The Pacific Experience in Developing Policy and Legislation on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation

UNISDR
The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

The Pacific Experience in Developing Policy and Legislation on Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation

UNISDR
The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

Contents

Glossary

ACP	African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCCPIR	Coping with climate change in the Pacific Island Region programme
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CERMP	Tonga Cyclone Emergency Recovery and Management Project
CHARM	Comprehensive Hazard and Risk Management Tool
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRM NAP	National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EDF-10	10th European Development Fund
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMCI	Emergency Management Cook Islands
EU	European Union
GCCA	Global Climate Change Alliance
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer International Zusammenarbeit
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015
IDNDR	International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
JNAP	Joint National Action Plan for DRM and CC
LDC	Less Developed Country
MCDEM	Ministry of Civil Defense and Emergency Management (New Zealand)
MECC	Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (Tonga)
MECDM	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (Solomon Islands)
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NDS	National Development Strategy (Solomon Islands)
NEMO	National Emergency Management Office (Tonga)
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NIP	National Infrastructure and Investment Plan (Tonga)

NSAP	National Strategic Action Plan for CC and DRM (Tuvalu)
NSDP	National Sustainable Development Plan (Cook Islands)
NSPF	National Strategic Planning Framework (Tonga)
PACCSAP	The Pacific–Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning Programme
PCRAFI	Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative
PIC	Pacific Island Country
PICTs	Pacific Islands Countries and Territories
RAMSI	Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands
RFA	Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005-2015
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPC/SOPAC	Applied Geosciences and Technology Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPREP	The Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TOP	Tongan Pa'Anga (currency)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
WB	World Bank

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 SCOPE OF THE STUDY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the process towards developing the Pacific integrated regional strategy for disaster risk management and climate change by 2015, and the global consultations for a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. It also aims to contribute to the discussions held at the 2013 Joint Meeting of the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change Round Table.

Since the global consultations were initiated in 2012, the inter-linkages between disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA) have been identified as a priority issue for the global post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. The consultation process will benefit from further input from the Pacific region where the high level of climate-related risks and the likelihood that these will increase substantially in the future, have made DRR and CCA key policy goals.

Taking into account the strong basis of learning the Pacific offers in the area of DRR-CCA, this study explores and aims to unpack the drivers and process to develop Joint National Action Plans on Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change (JNAPs), primary DRM legislation, and sustainable development plans addressing DRR and CCA in selected Pacific island countries (PICs). It also briefly discusses the experiences so far in the implementation of these instruments. The three PICs included in this study are Cook Islands, Solomon Islands and Tonga. This desk study was supported by phone discussions with national and regional focal points (Annex 1). The list of questions guiding the discussions can be found in Annex 2.

It is also to be noted that the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) has commissioned a review to look at the development and implementation process of the JNAPs in the region focusing especially on Tonga and Cook Islands. The aim of the review is to identify lessons learnt during the JNAP development and implementation processes, and areas of the development and the implementation process for further strengthening.

This study conducted for UNISDR by Ms. Laura Niskanen would not have been possible without the time, knowledge and experience offered by the national disaster risk management and climate change officials in the Cook Islands, Solomon Islands and Tonga. Equally important has been the support provided by the regional focal points in the SOPAC Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the Secretariat of the Pacific Environment Programme (SPREP) and World Bank, Solomon Islands. A special thank you is extended to Mr. Mosese Sikivou from the SOPAC Division of SPC, Mr. Jerry Velasquez, Mr. Timothy Wilcox, Ms. Madhavi Ariyabandu and Mr. Marco Toscano-Rivalta from UNISDR for guidance provided to this study. UNISDR appreciates and acknowledges all the contributions.

1.2 BACKGROUND

The Pacific is a highly disaster-prone region. The Pacific island countries are threatened by a variety of natural hazards, both climate-related or of geophysical origin, and sudden or slow onset. Prevalent natural hazards include tropical cyclones,

floods, king tides, droughts, earthquakes, tsunamis and volcanic eruptions. It is anticipated that the observed frequency and intensity of extreme weather and climate events will further increase in the Pacific due to global warming.[1,2] The comparative smallness, remoteness and archipelagic character of the Pacific island nations significantly contribute to their vulnerability to climate change[3] and disasters. Furthermore, the increased health and pollution hazards, and civil unrest in the past decade as a result of growing population, urban drift, uneven wealth distribution and political pressure are of concern[4].

The relationship between disasters, poverty reduction and socio-economic development is well established. The Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2012 highlights that the increasing disaster risks in Asia-Pacific are driven by the twin challenge of increasing exposure of its people and economic assets, and the inability of the most vulnerable groups to cope with disasters[5]. In the Pacific, even relatively minor emergencies can significantly affect populations, overwhelm national response capacities, and slow down advances in development. In terms of annual economic impacts from disasters, eight PICs[6] are among the 20 countries with highest average annual disaster losses as a percentage of the gross domestic product (GDP). In some PICs, annual disaster losses have even exceeded the GDP. The Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) has estimated that since 1950, extreme events have affected approximately 9.2 million people in the Pacific region, causing 9,811 reported deaths and damage of around US$3.2 billion. Tropical cyclones are the major cause for the loss and damage[7]. In addition, the increasing adverse effects of climate change are resulting in high costs of adaptation relative to GDP in the Pacific islands[8].

DRR and CCA are increasingly recognized as having a shared aim to reduce the vulnerability of the communities and contribute to sustainable development by improving the ability to better anticipate, resist, prepare for, respond to and recover from the impacts of hazards. Since 2010, several Pacific island countries have developed strategic integrated national approaches (e.g. Tonga, Tuvalu and Cook Islands) or are currently in the process of doing so to reduce more effectively the risks to sustainable national development from multiple hazards or phenomena. An integrated approach takes into account the existing national and regional capacities to address these disaster and climate change concerns overlapping through common factors of weather and climate as well as the similar tools used to monitor, analyse and address the adverse consequences. Risk assessments, flood management and building code enforcement all contribute towards both policy goals[9].

In terms of the terminology, it should be noted that in the Pacific disaster risk reduction (DRR) is considered to be one of two components that make up disaster risk management (DRM), the other one being disaster management (DM). Prevention, mitigation and adaptation are the sub-

1 Hay, J. and Mimura, N. 2010. The Changing Nature of Extreme Weather and Climate Events: Risks to Sustainable Development. *Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk*, 1: 1, 3 — 18.

2 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

3 Turning the Tide: Improving Access to Climate Financing in the Pacific Islands. Policy brief by MacLellan, N. for Lowy Institute, 2011.

4 Key messages from the Pacific Delegation to the 2011 Global Platform for DRR. 2011.

5 Reducing Vulnerability and Exposure to Disasters, Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2012, ESCAP and UNISDR.

6 Vanuatu, Niue, Tonga, FSM, Solomon Islands, Fiji, RMI, and the Cook Islands

7 Acting Today for Tomorrow: A Policy and Practice Note for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific Islands Region. World Bank, 2012.

8 Key messages from the Pacific Delegation to the 2011 Global Platform for DRR. 2011.

9 Concept note of the Joint Meeting of the 2013 Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, 8th – 11th July, Nadi, Fiji.

components of DRR whereas DM divides into preparedness, relief and recovery[10].

1.3 FINDINGS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL AND POLICY ANALYSIS ON DRR AND CCA IN THE PACIFIC

The UNISDR/UNDP study 'Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis' (2012) provided an analysis of the level of integration of DRR and CCA in the Pacific region with an emphasis on the policy and institutional environment. The study outlined some of the practical lessons learned on the rationale, challenges and barriers to integration which are presented below.

Disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation both aim to reduce vulnerability and enhance the resilience of societies to weather and climate hazards. The disciplines share common key concepts such as resilience, risk management approach, mainstreaming and 'no-regrets' actions which are beneficial to implement whether or not the expected consequences of climate change or a disaster actualise.

The analysis found that despite the challenges, the rationale for integration is clear for the region with several practical reasons supporting the approach:

1. Easing the burden of programming development assistance.
2. Minimising duplication of effort and redundancies.
3. Reducing potential conflicts in policy development.
4. Making efficient use of scarce resources.
5. The increasing recognition, especially at community level, that there is little practical difference between the two.

As for the key barriers to greater integration of DRR and CCA, the following reasons were identified:

1. Capacity constraints of PICs (related to lack of coordination, communication, political will, insufficient funds and absence of expertise).
2. Separate global and regional frameworks for CCA and DRR.
3. Perceptions of development practitioners that DRR and CCA are not valuable.
4. Difficulty quantifying the benefits of DRR and CCA.

The analysis also identified approaches to address barriers and facilitate integration. These approaches are:

1. Improved access to practical weather and climate change information.
2. Strong enabling environment and enhanced communication to practitioners in other fields and to the broader public.
3. More emphasis on bottom-up approaches.
4. Information support for decision-making (both scientific and economic).

It was found that in the Pacific island countries, the greatest potential for harmonizing DRR and CCA is at community level where the distinction between climate and disaster risk is less relevant.

The analysis included seven PICs (Cook Islands, FSM, Fiji, Palau, Samoa, Tonga and Vanuatu) and a more detailed analysis was undertaken of four of those countries (Cook Islands, Fiji, Palau and Vanuatu). The bulk of the analysis was undertaken in early 2010. The findings were updated in 2011, prior to publishing in 2012, in order to reflect major new developments at regional and national levels.

10 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

CHAPTER 2

Joint National Action Plans on Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change (JNAPs) – Regional Perspective

2.1 BACKGROUND OF THE JNAPs

In the Pacific, a strong national support exists for integrating disaster risk management and climate change. Since the adoption of the first joint national action plan for disaster risk management and climate change (JNAP) in 2010 by Tonga, 13 countries out of 14 Pacific island states have made commitment to integrate disaster risk management and climate change adaptation in some manner or form and three proactive countries mentioned below have completed their JNAPs. Depending on the country's preference, JNAP can cover both adaptation and mitigation to climate change.

2010 Tonga: Joint National Action Plan for CCA and DRM 2010-2015 (JNAP)
2012 Cook Islands: Joint National Action Plan for DRM and CCA 2011-2015 (JNAP)
2012 Tuvalu: National Strategic Action Plan for CC and DRM 2012-2016 (NSAP)

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (SPREP) in line with their respective leading regional roles in disaster risk management and climate change support PICs to develop and implement JNAPs together with other regional partners. SPC/SOPAC and SPREP coordinate the processes at the regional level.

The Disaster Reduction Programme of the Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC) of SPC provides technical and policy advice and support to strengthen disaster risk management practices in the Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs). SOPAC promotes national level mainstreaming initiatives by supporting the development, implementation and review of the main DRM policy documents such as the JNAPs, National Action Plans for Disaster Risk Management (DRM NAPs), DRM legislation and sustainable development plans[11]. SPREP's Climate Change Division provides among others technical assistance for the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation into national and sectoral policies, strategies and plans in collaboration with partners, including the development of the JNAPs[12].

Other partners supporting the development and implementation of the JNAPs in the region include Asian Development Bank (ADB), Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), European Union (EU), Global Campaign for Climate Action (GCCA), Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer International Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning programme (PACCSAP), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA), International Organization for Migration (IOM), International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) and World Bank (WB).

11 SOPAC's Disaster Reduction Programme's website: http://www.sopac.org/index.php/goals-rational-and-critical-issues-crp

12 SPREP's Climate Change Division's website: http://www.sprep.org/Adaptation/adaptation-overview

The information presented in this chapter is obtained from the interviews of SPC/SOPAC Division Deputy Director Mr Mosese Sikivou and SPREP Director Climate Change SPREP Ms Netatua Pelesikoti unless otherwise advised.

2.2 INTENT TO DEVELOP THE JNAPS

The regional focal points were asked to mention the main issues, challenges, needs, demands and expectations which have contributed to the formulation and adoption of the JNAPs in the region. The following issues and drivers were identified through the interviews of this study.

- **Climate and disaster resilient development.** The common denominator among the issues is the impact on sustainable development independent of the differences for example in the physical manifestation of vulnerabilities (e.g. atolls vs. volcanic islands), whether the vulnerability is defined by climate or geophysical risk, and the potential of the country's economic approach. Currently all island states in the region embrace an approach towards climate and disaster resilient development.

- **The 'common sense' approach.** The integrated manner to manage disaster and climate risk is generally seen as the 'common sense' approach in the Pacific. The main issues, needs and challenges driving the development of the JNAPs are similar across the countries.

- **Capacity constraints, lack of coordination and limited sharing of expertise at national level.** In 2008/09, discussions around an integrated approach started in the region when the regional organisations were supporting the countries to develop National Action Plans for Disaster Risk Management (DRM NAPs). The National Disaster Management Offices (NDMOs) had very limited numbers of staff (sometimes only one person in place) and stakeholders involved in DRR were not working in coordination with the NDMOs. The new mindset needed to be that DRR is the responsibility of all the agencies involved in development, not only that of the NDMOs. In view of the capacities at national level, it was considered that other stakeholders, such as those working with climate change, should be brought into the process as well. The aim was to have integrated planning capacity to deal with all the risks affecting development.

"Aim was to have integrated planning capacity to deal with all the risks affecting development."

- **Small communities, limited government systems and resources, and institutional arrangements at national level.** These are some of the other reasons for opting for an integrated approach in the Pacific.

- **Strong support from the regional organisations.** It is recognised that the JNAP development is still quite regionally driven by the regional organisations. This is seen to be at least partly due to the limited capacities at national level and lack of strong national coordinating bodies which would have a comprehensive view of the DRM/CCA activities in-country and would be informed of the global and regional processes.

- **Support from the momentum and advocacy created by the NAPA mechanisms.** The mechanism to develop the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) for the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate

Change (UNFCCC) contributed to the process by helping to move the vulnerability discussion to the development sphere by generating momentum and advocacy through the support it received.

2.3 PROCESS TO DEVELOP THE JNAP

The goal to develop a JNAP is to mainstream disaster risk reduction and climate change into development.

The first JNAP process was initiated for Tonga in 2009 while the work to develop DRM National Action Plans (DRM NAPs) and NAPAs had already started in 2006. The development of a JNAP follows the process prepared in 2009 under the Pacific Disaster Risk Management Partnership Network (PPN) to assist Pacific island countries to prepare DRM NAPs. The guide notes that the NAP is a whole-of-country plan representing all sectors of society and developed through a consultative and participatory process. It also reminds that the NAP is not the only instrument to be used to promote mainstreaming but should be complemented with sub-national or sectoral/ agency action plans at provincial, local and community levels[13]. Furthermore, the process itself was seen as an important tool to facilitate mobilisation of various DRM actors in-country to build momentum for a coordinated longer-term implementation[14].

The following five steps are involved in the developing a DRM NAP[15] and apply also as the outline for developing a JNAP.

1. *Preparing for the JNAP planning process*
   - Initial planning considerations
   - High Level Advocacy

2. *Situation Analysis*
   - Information collection
   - Stakeholder engagements
   - Identification of key issues by sectors or thematic areas

3. *Action Plan Development*
   - Validation and prioritisation of key issues
   - Problem-Solution tree analysis
   - Action matrix development

4. *Implementation Plan Development*
   - Institutional arrangements
   - Costing
   - Financing strategy
   - Communications strategy
   - Monitoring and evaluation

5. *Towards Implementation*
   - Government approval
   - Donor Interactions

The process starts off with the country's request to SPC and/or SPREP for assistance to develop a Joint National Action Plan. In many cases, the request for a JNAP has followed the development of a DRM NAP, a request to develop a DRM NAP or a review of the DRM arrangements in the country[16].

It depends on the country who will be the national focal point leading the process. When the technical support was provided through the old SOPAC before the merger with SPC in 2011, the NDMOs were leading the process in the country. Now as SOPAC Division is part of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, there is a greater possibility

13 Guide to developing national action plans – a tool for mainstreaming disaster risk management based on experiences from selected Pacific island countries. SOPAC joint contribution report 196. SOPAC, 2009.

14 A review of the Regional Disaster Risk Management Mainstreaming Programme in the Pacific. UNDP Pacific Centre and SOPAC Disaster Risk Programme, *draft* March 2011.

15 Guide to developing national action plans – a tool for mainstreaming disaster risk management based on experiences from selected Pacific island countries. SOPAC joint contribution report 196. SOPAC, 2009.

16 Update of Progress of DRM NAP's/DRM Mainstreaming Programmes/DRM & CC Joint NAP's in 14 Pacific ACP states as at 25th June 2012. SOPAC, June 2012.

for using different entry points. For example in Fiji, the discussions on an integrated approach have commenced with both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (responsible for climate change) and the Ministry of Rural & Maritime Development and National Disaster Management (responsible for DRM).

After a draft planning process with partners and clearance from national focal points, a high-level advocacy mission is destined to senior politicians and officials (Heads of State, ministerial level) to get their buy-in of the process. The high-level advocacy team established at SOPAC has been raising the profile of disaster risk in development since early millennium and it formed an important part of the NAP development process in the period 2006 - 2008. The advocacy team involved senior members of SOPAC together with the prominent former Deputy Prime Minister of Tonga the late Dr. Senipisi Langi Kavaliku, and as well other prominent DRM personalities from the region.

The situation analysis and action plan development is typically a process of 4-6 months. The aim is to address the gaps that are not yet being tackled. After this an implementation plan for the JNAP is drafted, including the institutional arrangements, costing, financial strategy, communications strategy, and monitoring, evaluation and reporting. The process to identify the best implementation arrangements involves separate stakeholder consultation. The JNAP is presented and endorsed in the highest decision-making body, often at the Cabinet. Following the approval, the plan is shared at a donor roundtable as one important part of the process is to identify implementation opportunities.

It is important to note that the countries are at different stages of development and the steps are not necessarily the same for all of them. It also depends on the countries request how the agencies of the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) can help to move the process forward.

The JNAP process has matured over the years through experiential learning. It started off as a more of a 'mechanical' process but a strategic shift seems to be currently happening. Previously the approach with both DRM NAPs and JNAPs has been to develop them discretely on the side of development and then move the issues from there. A recent example from the Solomon Islands indicates a change in focus towards developing a strategic approach in the development context. This new approach is expected to be more sustainable as its aim is for the sectors to strengthen the implementation of their activities which also considerably increases the ownership of the approach. A significant number of DRM-CCA projects are already being implemented in the countries, including the sectors, and there is currently a need for a more strategic level guidance rather than developing a national action plan.

2.4 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE JNAPs

This chapter presents the views shared during the interviews in relation to the implementation of the JNAPs in the region. However, it needs to be mentioned that it was clearly felt that it is too early to tell the impacts of the JNAP implementation in Tonga, Cook Islands and Tuvalu.

The JNAPs have the potential for bringing in risk reduction approaches into development discussion and they have contributed in creating an enabling environment for the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA) and the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005-2015 (RFA). The integrated approach has a groundswell of support as 13 out of 14 PICs have committed to an integrated approach since 2010. The whole aim of the JNAP is to increase the integrated practice of addressing the needs and challenges identified

by countries in relation to disaster risk reduction and climate change but this is yet to be seen in the implementation. It is too early to consider what the real impacts of the JNAPs are at different levels. However, the JNAP review commissioned by SPREP is expected to bring in more information on the actual implementation so far.

The JNAP takes into account the aspirations of the countries and is aligned to the national sustainable development goals. Its successful implementation supports the national development agenda. Also the strengthening of the sector plans contributes to the achievement of these goals. The integration of disaster risk reduction, climate change and sustainable development goals (DRR-CC-SDG) has picked up momentum recently in the Pacific and importantly the countries are showing ownership of this approach. There is also a coordinated process for inputs from the DRM and CC communities to the post-2015 consultations on DRR and the preparatory and actual meetings of the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in 2013 and 2014.

The JNAPs have the potential to contribute to the way prevention and preempting the accumulation of further risk is regulated but this is still work in progress. For example, financial instruments are being developed and environmental impact assessment (EIA) legislation as well as coastal zone management guidelines are in place for several countries. One of the JNAP activities has been to review and strengthen the EIA process to also consider risk, e.g. in Niue the EIA has been revised although the JNAP is not yet a nationally endorsed instrument. This shows that some identified JNAP activities can still move forward even before the official approval process has been completed. Some activities are also linked to earlier activities at the national level. The Cook Islands and Niue are in process of doing a formal review of the building code, an activity which originates from their DRM NAP.

JNAPs foster an effective use of financial and human resources for instance by improving coordination of funding coming through for DRM and climate change.

The hope is that the JNAPs could lead to support the countries to foster a culture of prevention and active engagement in the public and communities. The JNAPs emphasise the need for preparedness, awareness raising and community engagement.

The integrated approach is supported by donors and partners and JNAP is considered a credible mechanism. There are some mixed views related to the availability of funding. One view is that the countries are not struggling with the availability of funding but trying to make sense of it in view of the national and regional capacity. On the other hand it is also considered that donors have been slow to support the implementation of both the DRM NAPs and JNAPs although it is acknowledged that the JNAPs have leveraged additional funding coming into the country.

The key donors are referencing the integrated approach as a rationale of their funding, e.g. AusAID, ADB, EU and WB. For example, AusAID is currently working through an integrated approach in their new regional DRM Programme in the Pacific and Australia is developing a strategy on how they will provide support in DRR/CCA in the future. The World Bank has already developed its policy and practice note for climate and disaster resilient development in the Pacific[17]. Also, EU's 10th European Development Fund (EDF-10) is especially marketed to support the implementation of the JNAPs.

There is a need to review the existing legislation to make it more conducive for creating a more sound and enabling environment to undertake an

17 Acting Today for Tomorrow: A Policy and Practice Note for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific Islands Region. World Bank, 2012.

integrated approach. The existing legislation offers a rationale for the integrated approach but does not provide enough support. In the context of DRM, it can be assumed that the DRM legislation also encompasses climate change adaptation. The DRM legislation should have a stronger focus on response and preparedness including risk assessments and climate data, and reflect the main shift of future role of the NDMOs. The sectors work in silos with their own legislation and disaster and climate risk needs to be integrated to sector legislations, including the technical aspects. The Cook Islands, as the first PIC, taking steps to develop a new integrated legislation with technical assistance from SPREP as well as reviewing the building code.

The integration discussion has also prompted discussions on the changing role of the NDMOs which eventually would require changes to the current legislation. The NDMOs are starting to consider that their future will need to focus on disaster management. The Disaster Managers' Meeting in July 2013 will aim to articulate as a group where they see the strategic future role of the NDMO office. The Directors of NDMOs are very supportive of the JNAP process as they see the importance of being in the front line helping to further downstream that their role might need to be 'limited' in the future. The JNAP process also reviews the institutional arrangements and responsibilities. The challenge with the possible institutional rearrangements is that experienced and trained staff might be lost in the process if the activities are moved into a new Government department and the staff is reassigned within the former agency.

While the region is making good progress in integration, a point was raised that the global approaches are not supportive of integration or making it easy for the countries to mainstream DRR and CCA. One concrete example is the requirement to develop the NAPAs. However, the principal donors in the Pacific are not differentiating the funding and support the integrated approach.

CHAPTER 3

Country Studies – Tonga

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The information presented here is obtained from the interviews of the national and regional focal points and the policy and legal documents unless otherwise advised. This brief country study explores the intent and process of developing the Joint National Action Plan on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management 2010-2015 and the Emergency Management Act (2007) in Tonga. It also provides reflections on the implementation of these instruments.

Tonga is highly susceptible to the impacts of natural hazards and climate change due to its geographical, geological and socio-economic characteristics. The Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) has estimated that earthquakes and tropical cyclones are expected to cause an average annual disaster loss of 15.5 million USD in Tonga[18]. Since the 1960s, Tonga has been severely affected by five major tropical cyclones causing damage to crops, food supply, infrastructure, housing, tourism and other services[19]. The devastating tropical cyclones Isaac (1982) and Waka (2001) caused seven fatalities, destroyed the shelters of tens of thousands of people as well as much of the country's agricultural crops. The incurred disaster losses of about 75 million USD paralysed the local economy. Situated at the Pacific 'Ring of Fire', Tonga is also highly prone to seismic hazards. In 1977, a magnitude 7.2 earthquake caused considerable damage and in 2009, an offshore earthquake of a magnitude 8.1 generated a tsunami which severely impacted the Tongan islands of Niuatoputapu[20]. Tonga has also suffered from serious drought events in 1983, 1998 and 2006, affected by El Niño, with significant impact on food security and economic performance[21].

Key Policy and Legal Instruments in Tonga	
YEAR	**INSTRUMENT**
2006	Tonga Strategic Development Plan Eight 2006/07-2008/09; Looking to the Future, Building on the Past (SDP8)
2006	National Climate Change Policy
2007	**Emergency Management Act**
2009	Emergency Management Plan
2010	National Strategic Planning Framework 2010-2020 (NSPF)
2010	**Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management 2010-2015 (JNAP)**
2011	Tonga Strategic Development Framework (TSDF) 2011-2014

3.2 JOINT NATIONAL ACTION PLAN ON CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT 2010-2015

In the Pacific, Tonga has demonstrated leadership in developing and implementing integrated approaches to DRM and CCA[22]. Tonga was the first country in the region to develop a joint national strategy to address climate change

18 Country risk profile: Tonga. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.

19 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

20 Country risk profile: Tonga. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.

21 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

22 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

adaptation and disaster risk management in an integrated manner. The Joint National Action Plan on Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management 2010–2015 (JNAP) was produced as a component of Tonga's Second National Communication Project. The JNAP was officially adopted by the Cabinet in July 2010 becoming the first action plan concerning climate change as Tonga does not have a NAPA in place. On the DRM side, the Emergency Management Plan existed before the development of the JNAP.

The vision of the JNAP is to promote and ensure safe, healthy, secure and resilient communities to climate change impacts and disaster risks.

The Plan comprises of six priority goals presented below. Each of the goals has specific objectives and outcomes.

1. Improved good governance for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management (mainstreaming, decision making, organisational and institutional policy frameworks)

2. Enhanced technical knowledge base, information, education and understanding of climate change adaptation and effective disaster risk management

3. Analysis and assessments of vulnerability to climate change impacts and disaster risks

4. Enhanced community preparedness and resilience to impacts of all disasters

5. Technically reliable, economically affordable and environmentally sound energy to support the sustainable development of the Kingdom

6. Strong partnerships, cooperation and collaboration within government agencies and with civil societies, non-government organisations and the private sector.

It is noteworthy that the JNAP has integrated both climate change adaptation and mitigation in its priority goals providing thus a more comprehensive response to climate change[23] while at the same time it still addresses other non-climate-related risks. Mitigation is addressed under Goal 5 where one of its objectives refers to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Intent to develop the JNAP

The national focal points were asked to mention the main issues, challenges, needs, demands and expectations which contributed to the formulation and adoption of the JNAP. The following issues and drivers were identified through the interviews of this study.

- **A joint action plan makes sense.** Due to the synergies between climate change and disaster risk management as well as the geographical size of Tonga, it made more sense to the national actors to develop a joint plan instead of separate ones. The discussions for a joint framework started within the Climate Change Technical Team (Environment, Government ministries, NGOs, NEMO).

- **Increase coordination, avoid duplication of efforts and maximise the use of limited capacities and resources.** Before the JNAP was developed, a lot of international assistance was coming into the country and there was a lack of coordination between the projects on DRR and CCA, especially those implemented at the community level. The initiatives lacked proper consultations and activities were overlapping.

- **Improve donor and partner coordination.** Before having a joint national strategy in place

23 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

guiding the in-country engagement, the donors and partners were required to do a lot of ground work to explore how to tie their activities to the country's frameworks.

- **Climate change and disaster risk management are key priorities for the Government.** In 2006, the Tonga Strategic Development Plan Eight 2006/07-2008/09 (SDP8) presented Tonga's development vision and the national development goal 7 was to 'Ensure environmental sustainability and disaster risk reduction. Tonga's National Climate Change Policy was endorsed in 2006 to address climate change adaptation issues and was followed by the establishment of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change.

- **Increased awareness of climate and disaster risks among stakeholders.** The increased awareness of the stakeholders on the close linkages of climate and disaster risks contributed to addressing the issue.

- **High-level support and influence from key Ministers.** The Minister of Environment and Climate Change and Minister of Works and Disaster Relief Activities supported the development of the JNAP and its submission to Cabinet.

- **Alignment with national, regional and international frameworks.** The JNAP was Tonga's response to national, regional and international processes, agreements and frameworks. The JNAP supports national initiatives to strengthen the country's capacity to address the impacts of climate change and disaster risks. The timely implementation of the JNAP supports the goals and objectives of Tonga's National Strategic Planning Framework to which it is aligned to.

The JNAP complies with the Pacific Islands Framework of Action on Climate Change 2006–2015, the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005–2015, the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR), the Yokohama Plan for Action and the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015, and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Process to develop the JNAP

The process to develop the JNAP was led by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MECC) at the time, supported by the staff of the National Emergency Management Office (NEMO) and the Climate Change Technical Working Group. Throughout the process, training, facilitation and technical assistance was provided jointly by SOPAC[24] and SPREP. The preparation of the JNAP was financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the United Nations Development Programme and the ACP[25]-EU Natural Disaster Facility through SOPAC and SPREP. Push for the process came from the climate change side with a stronger technical knowledge on vulnerability and coastal resilience than with NEMO which is leaned towards disaster management.

The process to develop the JNAP for Tonga was adapted from SOPAC et al (2009)[26] and the steps were as follows:

1. Obtain political support;
2. Establishment of national multi-disciplinary teams for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management;

24 Merged with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in 2011.

25 African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States

26 Guide to developing national action plan: A tool for mainstreaming disaster risk management based on experiences from selected Pacific island countries. SOPAC Joint Contribution Report 196. SOPAC, PIFS and UNDP Pacific Centre 2009.

3. Situation analysis and vulnerability assessment;
4. Stakeholder and community consultations;
5. Development of the action matrix and prioritisation;
6. Costing of the CCA & DRM activities; and
7. Development of the implementation, monitoring and evaluation strategies
8. Government approval

1. Obtain political support

One of the first steps towards developing the JNAP was to solicit support and commitment from the Government of Tonga to ensure high-level political support for the process. In October 2009, SOPAC and SPREP together with the national technical team held meetings with the two key Ministers (Minister of Environment and Climate Change and Minister of Works and Disaster Relief Activities), Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of line ministries, statutory boards, civil society and NGOs to obtain their support. Also a High Level Advocacy Team from SOPAC delivered a presentation to Cabinet in support of the joint approach. Subsequently, the Cabinet Ministers endorsed the development of the JNAP which offered SOPAC and SPREP the mandate to facilitate the process.

2. Establishment of national multi-disciplinary teams for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management

A JNAP Task Force was created by merging the Climate Change Technical Working Group (TWG) and the DRM Task Force to support the JNAP process. The Climate Change TWG under the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change was responsible for the implementation of climate change activities at the technical level and consisted of greenhouse gas inventory and vulnerability and adaptation groups. The DRM Task Force was established in 2009 to provide technical inputs to DRM processes.

3. Situation analysis and vulnerability assessment

The situation analysis and vulnerability assessment was conducted and the findings were used as a basis for comprehensive community consultations.

4. Stakeholder and community consultations

Community consultations took place in the highly vulnerable communities on the islands of Tongatapu, Vava'u and Ha'apai between November 2009 and January 2010. The purpose of the consultations was to identify community needs, issues and priorities to address climate change and disaster impacts. Participants included town officers, district officers, and representatives from youth groups, churches, women's groups, farmers, fishermen, and teachers. The stakeholder consultations (Government ministries, NGOs and statutory authorities) identified related issues and priorities, and assessed the extent of mainstreaming CC and DRM at sectoral level and in the planning processes of the NGOs and civil society.

5. Development of the action matrix and prioritisation

In order to add value to the many existing Government initiatives and to facilitate progress in CCA and DRM, it was decided that the focus would be on the 'gaps'. The identified CCA and DRM gaps were prioritised by acknowledging that i) the JNAP should not be overly ambitious, and; ii) there is a need to make strategic use of limited resources. The intention was that the non-prioritised CCA and DRM issues as well as the new and emerging issues would be captured through a system for monitoring, evaluation and regular progress review. This was followed by validation and prioritisation of key issues, problem-solution tree analysis and action matrix development.

6. Costing of the CCA & DRM activities

The costing of the action matrix was prepared by SOPAC's Technical Team together with the JNAP Task Force in Tonga.

7. Development of the implementation, monitoring and evaluation strategies

The JNAP Task Force was convened in March-April 2010 to formulate the implementation, monitoring and evaluation strategies. The JNAP Task Force drafted the supporting text which was reviewed and edited by SOPAC and SPREP.

8. Government approval

In July 2010, the JNAP was submitted to Cabinet. Prior to this, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and Minister of Works and Disaster Relief Activities were briefed as the Ministers defended the JNAP in the Cabinet. The submission was accepted and no objections were presented thanks to the comprehensive consultations. The JNAP for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management 2010-2015 was endorsed by the Tongan Cabinet in July 2010.

Good practices assisting the process

The below good practices have been identified from the development of the JNAP in Tonga. It is expected that some of the good practices will also be useful for the effective implementation of the JNAP.

- **High-level political support.** A key aspect of the JNAP process was the high-level political support it received from the key ministers: Minister of Environment and Climate Change, and Minister of Works and Disaster Relief Activities.
- **Support and involvement of the existing national multi-stakeholder committees.** Several different level working committees (technical, advisory, CEO, Minister, Parliament) were in place under the environment, climate change and emergency management structures when the JNAP process started. These committees and groups included representatives from different Government ministries and NGOs, and they assisted the process by providing inputs and information from different groups of stakeholders. The committees also facilitated in getting the support and buy-in from the other ministries such as the Ministry of Finance and Planning when they realised how important climate change impacts will be for Tonga.

"High-level political support was key to the process."

- **Establishment of the JNAP Secretariat.** Another good practice was the establishment of the JNAP Secretariat which is driving the JNAP work in Tonga. The Secretariat was established in 2010, same year as the JNAP was approved. AusAID is funding the work of the Secretariat until 2014.
- **Assistance from regional organisations.** The assistance from SOPAC and SPREP supported the formulation of the JNAP. SOPAC and SPREP have provided professional and technical assistance throughout the development of the JNAP.
- **National Capacity Building and Enhancement.** Tonga has in-country experts

with the required skills and expertise to develop the JNAP. The development of the JNAP was a valuable exercise as it enhanced the technical capacities of the national stakeholders. It also reduces Tonga's high dependence on international consultants. Utilising the resources already available in the country and the organisations in the Pacific region to carry out this task is a cost-effective mechanism.

Implementation of the JNAP

The JNAP facilitates an integrated approach to development to address the needs and challenges in relation to DRR and CCA. The JNAP is in line with the National Strategic Planning Framework 2010-2020 (NSPF) as the primary outcome objective 7 of the NSPF addresses climate change: *Integrate environmental sustainability and climate change into all planning and executing of programs*. The Ministry of Finance and National Planning usually drives the implementation of the national sustainable development plans, in consultation with the Government ministries and relevant stakeholders. Having had a member of Ministry of Finance and National Planning involved in the working committees at advisory and parliamentary level, has helped to mainstream DRR and CC issues into other national polices and plans.

In relation to regulating prevention, the JNAP Secretariat has been working closely with the EIA unit. The EIA has been in use before the adoption of the JNAP, and climate change and DRM have already been included in the EIA process as issues to be considered in the screening of projects. The JNAP Goal 1 '*Improved good governance for climate change adaptation and disaster risk management mainstreaming, decision making, organisational and institutional policy frameworks*' includes mainstreaming of DRM/CCA into sectoral plans such as the National Infrastructure and Investment Plan (NIP) (2010). ADB has recently commissioned a study to explore how to integrate CCA and DRM into the NIP. However, the mainstreaming of DRR and CCA considerations into sectoral and community plans and programmes needs to be done on a more continuous basis and financial support is needed to deliver the work properly. For example, also the existing building code needs to be revised to incorporate CCA and DRM considerations.

To improve the DRM-CCA practice and coordination between stakeholders, various meetings are held under the JNAP such as the monthly meetings with the technical team and meetings on DRM and CC projects. In early 2013, coordination meetings with NGOs were initiated with the aim to improve the coordination and also to inform better what is in place nationally and how to contribute to the national effort. The challenge still is to get all the relevant NGOs and other stakeholders to attend the meetings. The JNAP Secretariat is also working to build up the relationship with the communities through running consultations and awareness raising activities on DRR/CCA under a pilot project.

Another aim is to further build the partnership with donors and partners. Last year one-on-one consultations were organized with resident donors and then a donor roundtable where also JNAP stakeholders were invited to. The plan is to organise a donor roundtable at a quarterly basis. The dialogue with donors is ongoing and good feedback has been received of having the JNAP in place as a Government approved national guiding document. The JNAP Secretariat has dialogued at least with ADB, AusAID, EU, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), UNDP and SPC/GIZ Coping with climate change in the Pacific Island Region (CCCPIR) programme, who are willing to fund or have already funded some of the JNAP activities. Also, funding has been or will be made available to implement activities through

the EU EDF-10 ACP-EU Natural Disaster Facility coordinated by SOPAC.

The institutional arrangements were revised and strengthened as a result of adopting the JNAP[27] and major institutional restructuring in Tonga is still being discussed. In 2012, there was an initiative to merge NEMO with the Environment and Climate Change Office. While this did not yet happen, the initiative is seen as a good sign by the national focal points as it would help the staff to work more closely with each other if placed under the same office. Currently the two key offices function under different Ministries. It is also suggested that the renewable energy should be placed under the same office as well as both natural and man-made disasters.

One of the key roles of the JNAP secretariat is to ensure the availability of funds and secure funds to implement activities under the JNAP. An activity recommended in the JNAP is to identify the best or most appropriate financing modalities for Tonga. The capacity of the Ministry of Finance and National Planning has recently been assessed through the ongoing GCCA project to see and promote the Ministry's capacity to support Tonga to directly access budget support. Also, a National Climate Change Fund Bill is currently being prepared by a legal drafter.

The Secretariat's aim is to get communities and public at large involved in the process for them to gain more knowledge and also to be more supportive of the work. Awareness raising has been conducted through TV and radio programmes, materials have been distributed to stakeholders, school visits have been conducted and a website was established for the JNAP Secretariat for disseminating information on the JNAP. It is however important to note that concrete actions also need to be implemented on the ground to support the awareness campaigning. The communities would like to see implementation efforts on the ground related to disaster preparedness and response, such as installing sirens, to be convinced of the importance of the advocacy messages. Some donors tend to understand the situation and concern of the communities, and are willing to assist with the funding for those activities.

It was also suggested that there is a need to start looking into developing an instrument like the JNAP which would link all the disasters, both natural and man-made. This could not come under NEMO but would need to have more collaboration between the different levels.

3.3 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ACT (2007)

The Emergency Management Act is the primary DRM legislation for Tonga and it was endorsed in 2007.

The Act calls for the development of the National Emergency Management Plan (2009) and District Emergency Management Plans. The Act stipulates that the National Emergency Management Plan and the District Emergency Management Plans need to include provision for 'mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery, based on risk management process' and 'priorities for disaster risk reduction'. The Act also provides for the establishment of the National Emergency Management Office (NEMO) and emergency management committee systems at the national, district and village levels. This has provided a strategy to involve the Government, NGOs and communities to collaborate together through different levels of committees and working groups. There is a strong focus on disaster management in both the Act and the Plan whilst acknowledging that DRR engagement is to be via multi-agency,

27 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

multi-sectoral approach to risk minimisation, using the Comprehensive Hazard and Risk Management Tool (CHARM) process developed by SOPAC[28].

The Emergency Management Act and Plan are due for revision in 2013. There is a need to ensure that the linkages between the Act, Plan and the JNAP are better established. While the JNAP has improved the process between disaster risk management and climate change, a more coordinated effort is needed between the instruments. Improved coordination is also seen as a potential way of ensuring more funding for DRM activities. Currently the majority of the JNAP funding is distributed on climate change related activities. A proposal has been prepared for NEMO to have a permanent representative at the JNAP Secretariat particularly to address this issue of coordination and distribution of funding.

Intent to develop the Emergency Management Act

The following issues and drivers were identified as the main issues, challenges and needs which led to the formulation of the Emergency Management Act.

- **Impacts of previous major disaster events and poor response.** The initial talks on formalizing a proper response took place after tropical cyclone Isaac in 1982 severely affected Tonga. During the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (1994-2004) and after other tropical cyclones, the discussions on developing DRM legislation started.

- **Need for the Government to lead the work.** One of the reasons for putting the Act in place was the need for the Government to lead the work of national actors and assist the international donors as it is in the end the one responsible to its citizens.

- **Regional push to develop DRM legislation.** The development of the Act was not initiated only locally in Tonga but there was a push from the regional level to develop DRM legislation. There was also the need to align the work with the regional frameworks and development partners and not work in isolation.

- **Political will.** The previous Minister of Transport and Works gave a lot of push to the development of the Act and also the current Minister is driving the process. Obtaining political will can however be challenging.

Process to develop the Emergency Management Act

The process to develop the Emergency Management Plan was initiated in 2001 after the Cyclone Waka (2001). A lot of consultations were held in the following three years. It took another three years for the Act to be endorsed by the Government in 2007. Tonga Cyclone Emergency Recovery and Management Project (CERMP) supported the development of the Act at its final stages by drafting the National Emergency Management Bill[29]. The CERMP aimed to assist in the recovery from Cyclone Waka and to strengthen and upgrade the emergency and risk management capacity of the country.

Initially, the move towards formalising a proper response came about already in 1982 after the tropical cyclone Isaac which was the first mayor cyclone affecting the country and causing a lot of damage. At that time there was practically no legislation in place. During the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (1994-2004) and in the aftermath of other tropical cyclones the discussions on DRM legislation started. In the mid-90s, the discussions were

28 National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013) - Interim. Tonga Government 2012.

29 Jayavanth, P., Takai, M. and Akau'ola, Siale. 2009. Disaster and emergency preparedness in Tonga. The Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health, Vol 40 (Suppl 1).

supported by an institutional strengthening and capacity building project by the Queensland Disaster and Emergency Services as it included exploring the possibilities of introducing the Emergency Management Act to Tonga.

Also, the Building Control and Standards Act (2002) and Building Code Regulations (2007) were developed parallel to the Emergency Management Act.

Implementation of the Emergency Management Act

A lot of advances have happened under the leadership of the current Minister of Transport and Works. For example, a National Emergency Fund came in place with a proposal to the Cabinet to allocate 5 million TOP to the fund which focuses on post-disaster assistance. The idea of the emergency fund emerged from the experiences with tropical cyclone Wilma (2011). Also a working group was created so that when a disaster happens, all transactions can be processed quickly.

The challenge is to have the resources to apply and implement the Act. The Emergency Management Act allows for the developing partners to identify how to link their activities to the national legal framework. A lot of projects are currently available for example on climate resilience and climate proofing infrastructure, such as buildings and roads. The challenge is however that the Government has limited human resources to access and manage the projects. The Ministry of Civil Defense and Emergency Management (MCDEM) of New Zealand has recently provided funding for NEMO to hire a project manager. The expectation is to gain access to a lot more project activities when the new person comes on board.

The enforcement capacity needs strengthening in Tonga and more resources are required to monitor the implementation of legal frameworks and regulations. This relates especially to the long-term mitigation of risk such as the building control. Another challenge is the capacity constraints of NEMO. The Emergency Management Act provides the authority to NEMO but very few resources are available to appropriately conduct the role stipulated in the Act. The Act provides NEMO however with the opportunity to take leadership with agencies and NGOs which have more human and financial resources to reach the community level. NEMO is trying to get the best out of the existing situation by using the linkages through the NGOs especially related to awareness raising and preparedness. NEMO would like to see the collaboration more formalised but this has proven challenging due to the NGOs' own funding and goals. Also, NEMO considers that the NGOs' work should be complementary to the national efforts to reduce the risks to communities and increase their resilience. The NGO coordination meetings initiated under the JNAP are seen as an important step towards a more coordinated and complementary approach.

Both the Emergency Management Act and the JNAP has greatly assisted NEMO in the coordination efforts by identifying the roles and offering clarity in accountability and responsibility across institutions and stakeholders. The Act is also considered to foster an effective use of resources. Furthermore, NEMO is looking forward to putting a system in place for a more effective, accountable and transparent use of resources.

The Emergency Management Act and the Plan regulate activities on public awareness. To enhance a culture of prevention and community engagement, radio programmes have been implemented as well as consultations discussing risk reduction issues. Also, as a result of the new inundation modeling for a tsunami, the people will know better the risk they are living with and which areas are highly vulnerable. The aim is that public awareness covers all hazards, including the maritime hazards, but currently the focus is still on natural hazards.

CHAPTER 4

Country Studies – Cook Islands

4.1. INTRODUCTION

The information presented here is obtained from the interviews of the national and regional focal points and the policy and legal documents unless otherwise advised. This brief country study explores the intent and process of developing the National Sustainable Development Plan 2011-2015 and the Disaster Risk Management Act 2007 in the Cook Islands. It also provides reflections on the implementation of these instruments.

The Cook Islands is highly vulnerable to disasters, comprising of 15 small islands scattered over 1.8 million square kilometres of the South Pacific Ocean. The Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) has estimated that earthquakes and tropical cyclones are expected to cause average annual disaster losses of 5 million USD in the Cook Islands[30]. Both the intensity and frequency of extreme weather and climate events has increased in the Cook Islands in the recent years[31]. The country lies within the "cyclone belt" and in 2005, its vulnerability to cyclones was highlighted when five consecutive cyclones over a period of two months hit the country. Also, in 2010 tropical cyclone Pat caused widespread damage on the island of Aitutaki. Other key weather related hazards affecting the island state are storm surges, intense rainfall events, droughts and climate change[32]. The Cook Islands is surrounded by the seismically active Pacific 'Ring of Fire' but no significant earthquakes have been reported recently[33].

Key Policy and Legal Instruments in the Cook Islands	
YEAR	**INSTRUMENT**
2007	**Disaster Risk Management Act**
2007	Te Kaveinga Nui – The 2020 Visionary Framework
2007	Te Kaveinga Nui – National Sustainable Development Plan 2007–2010 (NSDP)
2008	National Disaster Risk Management Arrangements
2009	National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Management 2009–2015 (NAP)
2011	**Te Kaveinga Nui – National Sustainable Development Plan 2011-2015 (NSDP)**
2012	Joint National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation 2011–2015 (JNAP)

4.2 TE KAVEINGA NUI – NATIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2011–2015

In 2007, the Government of the Cook Islands launched its first long-term development framework '*Te Kaveinga Nui – The 2020 Visionary Framework*'. The framework outlines five strategic outcomes that aim to deliver the national vision: '*To enjoy the highest quality of life consistent with the aspirations of our people in harmony with our culture and environment*'. The national vision and the development outcomes highlight social, economic and environmental priorities underpinned by good governance, culture and effective partnerships. These development

30 Country risk profile: Cook Islands. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.

31 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

32 Joint National Action Plan for DRM and CCA 2011-2015. Cook Islands, 2012.

33 Country risk profile: Cook Islands. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.

Figure 1. Phased approach of the *Te Kaveinga Nui – The 2020 Visionary Framework*[34].

outcomes for 2020 are realised through a phased medium-term planning approach by developing and implementing three consecutive National Sustainable Development Plans (NSDPs) (Figure 1).

The NSDPs set national goals, expected results and effective strategies to guide policy decisions over the medium term to progress towards the 2020 outcomes. The NDSP 2011-2015 is the second planning phase of the Te Kaveinga Nui. In support of better planned development, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation were identified as crucial components to be integrated across all aspects of the second NSDP. Out of its eight priority areas, the Priority Area 5 has a goal on '*Resilient and sustainable communities: A Cook Islands where our people are resilient to disasters and climate change to achieve sustainable livelihoods*'. DRR and CCA are also well streamlined into other thematic areas such as infrastructure, gender, and training and capacity building. The NSDP 2011-2015 acknowledges how disaster events and adverse impacts of climate change can undermine the country's resilience and impede development[35].

The three objectives under Priority Area 5 on '*Resilience*' are:

1. People are prepared for disasters and climate change impacts.
2. Impacts of disasters and climate change are reduced.
3. People are resilient to all forms of hazards.

To achieve these objectives, the strategies focus on ensuring strong governance arrangements for DRR and CCA; ensuring high quality risk information is available to inform planning; enhancing effective preparedness, response and recovery; and building resilience through effective disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

Intent to develop the NSDP 2011-2015 and integrate DRR and CCA

The national focal points were asked to mention the main issues, challenges, needs, demands and expections which lead to the formulation and adoption of the NSDP 2011-2015. The following issues and drivers were identified through the interviews of this study.

- **Need for a long-term view to development to better plan and work towards development outcomes.** As opposed to an ad-hoc approach, a long-term view to development was needed to guide the planning processes in country. The NSDPs were the first country-level plans to identify development priorities in the Cook Islands.

- **Integration of DRR and CCA makes sense.** In the Pacific island country context of small islands and populations, integration makes sense to the decision makers and stakeholders as the impacts of disasters are 'present' to everyone and many have lived through the reality of disasters. Also, as long as an approach makes sense to the community, it is more widely accepted at all levels.

34 National Sustainable Development Plan (NSDP) 2011-2015, Government of Cook Islands, 2011.

35 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

- **Grown national emphasis on DRR and linkages to climate change and resilience.** During the review of the first medium-term plan NSDP 2007-2010, it was found that emphasis on DRR had become more prominent in the country and also the connections between resilience and climate change had been acknowledged. The new NSDP 2011-2015 aimed to capture these two key elements.

- **Expected impacts of climate change and experiences from past disaster events.** The idea of integration came about through the experiences of the past disasters. In 2005, Cook Islands was hit by five consecutive tropical cyclones in the course of two months. These events also highlighted the potential impacts of climate change as it was expected that both the severity and intensity of the tropical cyclones would increase as a result of climate change. These disaster events underlined the connections between DRR and CCA.

- **Improved understanding of the linkages between DRR and CCA.** It became evident during the consultation process for the NSDP 2011-2015 that the awareness of the linkages between DRR and CCA had improved. For example, the tourism sector had a clear understanding that risks need to be reduced in order to minimise disasters impacts to the industry. The DRM and CC communities were also more prepared than previously to provide inputs to the development of the NSDP. The Joint National Action Plan for DRM and CCA 2011-2015 (JNAP) was being formulated at the same time.

- **Limiting duplication of efforts and maximise the use of limited resources.** This is considered an important aspect in all mainstreaming and integration efforts in the Cook Islands.

Process to integrate DRR and CCA into the NSDP 2011-2015

The following steps describe how disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation were integrated into the NSDP 2011-2015.

1. *Review of the previous plan: Identified resilience as a priority*

The formulation of the second NSDP started off by reviewing the NSDP 2007-2010 and considering the lessons learnt from the implementation of the first phase. During 2009-2010, community consultations were organised to review the strategies and outcomes of the previous plan and implementing agencies provided feedback on the progress towards target achievement. As a result, the priorities of the second NSDP were identified.

Resilience was identified as one of the new priorities for the new NSDP. This was supported by the reported damage and set back of developing targets from recent and regular cyclones as well as the knowledge that climate change is expected to cause increases in climate related hazards affecting the country. It was recognized that DRR and CCA needed to be integrated throughout the new plan.

In the first NSDP 2007-2010, one of the strategic goals focused on safe, secure and resilient communities.

2. *Establishment of the Economic Development Task Force as a coordinating body*

Economic Development Task Force was established by the new Government to further consult on strategies for achieving the priorities of the new NSDP. This task force comprised primarily of the private sector, representatives of NGOs and CSOs together with the central agencies supported by the Central Policy and Planning Office.

3. *Public consultation on strategies to achieve the priorities of the new plan*

In February 2011, a public consultation workshop was conducted to develop the Joint National Action Plan for DRM and CCA 2011-2015 (JNAP). This workshop was also used to identify how disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation could impact the new NSDP's priority areas and the goals within them, as well as how these objectives and strategies could affect hazard occurrence, exposure and vulnerability. National and local line agency representatives, hazard and climate change experts, NGOs, private sector and members of the public attended the consultation.

The process to develop the JNAP started after there already was a sense of what the priority areas of the new NSDP were going to be. The two processes then moved ahead simultaneously complementing each other.

"The two processes then moved ahead, simultaneously complementing each other."

4. *Task Force presented result of consultations at Economic Development Summit*

The development directions for NSDP 2011-2015 were validated at the Economic Development Summit in April 2011 through the consultation findings and presentations by the Task Force. Sustaining a high quality environment and managing risks was addressed as a way of maintaining the country's economic competitive advantage.

5. *Drafting of the plan and recirculation to key stakeholders*

The NSDP was drafted during July-September 2011 and circulated to key stakeholders for comments and feedback. The aim was to ensure that necessary considerations were reflected in the strategies of the different priority areas.

6. *Presentation of the draft in sectoral consultations*

The sectoral consultations were organized in October-November 2011. This step ensured that the cross-cutting nature of priorities such as resilience was considered across sectors. Further changes were suggested and the draft was amended.

7. *Presentation to the Cabinet for endorsement*

The document was then presented to the National Sustainable Development Commission for their final consideration before submission to Cabinet for endorsement. The Cabinet endorsed the NSDP 2011-2015 on 29 November 2011. The approval process was rather straightforward since community consultations had already been conducted as well as consultations with Government units on how to address the concerns of communities. Another key aspect assisting the approval process in the Cabinet was that the opposition had been involved in the development of the NSDP throughout the process as one of the principles was to 'keep politics out of the plan'.

Throughout the development process, part of the criteria was to ensure that cross-cutting issues such as DRR and CCA where duly considered. A lesson learnt from the process was that the key ingredient to the integration of DRR and CCA was the comprehensive consultative process providing various opportunities to ensure that those considerations were incorporated within the different goals. It also allowed various stakeholder

groups to provide their inputs into the plan, including highest levels of government, traditional leaders, private sector, NGOs, CSOs, community groups, and school children. The joint workshops for the JNAP and the integration of DRR and CCA into the other areas of the NSDP ensured a very close synergy between the two plans.

Implementation of the NSDP 2011-2015

The NSDP has played a mayor positive part in guiding the national development. It is the leading national document used by all government agencies and sectors to guide their activities. The NSDP 2011-2015 is also a powerful instrument to facilitate DRR-CCA-SDG integration. The Joint National Action Plan for DRM and CCA provides a roadmap to guide the implementation of the NSDP's Priority Area 5 on resilience.

There is a clear potential in the NSDP 2011-2015 together with the Cook Islands' JNAP to create a conducive environment and opportunities for implementing the HFA and the RFA. The priorities highlighted in the policies offer greater ability to develop financial proposals with development partners and prioritise the JNAP activities which in general are linked to sectoral plans and interlinked to the NSDP. Donors are more confident and able to support with better means when linkages to key national policies exist. It was considered that countries that do not have a JNAP or a DRR/CCA policy in place with links to national sustainable development plan might have a harder time trying to link to the financial proposals and support.

One of the challenges related to the funding of the NSDP 2011-2015 activities is that while there are financial opportunities available, it is not clear-cut for the PICs to access these opportunities due to the human and resource limitations, and the differences between island states and bigger countries. In PICs, the technical persons normally need to undertake two roles, one of them being mainstreaming. Tight deadlines for spending or applying for funding pose further challenge due to administration's limited resources and capacity constraints. In the past the country reacted to the encouragement of outside finances, whereas now the Cook Islands has returned to reprioritising the national focuses due to the capacity constraints in relation to the use of the funds.

NSDP has succeeded in linking to the performance monitoring of Government ministries. The priority is for the agencies to implement the NSDP through their business plans. The annual performance monitoring started in 2012 to review how well the ministries have linked their business plans to the NSDP 2011-2015. New processes have been put in place to look into the role of the NSDP, the areas with limited progress, the impact and sustainability of the activities, and the agencies' capacity to deliver.

4.3 DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT ACT (2007)

The Disaster Risk Management Act (2007) constitutes the primary DRM legislation for the Cook Islands. The Act seeks to ensure that DRM procedures are put in place and are provided for by the Emergency Management Cook Islands (EMCI) by means of disaster risk reduction, mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. It aims to establish an efficient structure for the management of disasters and emergencies by promoting cooperation amongst agencies with a role in DRM, and enhancing capacities to maintain the provision of essential services during periods of disaster and emergency; and to enhance the capacity of the government, relevant agencies and the community to effectively manage the impacts of disasters and emergencies and to take all necessary action to prevent or minimise threats to life, health and the environment from natural disasters, man-made disasters and other emergencies.

The Act outlines the role, responsibilities and functions of various actors and seeks to clarify

the risk governance arrangements. In addition the act outlines the functions of the Island Councils and their disaster risk management committees, including the development of a DRM plan for its area of responsibility. Other government agencies are also expected to develop DRM Plans.

Intent to develop the Disaster Risk Management Act

The following issues and drivers were identified through the interviews for this study when asked about the main issues, challenges, needs, demands and expectations which lead to the formulation and adoption of the Disaster Risk Management Act.

- **Experiences from past disaster events.** As mentioned earlier, the Cook Islands was hit by several tropical cyclones in 2005. These events highlighted various challenges in the response and one of the recommendations of the response assessment was for the Government to develop a new Act for coordinating the national DRM efforts.

- **Need to change the mindset from reactive to proactive.** Due to poor coordination, the mentality before the new Act was reactive focusing only on disaster management as opposed to risk prevention and mitigation. Previously it was common that after a disaster had happened, things returned back to 'business as normal'.

Process to develop the Disaster Risk Management Act

The development of the DRM Act started in 2005. A lot of consultations were held. Technical assistance was contracted to develop the draft legislation and discussions were held with lawyers from the Crown Law Office. It was identified for instance that at the time there were too many 'red tapes' preventing action and effective decision-making before a state of emergency could be activated. The previous Act was the 1973 Hurricane Safety Act.

The Crown Law Office was the final agency handling the draft before submission to Parliament was made for its endorsement. The Act was endorsed in 2007. Stakeholders understood the importance of the Act and the approval process was quite straightforward. The DRM Act was supplemented by the National Disaster Risk Management Arrangements in 2009. The DRM Regulations were meant to be drafted at the same time but due to capacity and resource constraints this was delayed and completed in 2010.

During the development of the Act, a major milestone took place when the Emergency Management Cook Islands (EMCI) was created in 2006 under the Prime Minister's Office. Previously disaster management activities had been placed under the Police.

Implementation of the Disaster Risk Management Act

A huge shift from disaster management to disaster risk management has taken place with a lot more awareness on hazards and vulnerabilities. Before the development of the Act, disaster risk management was working on an ad hoc basis and there was not either a national sustainable development plan in place at the time. The advantage now is to have the NSDP in place making it easier to mainstream DRR and CCA into the sector plans. Also, comparing the response efforts in 2005 to the tropical cyclone Pat response in 2010, a much more coordinated approach from response to recovery took place in 2010 than before the Act.

As part of the statutory responsibilities, EMCI has invested a lot of resources this year to support the culture of prevention and engagement of the communities, for example through awareness

programmes and documentaries. There is now very good response from the communities in preparation during the cyclone season.

The DRM Act provides for an all-agency response which offered a remarkable difference to the previous situation. However, one of the challenges has been the coordination of the various agencies acting under the Act and while the situation has improved, this is still work in progress. Another challenge is for the involved agencies to recognise the Act and new way of doing things. For example, a key agency presented their response plan according to the old Hurricane Safety Act 1973 two years after the DRM Act 2007 had been adopted.

In 2011, the Cook Islands Government put in place an Emergency Trust Fund. The Fund is crucial to disaster response and preparedness. This initiative came out of the lessons learnt during tropical cyclone Pat 2010 when some of the ministries were a bit slow to respond because of budget constraints.

During the upcoming review of the DRM Act and the DRM Arrangements, the linkages between the Government frameworks will be looked at as they are considered ad hoc. The international response law review has however already helped to improve the arrangements with Government and humanitarian actors. With the support of SPREP, a legislation review will be conducted in the Cook Islands to explore whether climate change adaptation should be merged to the DRM Act or kept separate. The possibility of developing an integrated DRM-CCA legislation will also be explored.

A new Island Government Bill for the Outer Islands was recently passed in February 2013. It deals mainly with governance issues and helps to define the roles of different actors, among describing disaster coordinators' responsibilities on the islands. The Bill is expected to strengthen the DRM coordination and decision-making in times of disasters on the Outer Islands, and by providing a clear governance structure, it strengthens the DRM Act.

In addition to the Island Government Act (2013), implementation of the DRM Act is facilitated through the DRM Arrangements (2009) and the DRM Finance Policy (part of a Financial Policies and Procedures Manual by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Management). The related sector legislation such as the Biosecurity Act (2009), the National Environment Act (2003), the Red Cross Act (2002), the Public Health Act (2008), and the Marine Resources Act (2005) also support the implementation of the Act[36].

36 National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013)– Interim. Government of Cook Islands, 2012.

CHAPTER 5

Country Studies – Solomon Islands

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The information presented here is obtained from the interviews of the national and regional focal points and the policy and legal documents unless otherwise advised. This brief country study explores the intent and process of developing a joint framework for resilient development.

The Solomon Islands is highly prone to the impacts of natural hazards and climate change. The Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) has estimated that Solomon Islands is expected to incur average annual disaster losses of 20.5 million USD due to earthquakes and tropical cyclones. The Solomon Islands is situated along the seismically active Pacific "Ring of Fire". In 2007, a devastating magnitude 8.1 earthquake struck the Western and Choiseul Provinces of the country generating a tsunami that killed 52 people and caused widespread damage to housing, infrastructure, schools, and medical facilities. The event resulted in an estimated 100 million USD in disaster losses. The Solomon Islands is also vulnerable to natural hazards such as tropical cyclones, storm surges, flooding, landslides and disease outbreaks[37].

Key Policy and Legal Instruments in the Solomon Islands	
YEAR	**INSTRUMENT**
2008	National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA)
2010	Disaster Risk Management Plan
2011	National Development Strategy 2011-2020 (NDS)
2012	National Climate Change Policy 2012-2017

37 Country risk profile: Solomon Islands. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.

5.2 JOINT FRAMEWORK FOR RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT

The Solomon Islands has agreed to develop an integrated risk planning approach. Instead of choosing the conventional way used in the region for developing a Joint National Action Plan, the Solomon Islands is exploring a strategic approach in the development context. The ongoing integration initiative seeks to develop a joint framework for resilient development which would be used to embed climate change and disaster risk considerations into development planning processes.

"Aim is to embed climate change and disaster risk considerations into development planning processes."

The importance of mainstreaming disaster risk management and climate change into development and how it still remains to be a challenge has come out strongly in the national consultations so far. Disaster risk management and climate change are not yet considered in terms of regular development in the Solomon Islands. Another key aspect in this high-level strategic framework is integration. The first step in the process was to acknowledge that climate change and natural hazards pose certain risks. For example, food security is threatened in hazard events in the Solomon Islands because most people rely on gardens, forest and ocean for food. Climate change will affect these sources as well (crops, weather) and so regardless of

the source of the risk, food security (agriculture, fisheries, forests etc.) will be threatened. A joint approach ensures a holistic way to deal with risk and helps to avoid duplication.

It is proposed that this new framework should strengthen existing development processes by providing a resilience focus. The aim is to have in place a framework which gives guidance to the different ministries in their work. Rather than looking into how other Government agencies can support the implementation of the work plan of the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), the framework will look at how MECDM can better support other ministries to do their work in a way that supports greater resilience. The new approach starts off by looking at how various risks impede the development of resilience.

It is suggested that this joint framework would be created to run in parallel with the National Development Strategy (NDS). The aim is to identify key climate change and disaster risks that are likely to undermine the achievement of the development objectives and also to identify options to reduce these risks.

The NDS 2011-2020 objectives are as follows:

- Alleviate poverty and improve the lives of Solomon Islanders in a peaceful and stable society
- Support the vulnerable
- Quality health care
- Quality education
- Increase economic growth and equitably distribute employment and income benefits
- Develop physical infrastructure and utilities to ensure all Solomon Islanders have access to essential services and markets
- Effectively respond to climate change and manage the environment and risks of natural disasters
- Improve governance and order at national, provincial and community levels and strengthen links at all levels

This approach came about through the recognition of small Government departments and that mainstreaming of DRM and CC cannot be any one department's job. Climate change and disasters affect multiple sectors and therefore a multi-sector approach to reducing these risks makes sense. The rationale of cost sharing and information sharing also supports the approach. During the past four years, some ministries have also started to recognise how their budgets have been affected by response to disasters and that there is a need to consider disaster and climate risks as part of their planning. Having people in high-level positions with awareness on disaster risk management and/or climate change is a key to the process.

In addition, the donors and partners in the region strongly promote integration and alignment which also brings pressure to the Governments to opt for an integrated approach for recognition and cohesion. However, donor funding is still largely divided into different streams which makes it challenging to plan for an integrated project with a comprehensive risk context. Thus, it would be preferable to grant funding for 'reducing risk' instead of determining which funding needs to be used for climate change adaptation and which for disaster risk management.

5.3 PROCESS TOWARDS THE JOINT FRAMEWORK FOR RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT

In the end of 2011, the discussions started on a Joint National Action Plan for the Solomon Islands. The Permanent Secretary of MECDM at the time saw the value of a joint framework and good steps were taken. After the Permanent Secretary was moved into a new ministry, the process progressed slowly and with no new person in place made joint planning more challenging in the

Ministry. Having strong and committed leadership is extremely important as well as projects and leaders that support alignment.

In April 2013, a strategic note was being prepared by MECDM with the support of partners to highlight the initiative to develop a joint framework for resilient development and the outcomes of the multi-stakeholder workshop held in March 2013. The strategic note will be sent to the Permanent Secretaries of the Ministries with a proposal to create a framework which would run alongside with National Development Strategy 2011-2020. The document will also be presented to the National Disaster Council, also made of Permanent Secretaries. It has been suggested that the framework would then be submitted to Cabinet. If endorsed, it is expected that different donors would probably be able to support the activities under the framework. Donors recognise that institutional capacity is thin and needs to be supported, and the joint framework would offer a way to do it. Some projects aimed at supporting this are already in the pipeline, such as the World Bank's 'Increasing Resilience to Climate Change and Natural Hazards' project and AusAID's 'Pacific Risk Resilience Program' implemented by UNDP Pacific Centre.

Previously the development of NAPA, National Disaster Risk Management Plan and the Climate Change Policy have all gone through extensive consultative processes and the current stakeholders have not seen the value of going through something similar again to create another plan to sit outside the National Development Strategy. The meaning is to use the information that has been gathered so far in the previous consultations, also recognising that for the communities there is not much practical distinction between the different sources of risk.

During the process, it is highly important to provide enough proof on the financial losses and/or the benefits of DRM/CCA. For example, the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) has estimated that the average annual loss due to tropical cyclones,earthquakes and tsunami is 3% of GDP. This is a powerful argument in the national discussions.

It was estimated that Solomon Islands would have also probably gone through a more 'conventional approach' if originals plans of Solomon Islands being the third country developing a DRM NAP would have happened. However, civil conflict in the country and entering of RAMSI (Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands) deferred the plans. It was decided to first review the DRM governance arrangements and then use the learning of that process for a structured approach for a National Action Plan. Also, with the benefit of hindsight, at that stage the DRM actors in country were continuously involved in disaster response. The 2007 tsunami in the Western Province acted as a catalyst for moving the DRM arrangements forward. Basically the disaster event was a wake-up call that the existing institutional mechanism was inappropriate and insufficient. The Government did not respond well in the 2007 event and the NGOs carried out a lot of the response work. A lot of lessons learnt were conducted after the tsunami.

In 2008, the NAPA was developed, referencing resilience without directly mentioning DRM or DRR. In 2010, the DRM Plan was adopted. The DRM Plan outlines the DRM Arrangements, including different committees, phases, clusters for response etc. and various committees which were devised to deal with these areas of overlap. In 2010, the NDMO was also moved from the Ministry of Home Affairs to MECDM, to the same ministry with the Climate Change Division. In 2012, the national Climate Change Policy 2012-2017 was endorsed by the Cabinet following a process which included a lot of consultations, community meetings etc. Both the DRM Plan 2010 and the Climate Change Policy 2012 make specific and repeated reference of the need to align the DRR and CCA activities.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions

The main issues, challenges, needs, demands and expectations which have contributed to the formulation and adoption of the discussed instruments can be summarized as:

- Aim to achieve climate and disaster resilient development
- Integration is the 'common sense' approach
- Devastating impacts of past disaster events and expected impacts of climate and disaster risks
- Small communities, limited Government systems and resources and institutional arrangements
- Capacity constraints, lack of coordination and limited sharing of expertise
- Avoid duplication of efforts and maximise the use of limited capacities and resources
- Multi-sector approach to reducing disaster and climate risks
- Improve donor, partner and stakeholder coordination at national level
- Increased national emphasis on disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation
- High-level political support
- Increased awareness of climate and disaster risks
- Need to change the mindset from reactive to proactive
- Strong support from the regional organisations
- Alignment with national, regional and international frameworks

Related to these issues, some practical steps are highlighted below.

1. Provide economic arguments on resilience

Impacts of past disaster events as well as the expected impacts on disaster and climate-related risk have been clear drivers for the development of the discussed instruments. It is important to ensure that economic arguments about resilience, estimates on average annual disaster losses and other expected impacts, as well as information on the benefits of DRR and CCA are available and forms an important part in the process. It will assist to achieve high-level political support and buy-in across sectors, both key aspects for the development and implementation of a new instrument. The UNISDR/UNDP institutional and policy analysis in DRR and CCA[38] identified information support for decision-making, both scientific and economic, as one of the approaches to facilitate integration. The study also recommended that each country should assess, in a general way and for the national context, the broader costs and benefits of taking a more integrated approach to DRR and CCA, relative to business as usual.

For example, the Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI)[39] aims to provide the Pacific Island Countries with disaster risk modeling and assessment tools and has so far produced country risk profiles for all 15 islands states involved in the initiative. It is the most comprehensive risk exposure dataset collected within the Pacific islands. It is a joint initiative of the SOPAC Division of SPC, World Bank and ADB.

2. Ensure high-level political support

High-level political support and awareness on DRR and CCA is crucial for the development and implementation of the policies and legislation.

38 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

39 Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) website: http://pcrafi.sopac.org/

High-level advocacy with the support of the regional actors is a key in achieving the necessary national buy-in for the process.

The Pacific 'Roadmap' process towards an integrated regional strategy for disaster risk management and climate change by 2015 fosters a high-level dialogue with Ministers and political leaders of the region with the aim to achieve high-level support to the integration approach and how disaster and climate risks can be more effectively integrated into the development agenda at national, sectoral and sub-national levels[40].

3. Review of linkages between national frameworks, policies and legislation

The linkages between national frameworks, policies and legislation relevant to DRR and CCA should be explored to gain a better understanding of how the different instruments can better support each other. The need to review the existing legislation has already been identified to make it more conducive for creating a more sound and enabling environment to undertake an integrated approach. It is viewed that the DRM legislation needs to have a stronger focus on response and preparedness and on the other hand it needs to be ensured that disaster and climate risk are integrated into sector legislations. Also, recently the Cook Islands has taken steps to explore the possibilities of developing a new integrated legislation with technical assistance from SPREP.

4. Recording good practices and lessons learnt

As the implementation of the instruments with an integrated approach such as the JNAPs or national sustainable development plans moves forwards, it will be useful to record the good practices and lessons learnt from the implementation, including how the integrated approach has addressed the challenges which contributed to the formulation of these instruments. These experiences would be a valuable resource for the countries which have made commitment to integrate DRM and CC but are yet formulating their approach. For instance the Solomon Islands' initiative of developing a strategic joint approach in the development context will provide an interesting example in the region. In the current context of a significant number of DRR-CCA projects implemented in countries, a more strategic level guidance might be more appropriate than developing a national action plan.

These good practices and lessons learned would also support the formulation and implementation of the integrated regional framework for disaster risk management and climate change. A compendium of Pacific DRM and CC case studies is one of the three major anticipated outputs of the 'Roadmap' process towards the integrated strategy by 2015.

5. Future roles and responsibilities under the integrated approach

An integrated approach is expected to respond to the challenges of capacity constraints and limited sharing of expertise at national level. When stakeholders from different backgrounds work together towards shared goals, there needs to be a common understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the key actors. Mainstreaming DRR and CCA should be a shared responsibility of multiple sectors.

The integration discussion has also prompted discussions on the changing role of the NDMOs and whether their role in the future would focus more on disaster management, ie. preparedness, response and supporting early recovery. There is

40 Concept note of the Joint meeting of the 2013 Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, 8th – 11th July, Nadi, Fiji.

a need for the NDMOs to articulate how they see the strategic future role of their offices. Similarly, it will be necessary to agree on the roles and responsibilities of the sectors in mainstreaming DRR and CCA and these discussions should be continued at national and regional level.

6. Contributions to the global post-2015 DRR agenda

Separate global and regional frameworks for DRR and CCA has been identified as a key barrier to greater integration of DRR and CCA in the region[41] and was further echoed through this study. The Pacific region needs to continue to be actively part of the global consultations for post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction through an engagement led by SPC/SOPAC and SPREP in line with their respective leading regional roles in disaster risk management and climate change. The current efforts to develop an integrated regional strategy for disaster risk management and climate change makes the Pacific the first region in the world to take such constructive steps towards consolidating regional, national and sub-national efforts to reduce the risks to sustainable national development posed by disaster and climate-related risk. This provides the Pacific with a great opportunity to articulate to the international community the kind of disaster and climate resilient development it wants.

41 Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis. UNISDR and UNDP 2012.

References

Policy and Legal Documents

Emergency Management Act. Kingdom of Tonga, 2007.
www.paclii.org/cgi-bin/disp.pl/to/legis/num_act/ema2007190/ema2007190.html?query=national%20emergency

Disaster Risk Management Act. Government of Cook Islands, 2007.

Joint National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation 2011-2015. Government of Cook Islands, 2012.
www.preventionweb.net/files/27076_jnapfinal2012.pdf

Joint National Action Plan for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management 2010-2015. Kingdom of Tonga, 2010.
www.preventionweb.net/files/18242_000922tongajointnationalactionp.pdf

National Development Strategy 2011-2020. Government of Solomon Islands, 2010.

National Strategic Planning Framework 2010-2020. Kingdom of Tonga, 2010.
www.finance.gov.to/sites/default/files/National_Strag_Plan_Fwork_0.pdf

Te Kaveinga Nui – National Sustainable Development Plan 2011-2015. Government of Cook Islands, 2011.
http://cook-islands.gov.ck/docs/nsdp_2011-2015.pdf

Tonga Strategic Development Plan Eight 2006/07-2008/09: Looking to the Future, Building on the Past. Kingdom of Tonga, 2006.
www.tonga-energy.to/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/Strategic-Development-Plan-2006-09-English.pdf

Other References

Acting Today for Tomorrow: A Policy and Practice Note for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific Islands Region. Report by World Bank. 2012
www.pacificdisaster.net/pdnadmin/data/original/WB_2012_Acting_today_tommorow.pdf

Concept note of the Joint Meeting of the 2013 Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management and the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, 8th – 11th July, Nadi, Fiji.
www.pacificdisasterclimatemeeting2013.net/docs/jm/CONCEPT%20NOTE_JOINT%20PPDRM%20PCCRT_FINAL_160513.pdf

Country risk profile: Cook Islands. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.
http://pcrafi.sopac.org/

Country risk profile: Solomon Islands. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.
http://pcrafi.sopac.org/

Country risk profile: Tonga. Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative, 2011.
http://pcrafi.sopac.org/

Disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in the Pacific: an institutional and policy analysis. UNISDR and UNDP, 2012.
www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/26725

Guide to developing national action plans – a tool for mainstreaming disaster risk management based on experiences from selected Pacific island countries. SOPAC joint contribution report 196. SOPAC, 2009.
www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/publications/v.php?id=11809

Hay, J. and Mimura, N. 2010. The Changing Nature of Extreme Weather and Climate Events: Risks to Sustainable Development. Geomatics, Natural Hazards and Risk, 1: 1, 3 — 18. www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/19475701003643433

Jayavanth, P., Takai, M. and Akau'ola, Siale. 2009. Disaster and emergency preparedness in Tonga. The Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health, Vol 40 (Suppl 1).
www.tm.mahidol.ac.th/seameo/2009-40-spp1/05-09-012.pdf

Key messages from the Pacific Delegation to the 2011 Global Platform for DRR. 2011.
www.pacificdisaster.net/pdnadmin/data/original/GPDRR_2011_key_messages.pdf

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013) – Interim. Government of Cook Islands, 2012.
www.preventionweb.net/files/28565_cok_NationalHFAprogress_2011-13.pdf

National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011-2013) – Interim. Government of Tonga, 2012.
www.preventionweb.net/files/28842_ton_NationalHFAprogress_2011-13.pdf

Reducing Vulnerability and Exposure to Disasters, Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2012, ESCAP and UNISDR.
www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/29288

Review of Disaster Risk Management Legislation in Pacific Island Countries and Territories, 2012.
Report prepared by Cristelle Pratt for UNISDR (draft report, work in progress).
www.unisdr-apps.net/confluence/display/bib/Homepage

Review of the Regional Disaster Risk Management Mainstreaming Programme in the Pacific. UNDP Pacific Centre and SOPAC Disaster Risk Programme, draft March 2011.
Turning the Tide: Improving Access to Climate Financing in the Pacific Islands.
Policy brief by MacLellan, N. for Lowy Institute. 2011
www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/turning-tide-improving-access-climate-financing-pacific-islands

Update of progress of DRM NAP's, DRM mainstreaming programmes, DRM & CC Joint NAP's in 14 Pacific ACP states as at 25th June 2012. SOPAC, June 2012.

Websites

SPC/SOPAC's Disaster Reduction Programme (accessed 8 May 2013)
www.sopac.org/index.php/goals-rational-and-critical-issues-crp

SPREP's Climate Change Division (accessed 8 May 2013)
www.sprep.org/Adaptation/adaptation-overview

Pacific Catastrophe Risk Assessment and Financing Initiative (PCRAFI) (accessed 26 June 2013)
http://pcrafi.sopac.org/

ANNEX 1

Interviewees

Regional Organisations

Mr. Mosese Sikivou, Deputy Director SOPAC, SPC
Date: 26 March 2013
Ms. Netatua Pelesikoti, Director Climate Change, SPREP
Date: 18 April 2013

Cook Islands

Mr. Charles Carlson, Director, Emergency Management Cook Islands
Mr. Patrick A. Arioka, Planning & Advisory Officer, Emergency Management Cook Islands
Date: 27 March 2013
Ms. Elizabeth Koteka, Chief of Staff, Office of the Prime Minister
Ms. Ana Tiraa, Director, Climate Change Unit
Mr. Ewan Cameron, Consultant, Climate Change Unit
Date: 2 April 2013

Tonga

Mr. Ringo Fa'oliu, Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Infrastructure and Disaster Relief
Mr. Leveni Aho, Director, National Emergency Management Office (NEMO),
Ministry of Infrastructure and Disaster Relief
Date: 11 April 2013
Ms. Lu'isa Tu'i'afitu Malolo, Deputy Director for Climate Change, Ministry of Lands,
Survey, Natural Resources, Environment and Climate Change
Date: 19 April 2013

Solomon Islands

Ms. Suzanne Paisley, World Bank, Solomon Islands
Date: 16 April 2013
Ms. Paisley supports the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) in coordinating the development of a joint framework for resilient development.

ANNEX 2
Interview Questions

1. What are the main issues, challenges, needs, demands and expectations which led to the formulation and adoption of the policies, legislation and the frameworks?

2. What are the impacts, effects and potential of these policy and legal instruments:

    i. for creating a conducive environment and opportunities for the implementation of the HFA, for bringing in risk reduction approaches, and for a paradigm shift from disaster management to risk management, for enabling a culture and practice of prevention;

    ii. how prevention, disaster risk management, including preempting the accumulation of further risk, are regulated;

    iii. in leading towards an integrated and harmonized practice of addressing the needs and challenges identified by countries in relation to DRR and CCA;

    iv. in leading to DRR-CCA practice, including certainty and predictability of action, clarity in accountability and responsibility across institutions and public and private stakeholders;

    v. fostering an effective use of natural, human and financial resources across public and private stakeholders;

    vi. fostering a culture of prevention and active and informed engagement in the public and communities at large;

    vii. in facilitating the DRR-CCA-SDG integration in the Pacific

United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
Asia and the Pacific
Bangkok
Tel : (+66) 22 88 2475
Fax : (+66) 22 88 1050
isdr-bkk@un.org
www.unisdr.org/asiapacific

United Nations Secretariat Building - 8th Floor
Section A Rajdamnern Nok Avenue -10200
Bangkok, Thailand

Pacific Sub-Regional Office
Tel : (+679) 310 0372
c/o UNDP, Private Mail Bag, Suva Fiji

Hyogo Office
Tel : (+81) 78 262 5550
Fax : (+81) 78 262 5554
ISDR-hyogo@un.org

Hito Mirai Kan 5F, Wakinohama Kaigan Dori
Shuo-ku, Kobe, 650-0024, Japan

UNISDR
The United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction

Cover Photo courtesy of Peter Muller, OCHA Suva