Core Indicator 2 Sub-question A: **Are information studies and assessments addressing climate change variability and resilience available?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Sectors Within SPCR in PNG** | **Progressive Data:**  **As of January 2017**  **(Score 0-10)** | **Examples or Evidence of Achievements** |
| **1. Department of National Planning** - Overall status of mainstreaming Climate Change into the development Planning Processes | 6 | The US$10million project of salt water desalination on Manus Island to address the issue of water and sanitation initiated by the Department with support from JICA. It has been successfully completed and launched recently. Manus is one of those island provinces targeted under the SPCR/PNG-Building Resilience to Climate Change. |
| **2. Agriculture** – Especially food security, crop varieties and new practices | 6 | There are many studies and assessments addressing climate variability and resilience. E.g.: Markham Valley Food Security Program, which reports on introduction of Drought Tolerant Crops. There are some studies/assessments that can be found on NARI Website: <http://www.nari.org.pg/about-nari> |
| **4. Health –** Water supply,sanitation and hygiene, water borne illnesses | 5 | There has been several studies done by IOM and USAID on the islands to inform policy makers on the need and the urgency to address issues of hygiene already in the targeted province and we intend to build on the knowledge products and enhance their capacities. |
| **5. Fisheries** – Including marine coastal and watershed management, food security | 4 | - There are assessments done by CFDA (Coastal Fisheries Development Agency) that capture information of climate change but it is very limited  - Studies and assessments are done by fisheries sector agencies and other research stakeholders but accessibility to information is limited and not applied  - Baseline information collected under CFDA’s provincial fisheries policy exercise in 3 provinces would lead to identify climate resilience parameters/variables. |
| **6. Transport & Infrastructure** – Ports and communications infrastructure | 2 | - Department of Works may have done some work but for Ports they only deals with Operations, Safety, Health and Environment. Authorities are beginning to take measures to factor in climate change in the design and codes |
| **7. DRM (disaster risk management)** – Risk reduction for climate disasters | 5 | -Information sharing on CC variability and resilience are accessible but not all information taken aboard.  -NDC does take information seriously from PNG National Weather Services(NWS) on climate Outlook concerning development of El Nino and La Nina, Sea-Swells and monsoon that likely cause damage to human life, property and coastal inundation or damage/ flooding.  - CC Variability goes along with alert/warning for early actions and this product is provided by PNG NWS |

|  |
| --- |
| **Scoring Criteria 0 - 10** |
| 0 = There are no existing climate change, variability and/or climate resilience studies/information or assessments available. |
| 1 = Some studies have been commissioned but are not completed as planned |
| 2 = Some studies have been commissioned and are mostly completed as planned |
| 3 = Some studies and assessments on climate change, seasonal variability and resilience exist, but issues addressed are very limited and/or their practical applications are limited |
| 4 = Some studies and assessments on climate change, seasonal variability and resilience exist, but issues addressed are moderately limited and/or their practical applications are limited |
| 5 = Several quality studies and assessments on climate change, variability and resilience exist, and cover some key issue areas with practical application |
| 6 = Several quality studies and assessments on climate change, variability and resilience exist, and cover several key issue areas with practical applications |
| 7 = There are many quality and relevant studies, assessments and information available that cover all key issues, with practical application |
| 8 = There are many quality and relevant studies, assessments and information available that cover all key issues and are understood by a few key actors and departments |
| 9 = There are many quality and relevant studies, assessments and information available that cover all key issues and are understood by most key actors and departments |
| 10 = There are many quality and relevant studies, assessments and information available on climate change, variability, and resilience and are well understood by all departments |

Core Indicator 2 Sub-question B: **Is the necessary climate change expertise available?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Sectors Within SPCR in PNG** | **Progressive Data:**  **As of January 2017**  **(Score 0-10)** | **Examples or Evidence of Achievements** |
| **1. National planning** - Overall status of the national climate change policy | 5 | - Yes the message is reaching those at the core agencies of government |
| **2. Agriculture** – Especially food security, crop varieties and new practices | 4 | - Not many climate change expertise from overseas but there are national experts who are mainly from the National Agriculture research Institute. There has been experts coming in at different times over the years but not necessarily climate experts for the sector. |
| **4. Health –** Water supply,sanitation and hygiene, water borne illnesses | 4 | There has been support mainly from EU support who have extensive experience in water supply projects across the country. Salvation Army is one NGO that works in communities to address this issue of clean drinking water. |
| **5. Fisheries** – Including marine coastal and watershed management, food security | 3 | -Department officials have attended training related to climate change |
| **6. Transport & Infrastructure** – Ports and communications infrastructure | 3 | Coastal infrastructures are vulnerable to sea level rise and erosion as well as flood. The message is slowing getting to engineers but it will need to mainstreamed into the design. |
| **7. DRM (disaster risk management)** – Risk reduction for climate disasters | 3 | -There is no CC expertise available within NDC and it is not necessary to have them. Let those government agencies mandated to keep the expertise, develop products and we as end-user can utilize NDC’s mandate to maximize the product for community and etc...  when we have expertise in our respective organization this makes us feel not needing to collaborate but instead compete. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Scoring Criteria 0 - 10** |
| 0 = No in-country climate change expertise available |
| 1 = Some department officials have attended climate change training courses on technical and/or scientific areas relevant to their work |
| 2 = Many department officials have attended climate change training courses on technical and/or scientific areas relevant to their work |
| 3 = A few persons are appropriately trained in climate change *and* have experience applying their expertise implementing climate change resilience strategies |
| 4 = Some persons are appropriately trained in climate change *and* have experience applying their expertise implementing climate change resilience strategies |
| 5 = Several persons in some key departments/sectors are appropriately trained *and* are qualified to implement climate change resilience strategies |
| 6 = Several persons in many key departments/sectors are appropriately trained *and* are qualified to implement climate change resilience strategies |
| 7 = At least one person in many key departments is appropriately trained *and* qualified to implement climate change resilience strategies through projects and programs |
| 8 = More than one person in most key departments are trained and qualified in climate change resilience strategies, and some also have experience implementing climate change projects and programs |
| 9 = Adequate climate change expertise is available in all key departments/agencies, and most experts have experience implementing climate change projects and programs. |
| 10 = Qualified climate change expertise is available in all relevant departments, agencies, and offices, and all experts have experience working on climate change projects and programs |

Core Indicator 2 Sub-question C: **Do national/sector incentives and legislative policies expressly address climate change and resilience?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Sectors Within SPCR in PNG** | **Progressive Data:**  **As of January 2017**  **(Score 0-10)** | **Examples or Evidence of Achievements** |
| **1. National planning** - Overall status of the national climate change policy | 8 | The Government of PNG and its parliament has passed the Paris Agreement Ratification Act and the Climate Change Management Act became enforceable from November, 2015. There is the Climate Change Policy for PNG. The other sectors are continuing to align and mainstream which is a continues activity as climate change continues to intensify and increase its intensity. |
| **2. Agriculture** – Especially food security, crop varieties and new practices | 3 | National Agriculture Development Policies. |
| **4. Health –** Water supply,sanitation and hygiene, water borne illnesses | 3 | National Water and Sanitation Policy. Need for a holistic approach. |
| **5. Fisheries** – Including marine coastal and watershed management, food security | 5 | Fisheries Management Act established. Need for a holistic approach |
| **6. Transport & Infrastructure** – Ports and communications infrastructure | 3 | Policies do exist but need to be reviewed to accommodate the Climate Change factor. Targeted training and awareness to incorporate the building codes and standards. |
| **7. DRM (disaster risk management)** – Risk reduction for climate disasters | 5 | There is a Disaster Management Act  -Requires review to take on Disaster Risk Reduction(DRR) and Resilience factored |

|  |
| --- |
| **Scoring Criteria** |
| 0 = No national/sector incentives and legislative policies exist |
| 1 = Plans for draft national/sector incentives and legislative policies are underway |
| 2 = Draft national/sector incentives and legislative policies are being developed |
| 3 = Draft of national/sector incentives and legislative policies exist but not yet finalized |
| 4 = Draft of national/sector incentives and legislative policies exist, and are nearly finalized and ready for implementation |
| 5 = National/sector incentives and legislative policies are mostly finalized, approved, but have limited implementation and/or application to climate change resilience |
| 6 = National/sector incentives and legislative policies that address climate change and resilience are finalized, approved, and are mostly being implemented |
| 7 = Incentives and policies under implementation are relatively wide ranging and cover some key issues, but require strengthening to be effective |
| 8 = Incentives and policies under implementation are wide ranging and cover most key issues, and have been strengthened through occasional remedial actions |
| 9 = Wide ranging national/sector incentives and legislative policies expressly address climate change resilience and are nearly fully implemented and updated periodically |
| 10 = Wide ranging national/sector incentives and legislative policies expressly address climate change resilience and are fully implemented and updated regularly |

Core Indicator 2 Sub-question D: **Does the government/sector participate in the coordination mechanism?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Sectors Within SPCR in PNG** | **Progressive Data:**  **As of January 2017**  **(Score 0-10)** | **Examples or Evidence of Achievements** |
| **1. National planning** - Overall status of the national climate change policy | 6 | The Department participates either when the CCDA invites for the meetings/workshops/forums  Or the Department research the Targets and Indicators in the Sustainable Development Goals, MTDPs 1,2,3 and overarching plans of the government concerning Climate Change |
| **2. Agriculture** – Especially food security, crop varieties and new practices | 5 | With the advent of climate change they have always been a part of the discussions as food insecurity and agriculture yield loss is a direct result of climate change. |
| **4. Health –** Water supply,sanitation and hygiene, water borne illnesses | 5 | Water and sanitation yes but only on ad hoc basis during the project periods |
| **5. Fisheries** – Including marine coastal and watershed management, food security | 5 | Again, as a result of coral reef bleaching and increased temperature has affected the stock of marine resources that people have been depending on for their food supply. Not often but on invitation and funding availability |
| **6. Transport & Infrastructure** – Ports and communications infrastructure | 4 | On specific invitation from the Climate Change and Development Authority to discuss areas in their sector related to rapid deterioration of public utilities and telecommunication infrastructures and early warning systems. |
| **7. DRM (disaster risk management)** – Risk reduction for climate disasters | 7 | Climate Change and Disaster risk reduction is about the notion of “prevention is better than cure”. We are beginning to join forces in terms of human and financial resources to maintain the coordination and collaboration. The provincial offices personnel are playing the dual role of climate change advocate and attend to disasters within their confines. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Scoring Criteria** |
| 0 = No cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for climate change activities |
| 1 = Yes, there is a cross-sectoral coordination mechanism; however it is not used and/or it’s inactive |
| 2 = Yes, there is a cross-sectoral coordination mechanism but its use is only on an as-needed basis |
| 3 = A cross-sectional coordination mechanism for climate change activities exists with meetings on a semi-regular basis with a few participants |
| 4 = A cross-sectional coordination mechanism for climate change activities exist and meets semi-regularly, with a moderate level of participation |
| 5 = A cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for climate change activities exist and meets regularly, with a relatively high level of participation of the member-base |
| 6 = A cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for climate change activities exist and meets regularly, with a high level of participation from an engaged member-base |
| 7 = An active cross-sectional coordination mechanism is used regularly for information sharing and a small degree of coordinated planning |
| 8 = An active cross-sectional coordination mechanism is used regularly for information sharing and a moderate degree of coordinated planning |
| 9 = An active and fully functional cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for climate change activities exist, with most relevant sectors/government agencies sharing information and coordinating on a regular basis |
| 10 = An active and fully functional cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for climate change activities exist, with all relevant sectors/government agencies sharing information and coordinating on an ongoing basis. |

Core Indicator 2 Sub-question E: **Coordination Mechanism**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scoring Criteria Below Each sub-question** | **Progressive Data:**  **As of January 2017**  **(Score 0-10)** | **Examples and Evidence of Achievements** |
| **i. Is the coordination mechanism functional e.g., established, effective and efficient?** | 9 | -We have a very effective stakeholder communication and coordination mechanism in the establishment of the Adaptation Technical Working Group (ATWG) which is an open and inclusive membership which includes NGOs, Developments Partners, Private Sectors and key agencies of government. All climate change adaptation and mitigation agenda is discussed and vetted by these functional committee. |
| *0 = No coordination mechanism*  *1 = Discussions have begun on forming a coordination mechanism*  *2 = Coordination mechanism is not yet established but informal plans are in place*  *3 = A budget and TORs are in place to set up a coordination mechanism*  *4 = Coordination mechanism is formally established but capacity is limited in outreach to engage and support a wide range of sectors*  *5 = Exists, with some outreach and engagement reach across a few sectors, but is still limited to effectively and efficiently coordinate*  *6 = Coordination mechanism has limited effectiveness across actors in many sectors and but is not efficient*  *7 = Coordination mechanism has moderate effectiveness across actors in various sectors, but has only limited efficiency*  *8 = Coordination mechanism is effectiveness across actors in various sectors and but needs minor improvements in efficiency*  *9 = Coordination mechanism is effectiveness and efficiency and only minor improvements are needed to make it fully functional*  *10 = Exists, and is fully functional, effective and efficient in ensuring mainstreaming of climate change across all sectors* | | |
| **ii. Does it coordinate climate resilience interventions, other than those funded by PPCR?** | 8 | The ATWG was instituted even before the SPCR/PNG BRCC was approved and funded by CIF. This committee is vibrant and is working and we have quarterly meetings and have a mailing list where, when meetings are not held we circulate materials for discussions on e-mail etc. We have focal points through these contacts in the different sectors and depending on the agenda – we ensure the relevant sector comes or is tasked to share light or update on any developments. |
| *0 = No coordination mechanism*  *1 = Coordination of any climate change project is only as needed*  *2 = Coordination of some climate change projects is periodic, but not regular*  *3 = Plans are in place to mandate cooperation and coordination of all interventions on a regular basis*  *4 = Mandate on coordination of all interventions is agreed but is not yet applied due to limited capacities and leverage or authority*  *5 = Mandate on coordination of all interventions in place with some capacities met, but is inconsistently applied, with significant duplication of effort*  *6 = Mandated coordination of a few interventions, but with limited application and effectiveness, and some duplication of effort*  *7 = Mandated coordination of some interventions, with moderate effectiveness and limited duplication of effort*  *8 = Coordinates many interventions, and is relatively effective, with very little duplication of effort and increased collaboration*  *9 = Coordinates most interventions, and does so effectively, with no duplication of effort and high levels of collaboration*  *10 = Effectively coordinates all climate resilience interventions* | | |
| **iii. Is there a broad set of non-governmental stakeholders involved?** | 8 | We have a host of both international and local NGOs working in PNG. They are all members of the Adaptation and Mitigation Technical Working Groups. The NGOs interface with the people in the communities and are actively involved in various development intervention programs Some known international NGOs include IOM, Wildlife Conservations society, WWF, Salvation Army, The Nature Conservancy to name a few. Development partners who are into climate change space include ADB, UNDP, UN-GEF, South Pacific Regional Environment Programs (SPREP), Japanese Inter. Development Cooperation Agency, KOICA, USAID and off-course our traditional support from Australia who continue to remain our main development partner due to its proximity. The Climate Change and Development Authority continues to enjoy the support from them and acknowledge their contributions across all sectors to mitigate the adverse effects of Climate Change. |
| *0 = No coordination mechanism*  *1 = Plans and/or discussions are in place to better involve non-government stakeholders in the coordination mechanism(s)*  *2 = Little representation of non-government stakeholders and they are not involved with coordination*  *3 = Some representation of non-government stakeholders, but involved only on as-needed basis*  *4 = Moderate representation of non-government stakeholders, but they are not actively involved*  *5 = Non-government stakeholders are fairly well represented, but there is a low level of active involvement*  *6 = Non-government stakeholders are represented, but with only some active involvement*  *7 = Non-government stakeholders are represented, with a moderate level of active involvement*  *8 = Non-government stakeholders are represented, with a relatively high level of active involvement*  *9 = Non-government stakeholders are fully represented, with a high level of active involvement*  *10 = Non-government stakeholders are fully represented and are consistently and actively engaged* | | |
| **iv. Is the relevant climate resilience information in the public domain?** | 7 | We have regular dialogues, consultations, workshops, meetings where we communicate because we do acknowledge that climate change knows no boundaries and cuts across all sectors. It is generally accepted that we need to mainstream climate change into all development planning processes. We are starting to talk about a central information Hub. We intend to centralize all knowledge products including those from SPCR/PNG BRCC and other projects for future references and replication purposes. Data is scattered all over the institutions and sectors which we will consolidate and centralize in one location that will hook up for ease of access for planning purposes. |
| *0 = No coordination mechanism*  *1 = Discussions are taking place on how to get climate resilience information into the public domain*  *2 = A concrete strategy or plan exists on how to get climate resilience information into the public domain*  *3 = Very little climate resilience information is in the public domain, with a lack of resources and capacities to implement the plan or strategy*  *4 = Little climate resilience information is in the public domain, with few resources and capacities to implement the plan or strategy*  *5 = Some climate resilience information is available to the public, but there are major challenges to accessibility and using appropriate media to reach them*  *6 = A fairly wide range of climate resilience information is available to the public, but moderate challenges remain in ensuring accessibility and use of appropriate media*  *7 = A wide range of climate resilience information is available to the public, but some challenges remain in ensuring accessibility and use of appropriate media*  *8 = A wide range of high quality and useful climate resilience information is available to the public, and small challenges remain in ensuring accessibility and use of appropriate media*  *9 = Targeted climate resilience information is high quality, relevant and accessible to the public, but reach is limited by technology and infrastructure*  *10 = All relevant climate resilience information is readily available to the public* | | |
| **v. Are females and males participating equally?** | 8 | In PNG, like never before women and girls are active players in both government and commerce. The notion of gender equity has had huge strides. Development partners have done a wonderful job in amplifying and promoting this in a male dominated society. We see ourselves as equal partners in development especially in this area of climate change where it is concerned with livelihood issues, professional women are taking up key leadership responsibilities to echo the plight of women, children and marginalized groups. |
| *0 = No coordination mechanism*  *1 = Discussions are in place to improve gender balance with participation in the coordination mechanism*  *2 = Concrete plans have been approved to help ensure gender balance with the coordination mechanism*  *3 = A few examples of gender balance in participation are apparent at the national level, but sub-national level engagement is completely dominated by men*  *4 = Some examples of gender balance in participation are apparent at the national level, with a few women having “voice” in decision-making and/or positions of leadership, but sub-national level engagement is still mostly dominated by men*  *5 = Many examples of gender balance in participation are apparent at the national level, with a few women having “voice” in decision-making and/or positions of leadership, and concrete steps are being taken to increase gender balance with participation and decision-making at the sub-national level*  *6 = Some gender balance in terms of active participation of women, with some in decision-making and leadership roles at the national level, and there is early evidence of improvements in gender balance at the sub-national level*  *7 = Moderate gender balance in terms of active participation of women, and many taking decision-making and leadership roles at the national level, and moderate progress in gender balance of active participation at the sub-national level*  *8 = Gender balance largely exists through active participation and a moderate representation of women in decision-making and leadership roles at the national level, with significant progress in gender balance at the sub-national level; though women are lacking decision-making and leadership roles*  *9 = Gender balance exists through active participation, and a equal representation of men and women in decision-making and leadership roles at the national level, and there is largely gender balance at the sub-national level in terms of active participation, decision-making and leadership*  *10 = Fully active and equal gender representation at all levels of coordination* | | |