with regional stability into the future.

STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT - THE PARTNERSHIP MODEL

In its current form, the Partnership model will not achieve its intended outcomes by the end of the program. Despite good intentions and some isolated examples of collaboration, it has not yet been able to demonstrate its benefits in the Pacific beyond the three sub-program components. The Partnership model has been unable to overcome structural and historical differences, and is adding another layer of organisation that is diverting effort from achieving sub-program objectives. In the eye of many stakeholders, the Partnership has come to mean the Support Unit only.

The potential gains from a shared identity and strategy for Australia's contributions to climate and disaster information have not yet been realised. The original rationale for combining the three sub-programs under the Partnership was loosely defined to promote flexibility and respond to the needs of the Pacific region. However, the lack of formalised Partnership structures and dedicated resources has provided few incentives for collaboration and is reliant on goodwill between the sub-program team leaders. DFAT's clear preference for the life of the program has been to promote the Australian Government's support for climate change and disaster resilience, not the partnership itself. As such, a Partnership branding has not been developed, and the potential to profile the work of the Australian Government instead has fallen short in influencing positive perceptions in the Pacific of Australia as a valued partner in climate change action and DRR.

It was well-recognised amongst partners that the three sub-programs are very different on many fronts: they have different programmatic histories; the timing for commencement and completion of the sub-programs is different; the high-level objectives of each program are different; and the organisational ways of working of each sub program partner and their institutional culture are very different.

Stakeholders have more visibility of the individual contributions being made by the sub-programs and as a result there was a common and broad acceptance of the Partnership SU as being the main vehicle for the Partnership brand in the Pacific.

The Partnership has demonstrated some isolated and discrete areas of collaboration that have added value beyond their individual workstreams. The team leaders have instigated regular dialogues at a management level to share information and identify opportunities where they can support or extend their programs to meet shared Partnership objectives. The other significant collaboration has been the Regional Workshop held in 2018 (Fiji) and 2019 (Canberra) (due to COVID-19 the 2020 workshop did



not proceed) that brought together implementing partners from the sub programs with key DFAT staff and stakeholders in the region. These events were well-received and provided a space for learning and networking among participants with a view to strengthen the Partnership implementation.

The focus for the sub-programs has been on delivering results under their individual program frameworks rather than a shared overarching strategy. Much of the success achieved by the Partnership has been through the individual programs and the relationships they have made in the Pacific. Where the Programs are responding to specific needs of Pacific stakeholders and working in tandem with them to address those gaps or challenges, they are demonstrating the strongest value. Pacific stakeholders identified the desire to have country level coordination of the Partnership to be able to access the full benefits of the partnership approach (for example, the 3 sub-programs jointly identifying or responding to country-specific needs and developing a plan to address it in partnership). They re-iterated that the Pacific region is not homogenous and requires nuanced understanding of the different culture both within and between countries.

While not an example of collaboration, the Partnership has also created incentives for partners to push beyond their traditional comfort zones and consider the different approaches to achieving their goals. For example, COSPPac2 considering approaches to generating and delivering climate science that go beyond a client-focused approach to incorporate community level engagement.

There is a lack of dedicated resources for coordination of the partnership and the role of the different sub-programs was not well articulated in the original design and service agreements between DFAT and the subprogram partners. DFAT's role in supporting the Partnership has shifted over the course of the Partnership which has created further uncertainty about the roles of the partners in relation to the Partnership. Partners recognised the need to revisit roles and responsibilities to reset expectations and review the unmet needs of the Partnership model if it is to be effective.

The management of the sub-programs by DFAT is fragmented with each sub-program managed by and reporting to different sections within DFAT. This further complicates and confuses any approaches within the Partnership to streamline activities, MEL, and reporting. Without a single point of accountability within DFAT, the sub-programs are incentivised to respond to the priorities of the section they report to. Limited communication between these relevant sections in DFAT further exacerbates this challenge.

The **Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (MEL)** Plan developed for the Partnership considers the different outcomes being delivered by each sub-program and provides a practical approach to conceptualising how the overall Partnership contributes to improved climate and disaster resilience in the Pacific. Collection and analysis of MEL data through the Partnership SU has resulted in a rich repository of information across the Partnership, and more broadly for Australia's aid investments in the climate change and DRR portfolio, housed and accessed through the Partnership's Climate Wise online platform. While the platform itself is accessible by DFAT officers, the detailed information



provided is difficult for DFAT officers to interpret and is more usefully accessed when transformed into a communications product.

Despite this, there has been difficulty in obtaining adequate qualitative and quantitative information to support assessment of Outcome 3 of the Partnership. The outcome is poorly defined (whose perceptions of Australia are we influencing?) and the MEL Plan does not engage with measuring this outcome directly in the performance assessment framework.

Strong efforts have been made to build the capacity of DFAT program managers and partners to provide clear data across the key result areas of the Partnership's performance assessment framework (PAF), including online tools for data collection and accessible documentation. There has been effective tracking progress of the outputs under the Partnership and reporting has focused on aggregating information from the three sub-programs to demonstrate compliance with DFAT's AQC reporting. There is great potential for the longitudinal impact study being conducted by the University of Technology Sydney, Institute of Sustainable Futures (UTS-ISF) to provide tangible demonstrations of the Partnership theory of change in practice. However, delays to the study and challenges around the publication of the first report have reduced the likelihood of the study having a meaningful contribution before the end of this phase of the Partnership.

The sub-programs do see opportunities for collaboration in the future. This would require dedicated time and resources to identify, assess and implement such collaborative activities which sit outside the current scope of all three program's current resourcing. The purpose of such activities would be to pilot potential joint activities and test the effectiveness of the proposed Partnership synergies.

There is also a renewed focus on climate change within DFAT that is considering how Australia can best allocate, deliver and account for its resources in climate and disaster resilience across the entire aid program, not just the Pacific. This has led to internal discussions about the value of a support unit function in assisting the aid program to further its ambitions in having a climate and disaster risk informed portfolio globally. The notion that this may lead to further internal resources in DFAT presents a potential opportunity to strengthen linkages between the SU and DFAT and address challenges of connecting DFAT's policy areas with climate and disaster science and information.

OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT - PROGRESS TOWARDS THE PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES

While the Partnership model itself has struggled to make headway, progress towards the outcomes articulated in the Partnership design - and essentially those being pursued by the individual sub-programs - are more encouraging and are discussed below.



OUTCOME 1. AUSTRALIAN AID INVESTMENTS ARE CLIMATE AND DISASTER RISK INFORMED

There has been sustained improvement in the integration of climate change and disaster risk resilience in Australian aid investments in the Pacific over recent years. This is evidenced from:

- trend data on climate integration drawn from annual investment checks from 2018.
- the increase in climate and disaster risk resilience being the primary or secondary objective in aid investments and the corresponding increase in reported climate financing.
- the high-level of demand for SU services (194 requests from 98 programs in 2019-20)⁸
- collaborating information from interviews and case studies conducted during this review.

Data, however, to support a more comprehensive and qualitative assessment of integration is not available, nor did the review have the time and resources to conduct such an assessment.

Evidence and feedback suggest that the SU has been instrumental in achieving these gains in integration. Consultations with Post/DFAT staff and implementing partners confirmed that, for the most part, assistance from the SU and Expert Panels⁹ was flexible, responsive and of high quality. This was confirmed in more detail by the case studies (e.g., PNG Transport Program). Feedback surveys conducted by the SU show high levels of client satisfaction (over 90%). A particular advantage is that the SU is resourced to fund this assistance, enabling it to be mobilized quickly. To a noticeable extent, the SU has served to fill the technical expertise gap within DFAT, at least in the Pacific, on climate change that was identified in the Office of Development Effectiveness's 2018 Climate Evaluation¹⁰.

While disaster risk reduction appears to be a less visible feature of the SU communications where climate change dominates, there is no indication that the assistance provided by the SU or the Expert Panels is not adequately addressing these risks. Feedback indicated the SU DRR Advisor located in the Pacific has been a valued resource, able to connect people and programs where there are opportunities for synergy in addressing disaster risk. Strong collaboration with Geoscience Australia's flexible mode of working has also seen quality and influential support provided in Tonga through the Gov4Res program.

There is some evidence of integration benefiting from the "partnership" approach, for instance in linking COSPPac2 historical weather data and seasonal forecasts for AIFFP PNG Trans-National Highway, and in upcoming agriculture sector programs. This is not, however, a dominating feature of the integration effort.

⁸ ACP Aid Quality Check (AQC) Report 2020

⁹ Expert Panels are specialists contracted to provide climate and disaster risk advice across eight sectors including health and infrastructure.

¹⁰ DFAT (2018) *Investing in the Future: Evaluation of Australia's Climate Change Assistance*, Accessed at: <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/evaluation-of-australias-climate-change-assistance.pdf>, p60



On occasion support provided has not been fit for purpose and some knowledge brokering efforts have not had the desired results, partly because of COVID restrictions. In rare instances, technical assistance provided through the Expert Panels was not up to the task at hand from both a technical and developmental aspect. Comment was made that while SU advice was very good technically, it sometimes struggled with more strategic pieces of work. Further, while assistance is provided almost entirely by Australians and is often fly-in and fly-out (recognising that most of the climate science, engineering and architectural skills being mobilised are not readily available in the Pacific) it would be timely to investigate scaling up the engagement of local capacity that is available in the region. The review notes and welcomes recent efforts by the SU to appoint local facilitators in major countries and to engage some Pacific expertise in the Expert Panels.

To minimize this occurring in the future, the SU should continue to strengthen its quality assurance processes, particularly at the early identification stage (e.g., determining whether they have the right expertise available to meet a particular request), and regularly review its panels and processes to ensure they are relevant and efficient. Drawing in greater Pacific-sourced expertise would add significant cache to the SU's work and build Australia's credentials as an enduring climate partner in the region.

CASE STUDY

PNG TRANSPORT SECTOR SUPPORT PROGRAM

The Papua New Guinea-Australia Transport Sector Support Program (TSSP) commenced in 2007 as a 15–20-year commitment to support the PNG Government to maintain its transport infrastructure network. Australian support is nearing \$1 billion since its inception.

After a request from DFAT staff in the PNG High Commission, the Support Unit initiated engagement with TSSP's management to discuss the project's approach to climate and disaster risk. The SU assisted with the development of terms of reference (TORs) for an Environmental Safeguards and Climate and Disaster Resilience Strategy (ESCCDR Strategy) for the project in early 2020. The SU drew on the Expert Panel (Pacific Connections) to provide technical assistance to undertake consultations and develop the ESCCDR Strategy in late 2020. The SU reviewed the strategy and, arising from that strategy, advised on the TORs for an Environmental Safeguards position within TSSP.

The SU and Pacific Connections are providing technical assistance for a workshop with PNG Climate Change Development Agency to finalise the ESCCDR Strategy for broader application across the PNG transport sector. Implementation of the strategy should deliver significant benefits in providing more climate and disaster resilient roads and other transport infrastructure in PNG.

Feedback from TSSP management and the PNG post was uniformly positive on the support and performance of the SU and Expert Panel. Assistance was seen to have been responsive, timely and of high quality. Particular praise was given to the flexibility of support, aided by the ability of the Expert Panel/SU to draw on its own resources to respond. This initiative was also facilitated by DFAT staff at Post who had knowledge and experience in climate and disaster risk and were able to use the outreach undertaken by the Support Unit to drive the engagement.



While integration has improved, there remain significant opportunities to strengthen the coverage and depth of climate and disaster resilience in Pacific aid investments. Integration has been more difficult, for instance, with existing legacy projects. With new designs the effectiveness of integration efforts will depend largely on the stage in which the SU is engaged. There also appears to be an opportunity to enhance its influence by going upstream and influencing country and sector strategies and investment pipelines.

The reasons for this uneven approach rest in DFAT's policies, systems and people:

- *Time pressures on DFAT staff and inconsistent leadership on the priority afforded to the integration of climate change considerations in aid investments.* Posts face significant pressures which have intensified due to COVID19. Further, parts of DFAT perceive that there is not a clear policy priority afforded to climate and disaster risk in the Partnership for Recovery policy released early last year. These two factors appear to constrain the ability of some Post staff to allocate the time to fully engage with integration efforts.
- *Varying capacity and knowledge of DFAT staff.* Past evaluations (e.g., ODE Disability¹¹) underline the disproportionately positive impact that a basic understanding of a thematic issue can have on integration efforts. Positive examples of climate integration can often be traced to the identification of opportunities by DFAT staff (e.g., PNG Post on Transport Sector's Climate Change and Environmental Safeguards Policy). Further, despite outreach efforts, knowledge of the Partnership and of the SU varies across Posts and is exacerbated by staff turnover.
- *System weaknesses.* The cessation of the previous annual performance monitoring tool (Aid Quality Check) has reduced both the incentive for DFAT staff to engage regularly on climate and disaster risk, and the opportunity for the SU to engage with Posts on investments. Design processes could be enhanced, such as including climate and disaster risk in the quality assurance matrix, while also respecting corporate efforts to simplify and streamline systems and processes.

Finally, **integration efforts are also constrained by the lack of dedicated climate expertise within DFAT.** Internally, there is no bridge between the SU and the broader DFAT institutional environment – hence that expertise is not present in policy and operational discussions within DFAT, nor are lessons disseminated across divisions. Externally, it means that the technical face of climate change integration in the region is not DFAT and is not present to advance Australia's credentials as a climate change partner at high level political and technical discussions. Establishing such internal expertise and its role within DFAT would be consistent with the recommendations of the 2019 Thematic Group Review.

¹¹ DFAT (2018) *Development for All: Evaluation of Progress Made in Strengthening Disability Inclusion in Australian Aid*, Accessed at <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/development-for-all-evaluation.pdf>, p61.



These challenges are neither new nor unique to climate integration (ODE Disability, Climate 2018). Nor are we talking about a failure, rather it is seeking to identify the remaining weaknesses that are hindering a more systematic and consistent approach to climate and disaster risk integration in the Pacific.

OUTCOME 2. AUSTRALIAN SUPPORTED CLIMATE CHANGE INFORMATION IS RELEVANT AND INFLUENTIAL

Progress towards a achievement of this outcome has been variable across the Partnership. The three sub-programs play distinctly different roles in supporting climate information and have progressed to different degrees in their ability to deliver influential climate information for the Pacific. However, the breadth of climate information being produced, and the number of pathways developed to facilitate better utilisation of this information is considerable.

COVID-19 has significantly delayed some aspects of the knowledge brokering activities. Combined with the long lead times for seeing impact in this type of work, there should be caution in dismissing these activities too early as they do require long-term investment to reach their full potential.

COSPPac2 continues to provide important, relevant, and influential information to Pacific Island national meteorological services partners. There is acknowledgement by Pacific partners that Australia's contribution through COSPPac2 fills a unique, critical need in the Pacific, particularly in generating short-term seasonal forecasts and building capacity of national meteorological services.

The program continues to build on Australia's strong base of support for seasonal predictions (through weather, climate, and oceanographic monitoring) and for ongoing geodetic sea level monitoring in the Pacific. Pacific partners are ready for COSPPac2 support to be further extended beyond national technical capacity building to consider traditional knowledge and brokering knowledge products at the community level.

Some pilot activities are showing success in downscaling climate information produced by COSPPac2 to particular sectors within countries. For example, Fiji's sugar industry (through the Sugar Research Institute of Fiji - SRIF) is now producing a quarterly bulletin with seasonal outlooks for rainfall and temperature. These bulletins also include advisory information from SRIF to sugar cane farmers relating to the appropriate actions that should be taken to respond to the seasonal predictions in the bulletin. It's important that as this work takes shape it draws on local knowledge to ensure relevance with local people and systems, rather than relying on approaches to knowledge translation that have worked in the Australian context.

COSPPac2 recognises the gap in community capacity to interpret information from scientific services and is also seeking new partnerships (such as the Red Cross with the Early Action Rainfall Watch) to continue to ensure information is linking with community needs. This is also ensuring that COSPPac2 is strengthening its approach to GEDSI. The Solomon Islands Early Action Rainfall (EAR) Watch workshop



was the first time a person with disability has attended a COSPPac2 workshop. This has given the program a new perspective on the relevance of information produced by the program and the need to secure further resources and expertise to effectively integrate GEDSI into climate information products.

While this phase of COSPPac2 is the first to extend beyond national government support and reach out to community level actors, developing climate knowledge products at this scale is still in its early stages and achievements remain unclear. Pacific organisations have noted that the majority of Pacific Islanders have a strong preference for relying on traditional knowledge over scientific knowledge in relation to climate and weather information. Identifying the pathways for COSPPac2 information to be downscaled to the community level – through early warning systems, linking with traditional knowledge, tailoring to inclusive community groups – will be critical to scientific knowledge in the Pacific being influential beyond national meteorological services.

There remains a gap in the Partnership’s ability to provide long-term climate projections that can inform DFAT investments, particularly in infrastructure. While the expert panels engaged by the SU have been able to deliver this technical support, there have been concerns about the currency of the information provided and methodologies used in some instances. Having a more consistent approach to sourcing and providing this climate information may increase confidence with DFAT program managers. Australia has previously supported this work through CSIRO in the Pacific, however there remains a critical need to continue to build climate science capabilities in the Pacific which is currently outside the scope of this partnership. The role of CSIRO in the current Partnership is framed through knowledge brokering activities connecting climate projections with national/subnational and sectoral applications informing climate change impact assessments. CSIRO are keen to see relationships within the Partnership be more effective and strategic to maximise opportunities across DFAT’s entire portfolio, not just within the Partnership.

There are also opportunities for COSPPac2 to work more closely with Gov4Res to ensure the climate information is grounded with broader government ministries beyond technical climate and meteorological agencies and departments. However, COSPPac2’s more supply-driven approach has been identified as a barrier to pursuing closer engagement with the emergent needs of Pacific Government and other stakeholders, beyond the meteorological services.

Gov4Res recognises that it is a stronger program if it has access to appropriate and tailored scientific information. For example, some government ministries are not engaging with climate and disaster risks at all in their planning and budgeting. Having simple hazard information that can be communicated with a non-technical audience can create a strong pathway to opening conversations about integrating risk and resilience into those ministries. In Tonga, Gov4Res partnered with Geoscience Australia to produce tailored mapping that utilised Tonga’s Ministry of Finance data from post-cyclone Gita. This mapping helped demonstrate the cost-benefits of rebuilding post-cyclone vs investing in climate and disaster resilient infrastructure design.



The Partnership SU is beginning to fill a gap in the Pacific between the production of climate science information and the understanding and utilisation of that information beyond technical partners. Most of this work has been prioritised through DFAT investments and opportunities to integrate climate and disaster risk information, however there are some emerging success stories relating to the Partnership SU knowledge brokering activities, particularly where GEDSI is a focus.

The SU is continuing to deepen its understanding of where knowledge gaps exist in the Pacific that can be addressed to strengthen integration of climate and disaster risks. Part of this includes acknowledging that the demand for climate information is generated at a sectoral level within countries rather than the need for broad geographic climate information (e.g., country or subnational level). A pertinent example in the time of COVID-19 has been the brokering of climate information into health policy and planning undertaken by the SU.

Emerging success stories are evident where the SU is helping to connect Australian climate science investments (see COSPPac2 above) with downstream partners to localise information to the PIC or sectoral context. **GEDSI integration with climate and disaster resilience is an area of impact that has also been well-received by partners** and has demonstrated a niche where Australia can provide a significant value-add in leveraging local knowledge in combination with traditional climate science-based information. Several interviewees highlighted the knowledge brokering activities implemented by the Shifting the Power Coalition in the Pacific that is building inter-generational collaboration and diverse young women's leadership to support linkages between climate science/services and traditional knowledge, as well as women's engagement in policy advocacy processes.

Further success in integrating GEDSI in climate and disaster risk and resilience activities, particularly in relation to aid program integration, is limited by DFAT's policy context that does not draw a strong link between these intersecting areas either through the *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy 2016* or the *Climate Change Action Strategy 2019*. Many staff and partners saw the integration of gender or climate change as optional 'add-ons' where they could sensibly choose which policy applied most to the investment and discount the less relevant policy. This approach to policy implementation limits the effectiveness of investments in addressing the systemic and intersecting challenges of addressing GEDSI and climate change and disaster risks concurrently.

Knowledge brokering activities have primarily prioritised enhancing the integration of climate and disaster risks through DFAT investments in a way that aligns with PIC needs. While it is not possible to say yet from the evidence viewed whether the investments in knowledge brokering have been the 'right' investments given the context, there doesn't appear to be a clear decision-making framework for how knowledge brokering activities are identified and selected.

This has also raised some concerns among Pacific stakeholders that the climate information is not grounded in the region and misses the connections with Pacific Islands traditional knowledge on climate and disasters. They highlighted that the current model for delivering climate information through the sub programs is through primarily Australian-based implementing partners, with Australian expertise,



and in some cases proposing Australian context-specific solutions. The greatest opportunities for strengthening the impact of Australian supported climate information are in connecting to local and traditional knowledge and strengthening the network of Pacific knowledge brokers and climate experts to lead these initiatives.

CASE STUDY

KIRIBATI FACILITY

The Kiribati Facility continues the long-term Australian investment (since 2010) in the leadership and coordination capacity of the Government of Kiribati Ministry of Employment and Human Resources in the skills and employment sector.

The Support Unit utilized the annual in-country advisory visit to identify the key priority areas for collaboration with programs supporting the Kiribati education sector. This led to the SU facilitating the engagement of a technical advisor from the Climate Change Expert Panel to support the Kiribati Institute of Technology (KIT) in developing climate change and environment policies and curriculum modules. This included revision of KIT's environment and climate change awareness action plan and implementation strategy, and development of a nine-module online climate change curriculum with a view to being a stepping-stone towards a full curriculum on climate change and environment in the future.

It is too early to make a judgement on the impact of the technical support on students, staff and the broader community involved with KIT. The curriculum was still in an approval phase within KIT at the time of interviewing, while the environment and climate change awareness plan was delayed in 2020 but will push ahead in 2021 with the identification of a climate change champion in KIT. KIT is positioning as a climate leader and knowledge broker within their community and recognize the opportunity to support students in validating their experiences of their local environment.

Feedback from the Post, KIT, and technical advisor, indicate that the assistance and performance of the SU and Expert Panel were positive and of a high quality that met the needs of local stakeholders. Specific feedback from KIT and the technical advisor did raise some issues with the consulting-based approach to support: KIT could not develop ongoing (sustainable) relationships with the technical advisor; contracting arrangements created inefficient communications between KIT, SU and technical advisor; the work appeared opportunistic and not linked with the broader sub-programs of the APCP 'Partnership'; and there is still a lag in knowledge for advisors who require contextual support (local knowledge) to undertake the work.

Stakeholders suggested the SU could be more proactive in supporting co-identification of opportunities for climate change and disasters integration and knowledge brokering in programs, recognizing many programs' lack of climate expertise. A more sustainable approach to the technical support would be through strengthening PIC expertise in the SU and its Expert Panels, and in particular engaging indigenous people who can speak from lived experience about the impacts of climate change and disasters in each country.



OUTCOME 3. AUSTRALIA IS VALUED AS A CLIMATE CHANGE PARTNER IN THE PACIFIC

A key objective of the Pacific Step-Up and the Partnership is to enhance the reputation of Australia as a valued climate change partner.

To a large extent, implementing the sub-programs effectively and in a way which partners closely with Pacific stakeholders will be the driving factors in enhancing Australia's climate credentials. Increasing the involvement of Pacific expertise will enhance Australia's standing in the Pacific as an enduring climate partner by embedding the work in the Pacific context and enhancing incorporation of local knowledge and practices. It is in Australia's national interest to engage on this issue in a way that respects the value of Pacific expertise and knowledge.

With Gov4Res having broad engagement in the Pacific region, and COSPPac2 having long standing relationships with Pacific stakeholders, it would stand to reason that these sub-programs would also play a key role in driving this outcome. However, discussions with Pacific stakeholders have highlighted the challenges around the Partnership identity, including the ability of the Gov4Res program, a multi-donor funded initiative managed by UNDP, to cut through as an Australian supported initiative.

That said, **communicating what the Australian Government is achieving has an important role to play.** Communications is also central to achieving other Partnership and sub-program objectives, particularly in informing governments and communities on climate and disaster risk. The Partnership has a communications plan and has generated and disseminated a significant number of products, including country factsheets, Postcards, and the Climate Wise website. These products serve numerous purposes and audiences. Following requests from DFAT, the SU now prepares a calendar of upcoming events in which communication products are attached.

Review discussions suggest that, at the operational level, the APCP is promoting the perception of Australia as a valued partner on climate change. **It is difficult to know, however, whether this is turning the dial on Pacific perceptions more broadly.** The review did not have the time or resources to critically assess this perception or how widely it is held, or how that may have changed because of the Partnership. The framing of this outcome for the Partnership has also not been clearly articulated through the MEL Plan which also leaves open the question of whose perceptions in the Pacific the Partnership is aiming to influence.

Discussions during the review revealed some uncertainty on the intended audiences of communication products. The Postcard series, for instance, was seen by some as useful for DFAT briefings, but of no real value to the authors who often received no feedback or recognition of their contributions. The Climate Wise website contains extensive information on the Partnership, its activities and climate science but access is limited. Some Posts commented that more country/context specific support and implementation strategies are needed to run effective communication campaigns. Questions were raised as to whether the breadth of communication products should be more focused in order to deliver greater impact.



Efforts to communicate key messages have been stymied by draft material not linking in with relevant policy contexts, slow clearance processes and an unwillingness by DFAT to use dissemination platforms outside of those run by DFAT. That DFAT takes a cautious approach to communications is understandable given the high political profile of climate change in Australia's relations with the Pacific. This risk-aversion however comes at a cost as the SU is unable to fully utilise the wealth of stories and content, and communication tools at its disposal to promote Australia's achievements and support. Issues around DFAT's clearance processes together with inadequate staff resourcing and direction on communications efforts within the Support Unit has meant that, at times, the communication needs of Posts have not been met. and effort has been wasted in producing material that has not been used.

Further, there appears to be some lack of clarity around the roles and responsibilities of the SU and DFAT at Post and DFAT Canberra. In some instances, the SU's engagement in policy messaging blurs with its technical support and briefing role as outlined in the APCP Communications Plan. Difficulties negotiating the Partnership's communication clearance processes has meant that the sub-programs have been more comfortable releasing communications under their own sub-program banner, thereby creating some duplication of message and lost opportunities to promote Australian Government support in the sector.

Recent efforts to sharpen the focus of communication efforts around campaigns (e.g., UNFCCC meeting in Glasgow), and an agreement around the framing of communication messages, are welcome. These efforts should be accelerated and accompanied by support to Posts to tailor communication messages and campaigns to their particular contexts. Consideration should be given to broadening communication platforms and to provide access to the SU communications experts to analytics from DFAT platforms.

In summary, there is a need to accelerate efforts to sharpen the focus of communication efforts and more deliberated strategies to implement them. Clearance processes need to be streamlined, aided by a clearer articulation of Australian Government messages by DFAT and more senior direction within the SU. The roles and responsibilities of DFAT (Posts and Canberra) and the SU need to be clarified and widely understood. Clear parameters for developing and disseminating communications should be developed and implemented.



CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are compelling developmental and political imperatives for ensuring Australia's aid support for climate and disaster risk is effective and seen to be effective.

Pacific island countries reaffirmed that climate change poses the single greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and wellbeing of the peoples of the Pacific through the 2019 Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) Kainaki II Declaration for Urgent Climate Change Action Now. This is the strongest collective statement Forum Leaders have issued on climate change.

For Australia, helping the region tackle climate and disaster risk was identified as a central priority in 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper and Pacific Step-Up - both as an issue in itself and as a core part of ensuring regional security. COVID 19 and shifting geo-political forces only serves to sharpen this priority. As part of its global commitments, Australia also needs to account for its climate finance and demonstrate its international credentials.

The APCP is a critical part of Australia's efforts towards these ends. It has made some good progress in advancing Australia's and the region's interests. The recommendations below are designed to strengthen these efforts, by focusing resources, enhancing the role of Pacific expertise and knowledge, strengthening integration, better communicating achievements, and working towards more transformative solutions. The recommendations are divided into two sections: strategic level and operational level. They are intended to help inform future Australian support for climate and disaster resilience in the Pacific.

STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Wind down the partnership approach and allow the sub-programs to continue independently

DFAT and sub-program partners should begin to wind-down the current partnership approach. The next phase of support should focus on the quality of the sub-programs, and on identifying opportunities for the SU to be a resource to support cross-regional activities that build relationships and learning. This may include:

- identification of specific pilots where collaboration between sub-programs could be tested.
- maintenance or expansion of regional learning events.
- a revised MEL framework for the SU to replace the Partnership MEL plan.
- revitalising Australia's support for long-term climate projections, in particular to inform infrastructure investments.

2. Enhance engagement with Pacific partners

Any future strategic investments should identify, develop, and draw on Pacific sources of expertise where available and build on the SU recent appointments of local facilitators in country. This is



particularly pertinent where DFAT is seeking to strengthen the effectiveness of integration and knowledge brokering effort. DFAT should explore options to create more meaningful partnerships with Pacific partners already influencing climate change discourse in the Pacific. Climate science and other related climate information must be targeted more directly to the needs of PICs and this can only be achieved with consistent and relevant PIC expertise and experience.

3. Develop DFAT internal expertise on climate change

There is a noticeable gap in implementation of Australia's climate change support that requires internalisation of expertise in DFAT. In considering what this may look like, DFAT should consider expertise that can:

- be responsible for the overall quality of climate related advice within DFAT, centralised under the Ambassador for Climate Change.
- engage with DFAT's policy and operational discussions and provide a bridge between those discussions and the SU's considerable technical expertise and knowledge share across DFAT divisions, drive system enhancements and build capacity.
- quality-assure the work of the SU.

OPERATIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

4. Strengthen the Support Unit to ensure it remains fit for purpose as its role evolves

The Support Unit provides critical support to Australia's aid investments across the Pacific and has established generally strong systems, processes and engagement that should continue unimpeded. There are opportunities to further strengthen the SU with consideration to:

- ensuring assistance provided by the SU and Expert Panels is fit for purpose.
 - o consider locating SU staff in the region in order to enhance quality of relationships and advice.
 - o strengthen quality assurance processes for SU and Expert Panel support
 - o regularly review and renew the Expert Panels and prioritise Pacific Island identities.
- identifying and managing opportunities for collaboration with other climate and disaster risk programs
- adopting a clear strategy for identification and selection of knowledge brokering activities
- establishing clearer lines of responsibility with DFAT
- enabling services to be available to areas of DFAT beyond the Pacific while not diverting effort and resources away from the Pacific

5. Enhance integration by strengthening internal incentives

DFAT can enhance integration of aid investments through targeted incentives that reaffirm the importance of climate change and disaster risks and opportunities in effective aid programming. This may include:

- re-emphasising the policy priority of climate and disaster risk in aid investments and strengthen the linkage with GEDSI to avoid being an 'add-on'.



- strengthening climate and disaster risk considerations in DFAT's aid investment design guidelines.
- conducting regular, preferably biannual, surveys on the depth and quality of climate and disaster risk integration across the aid portfolio.
- ensuring Posted officers have a developed understanding of climate and disaster risk prior to commencement and receive continual learning.

6. Sharpen the focus of communications to promote Australia as a valued climate partner

For Australia to be a valued climate partner, effective communications will be critical to building a strong narrative that complements the strong Pacific narratives on climate change and disasters. Future communications should:

- agree and resource more focused and tailored communication priorities and products.
- streamline and devolve clearance processes and clarify guidelines for communications, including broadening dissemination platforms.
- reaffirm roles and responsibilities as outlined in the 2018 Communications Plan.



ANNEXURES

ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

ANNEX 2: Mid-Term Review Plan

Annex 1 and 2 have been submitted to DFAT separately and are available upon request.

ANNEX 3: Consultation List

DFAT - Canberra

| Name | Level /Division/Branch |
|------------------------|---|
| James Gilling | First Assistant Secretary, Humanitarian Partnerships Division |
| Andrew Egan | Assistant Secretary, Agriculture, Infrastructure and Water Branch |
| Tim Gill | Director, Agriculture and Water Section |
| Russell Miles | Director, Climate Adaptation |
| Emi Tagi | Pacific Climate Change Section |
| Natalie McKelleher | (Former) Pacific Climate Change Section |
| Kirsten Hawke | Aid Management and Performance Branch |
| Mark Palu | Aid Management and Performance Branch |
| Racheline Jackson | Sustainability and Climate Change Branch |
| Luke Millar | Sustainability and Climate Change Branch |
| Christine Ford | Sustainability and Climate Change Branch |
| Rhonda Bobbin | Sustainability and Climate Change Branch |
| Fiona Lynn | Agriculture, Infrastructure and Water Branch |
| Ceri Teather | Disaster Risk, Resilience and Recovery section |
| Ryan Thew | Private Sector Partnership and Finance Branch |
| Celeste Powell | (Former) Pacific Climate Change Section |
| Philip Martin | Australian Infrastructure Financing Facility for the Pacific |
| Nikolas Yiannakopoulos | Australian Infrastructure Financing Facility for the Pacific |

DFAT - Post

| Name | Post |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Melissa Tipping | Fiji Post – Suva |
| Natasha Verma | Fiji Post – Suva |
| Kenneth Cokonasiga | Fiji Post – Suva |
| Nige Kaupa | PNG Post – Port Moresby |



| Name | Post |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Nicholas Saunders | PNG Post – Port Moresby |
| Tekirabereta Matioa | Kiribati Post – Tarawa |
| Arititea Teeta | Kiribati Post – Tarawa |
| Kilistina Best | Tonga Post – Nuku'alofa |
| Kepreen Veetutu | Tonga Post – Nuku'alofa |
| Shelly Thomson | Tonga Post – Nuku'alofa |

Sub-Program Implementing Partners

| Name | Partner |
|--------------------|---|
| Kate Duggan | Palladium, APCP SU (Team Leader) |
| Gillian Starling | Palladium, APCP SU (Climate Change Advisor) |
| Clare White | Palladium, APCP SU (Climate Change Advisor) |
| Jeong Park | Palladium, APCP SU (DRR Advisor) |
| Arthi Patel | APCP SU (GESI Advisor) |
| Katie Frisch | APCP SU (Knowledge Brokering Advisor) |
| Alex Nichols | APCP SU (Communications Specialist) |
| Paul Crawford | APCP SU (MEL Advisor) |
| Bruce Bailey | APCP SU (MEL Advisor) |
| Celine Becker | Australian Bureau of Meteorology, COSPPac2 (Project Manager) |
| Simon McGree | Australian Bureau of Meteorology, COSPPac2 (Technical Lead) |
| Jeff Aquilina | Australian Bureau of Meteorology, COSPPac2 (Team Leader, Pacific Sea Level and Geodetic Monitoring) |
| Moortaza Jiwanji | UNDP, Gov4 Res (Project Manager) |
| Nicola Glendinning | UNDP, Gov4 Res (Deputy Project Manager) |

Pacific-based Organisations and Programs

| Name | Organisations and Programs |
|-----------------|---|
| Tagaloa Cooper | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) |
| Teuila Jane | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) |
| Salesa Nihmei | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) |
| Siosinamele Lui | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) |
| Molly Powers | The Pacific Community (SPC) |
| Bipen Prakash | Fiji Meteorological Service |



| Name | Organisations and Programs |
|----------------------|--|
| Seti Chen | CEO, Tonga Power Pty Ltd |
| Emily Erasito | GIZ, Accelerating Climate Education |
| Sanjeshni Kissun | GIZ, Accelerating Climate Education |
| Amelia Siga | GIZ, Accelerating Climate Education |
| Sharon Bhagwan-Rolls | Shifting the Power Coalition |
| Marita Manley | Talanoa Consulting, Australia Pacific Climate Alumni Network |
| Niki Goulding | Talanoa Consulting, Australia Pacific Climate Alumni Network |
| Jason Fello | Kiribati Facility (Team Leader) |
| Jo Simpson | GHD, PNG Transport Sector Support Program |

Other Stakeholders

| Name | Stakeholder |
|--------------------|---|
| Rebecca McNaught | SU Expert Panel Member |
| Simon Wilson | SU Expert Panel Member |
| Shirley McGill | New Zealand's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) |
| Sarah MacCana | New Zealand's Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) |
| Keren Winterford | UTS ISF, Knowledge Brokering Longitudinal Study |
| Anna Gero | UTS ISF, Knowledge Brokering Longitudinal Study |
| Geoff Gooley | CSIRO, Next Generation Climate Projections for the Pacific |
| Kath Kirby | Asia Education Foundation, Australian PNG Australian Secondary Schools (PASS) Education program |
| Sophie Howlett | Asia Education Foundation, PASS |
| Emeline Gillingham | Asia Education Foundation, PASS |