



Supplementary Materials: Action Research to Enhance Inter-Organisational Coordination of Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific

File 1: Overview of the Regional Organisations
File 2: Overview of the global climate change adaptation financing architecture and the competition for scarce resources
File 3: Team structure (roles and tasks within teams)
File 4: Instructions for teams: Developing a 'bankable' adaptation project proposal
File 5: Pre- and post-test interview guide
File 6: Mid-term survey questions
File 7: Observation schedule for virtual team meetings
File 8: Project proposal evaluation grid
File 9: Budget

File 1. Overview of the Regional Organisations

The Pacific Community (SPC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (SPREP), two of the four regional organisations (ROs) at the forefront of climate action in the Pacific, and that have overlapping adaptation-related mandates, will serve as the target organisations in this research. For these organisations, achieving sustainability rests at the core of their operations (see [1] for a discussion of the different approaches to sustainability and organisational activities). Coordination within and between them is linked to the achievement of globally-agreed environment and development goals such as those contained in the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the 2015 Paris Climate Accord, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (following [2]).

Overview of SPC

Headquartered in Noumea, New Caledonia, The Pacific Community (formerly the Secretariat of the Pacific Community) is owned and governed by its 26 Member States, including 22 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs), Australia and New Zealand¹. It was established in 1947 and has a mission to effectively and innovatively apply science and knowledge for the well-being of all Pacific peoples.¹ It asserts itself as the main scientific and technical organisation providing developmental support in the Pacific.¹ Regional Development Goal 2 in SPC's 2016-2020 Strategic Plan targets ensuring empowered and resilient Pacific communities, with a sub-goal of improving responses across sectors to natural disasters and climate change.¹ These activities include national-level climate change adaptation and integrated community-based adaptation.

SPC's executive management team is comprised of a Director-General and two deputies.² SPC has six technical divisions, as well as four programs. The six divisions include fisheries and marine ecosystems, geoscience, and land resources.³ In addition to the Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability (CCES) Program, there are programs focusing on education quality, regional rights, and social development.³ In addition to a Director, an Environmental Sustainability Coordinator and an Administrative Assistant, the CCES Program has seven staff members working in two separate project sub-teams – the Restoration of Ecosystem Services and Adaptation to Climate Change and the Pacific Territories Initiative for Regional Management of the Environment Project.⁴

In 2016, SPC's total income was approximately US\$87.73 million⁵ – 67% came from project income, excluding management fees, and 24% from assessed and voluntary Member and host contributions.⁶ Expenditure on the CCES Program was approximately US\$6.03 million.⁶ This accounted for 9% of total expenditure.⁶ For SPC, organisational financial sustainability appears to largely relate to day-to-day financial management, budget balancing and risk management.¹

Overview of SPREP

Headquartered in Apia, Samoa, the Pacific Regional Environmental Programme was formally established by Pacific Island Leaders in 1993—its Secretariat was to serve as the primary RO supporting Member States' response to various environmental challenges.⁷ Its aim was to promote Pacific regional cooperation, as well as to provide assistance for protecting and improving the

https://bit.ly/3dGrjtm (accessed on November 28, 2017).

¹ SPC. Pacific Community Strategic Plan 2016-2020; The Pacific Community: Noumea, New Caledonia, 2015.

² SPC. Organisational Structure. Available online: <u>https://bit.ly/2zyiJyh</u> (accessed on November 28, 2017).

³ SPC. About Us - Structure. Available online: <u>https://bit.lv/2vHXpX6</u> (accessed on November 28, 2017).

⁴ SPC. Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability - Meet Our Team. Available online:

⁵ All expenditure estimates are author-calculated; 1 Comptoirs Français du Pacifique (CFP) unit = 100 CFPs (at the time of writing).

⁶ SPC. Pacific Community Financial Statements for 2016; The Pacific Community: Noumea, New Caledonia, 2017.

⁷ SPREP. *Strategic Plan* 2017-2026; Secretariat of the Regional Environment Programme: Apia, Samoa, 2017.

region's environment, thereby ensuring sustainable development for people today and for future generations.⁷ Since then, the organisation has grown into more of a partnership for and with its 26 Member States, including 21 PICTs.⁷ Its vision is to create a resilient Pacific environment that will sustain livelihoods and the region's natural heritage in culturally appropriate ways.⁷

SPREP's senior management team is led by a Director-General and is comprised of eight other officers, including the Director of Climate Change, though the post is one of 15 posts that are currently vacant.⁸ The Climate Change Division⁹ is one of four thematic divisions (Corporate Services excluded). ¹⁰ The other three are Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management, Environmental Monitoring and Governance, and Waste Management and Pollution Control¹⁰—the Directors of these Divisions are also part of the senior management team. The Climate Change Division has one officer each working on adaptation, mitigation and the Pacific Climate Change Centre, and 14¹¹ officers responsible for science and policy.¹⁰

Against the backdrop of Pacific Leaders identifying climate change as the biggest threat to the Pacific region, SPREP sees itself as being well-placed to lead, coordinate and implement climate-related programs and projects.⁷ Regional Goal 1 in its 2017-2026 Strategic Plan is to strengthen Pacific peoples' climate change resilience.⁷ In 2015¹², it had a total income of US\$16.35 million – 74% came from donor and program funding support and 12% from Member contributions; US\$4.46 million¹³ (or 27% of total expenditure) was spent on climate change-related activities.¹⁴ Its Strategic Plan also identifies predictable, multi-year funding and innovative financing, including on-boarding new partners, as potential focus areas.⁷ In terms of organisational financial sustainability, SPREP has an interest in sustainable funding and is willing to embrace structural reorganisation, capacity-building, and on-going change management.⁷

⁸ SPREP. Our Team. Available online: <u>https://bit.ly/3cs4olj</u> (accessed on November 28, 2017).

⁹ The name of the Department was recently changed to the Climate Change Resilience Programme (*pers comm*, March 9, 2018).

¹⁰ SPREP. Approved Organisation Structure - May 2017. Available online: <u>https://bit.ly/2YXVbxb</u> (accessed on November 28, 2017).

¹¹ Author-calculated.

¹² 2016 and 2017 figures were not available at the time of writing.

¹³ Author-calculated.

¹⁴ SPREP. Annual Report 2015; Secretariat of the Regional Environment Programme: Apia, Samoa, 2016.

File 2. Overview of the Global Climate Change Adaptation Financing Architecture and the Competition for Scarce Resources

Adaptation to climate change is costly.¹⁵ Article 4 of the UNFCCC calls for developing country Parties who need financial resources to have these provided by developed countries so they can meet the agreed costs of implementing adaptation measures.¹⁶ It also provides for consideration to be given to the needs and concerns of countries that are particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts.¹⁶ The Green Climate Fund (GCF) is a financial mechanism under the UNFCCC and is one of many multilateral sources of financing for adaptation programming in the Global South. Since its initial resource mobilisation in 2014, it has earmarked 50% of its adaptation funds for programming in small island developing states (SIDS), least developed countries and Africa.¹⁷ Research by Robinson and Dornan [3] shows that international donor agencies such as the GCF are increasingly channeling climate monies to SIDS through ROs such as SPC and SPREP for reasons relating to economies of scale and return on investment. There is also evidence that SIDS policy-makers (as is the case in other jurisdictions as well) are rebranding development projects as climate change projects in the hope of attracting increased financial support for on-the-ground interventions [4]. This practice, the magnitude of which is uncertain, invariably increases the number of organisations that are implementing climate-related projects and 'doing' adaptation. In the case of regional-level governance, this contributes to the tangled nature of regionalism in the Pacific.

SPC and SPREP signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for resilience and sustainable development in 2017 [5]. While the details of the agreement are not public (*pers comm*, September 24, 2017), the MoU is reported to cover technical and development cooperation in climate change and other areas (see [5]). Currently, SPREP and SPC are two of 13¹⁸ direct access regional accredited entities to the GCF, which means that PICTs can benefit from the growing Fund through regional mechanisms.¹⁹ SPREP and SPC are two of four Pacific organisations with GCF accreditation – the other two being the Cook Islands' Ministry of Finance and Economic Management and the subregional Micronesia Conservation Trust. As accredited entities for small projects (>US\$10 million but <US\$50 million), SPREP and SPC are able to apply GCF resources towards SIDS-focused adaptation projects, as well as building national capacity in order to address climate change.²⁰ With SPC having achieved GCF accreditation status only recently²¹, there will be both new opportunities for and threats to increased regional-level organisational effectiveness and sustainability, which the implementation of the experimental design described in this paper will help to deconstruct.

¹⁵ UNEP. The Adaptation Gap Report 2017; United Nations Environment Programme: Nairobi, 2017.

¹⁶ United Nations. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; United Nations: Rio de Janeiro, 1992.

¹⁷ GCF. About the Fund. Available online: <u>https://bit.ly/2HjjyJQ (accessed on March 2, 2020).</u>

¹⁸ As at January 16, 2020.

¹⁹ GCF. Accredited Entity Directory. Available online: <u>https://bit.ly/2WS8XPf (accessed on March 2, 2020).</u>

²⁰ GCF. Accredited Entity: Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme. Available online: <u>https://bit.ly/2YWdYsU (accessed on March 2, 2020).</u>

²¹ The accreditation agreement was signed on November 8, 2019.

File 3: Team Structure (Roles and Tasks within Teams)

Our co-researchers will be assigned to one of four virtual teams, with each team including three people from each of SPC and SPREP. Each virtual team will work together for a six-month period in order to develop a 'bankable' adaptation project proposals for GCF support. This duration fits with general timelines observed for the development of major climate-focused projects, including those to be GCF-funded. All four virtual teams will be told that the proposal development fits under the 2017 MoU between SPC and SPREP, which requires the two organisations to coordinate and collaborate on climate change, resilience and sustainability issues. Further, they will be told that teamwork will be a key aspect of the project proposal development. Their action research focused work will be a part of their normal work duties for the duration of the experiment, and teams will be advised that they will work collaboratively with the academic researchers, and about the research objectives linked to the funding proposal development.

Two of the four teams will have formal team structures, that is, each team member will have an explicit role in the team, as chosen and outlined by the researchers. In contrast, the remaining two teams will have no formal structure. As outlined in the main text of the paper, one of the teams with formal structure and one of the teams without formal structure will have facilitated reflections on team functioning following team activities.

The academic researchers will work with the team members in the structured teams to organise the work and roles (e.g. team leader, secretary, communications officer). Here, structure will relate to the roles of team members and the specific tasks to be undertaken over the life of the experiment. The teams without formal structure will be asked to self-organise their work, any formalization of roles, and milestones to achieve the overall task. They will be asked to report on the structures that were adopted, if any.

All four groups will receive instructions at the beginning of the experiment. While researchers will have limited control over whether experimental design information is shared across groups, all participants will be asked not to discuss the details of the instructions with members of other teams.

File 4: Instructions for Teams: Developing a Bankable Adaptation Project Proposal

Once the virtual teams are established, they will work together for a six-month period. This period fits with general timelines observed for development of major climate-focused projects (e.g. those funded through the GCF). Team members will be advised by their department head that they will work as an inter-organisational group (of 6 people) to develop a proposal for an adaptation initiative (further details on the proposal to be developed are included below). All teams will be advised that this proposal development fits under the 2017 MoU between SPC and SPREP that requires them to collaborate and coordinate on resilience and sustainability issues, and that the project proposal that the teams will develop. Their work on this action research project will be a part of their normal work duties for the period of the experiment. The details of how each of the four teams will be supported to work across the two organisations are detailed here.

Team 1

Team 1 will provide a baseline for the action research project. This team will not receive any particular support, incentives or structures to assist the team members to work together, beyond what is described in the paragraphs above.

In Figure 2 of the main paper, Team 1 is the team without formal structure and without facilitated reflections.

Team 2

The team 2 structure will follow the technical working groups that Gilfillan [6] described being used in Cambodia (i.e. they will be a coordination mechanism, but no particular support to maximise its utility beyond the overall goal of producing a funding proposal). In practice, this means that when the teams are formed this team will just be asked to develop a meeting schedule for the duration of the experiment, including procedures to be followed in case planned meetings cannot occur.

In Figure 2 of the main paper, Team 2 is the team with formal structure and without facilitated reflections.

Team 3

Team 3 will have the facilitated reflections to assist team members to actively learn during the project, but will not have a formally organised team structure. This team will, in collaboration with the academic researchers, choose particular points in the project for facilitated reflections on how activities have worked, where things went well, and where they could be improved.

In Figure 2 of the main paper, Team 3 is the team without formal structure and with facilitated reflections.

Team 4

Team 4 includes both the formal structure of Team 2 and the facilitated reflections on team functioning of Team 3. This team will be asked at the beginning of the project to develop a meeting schedule for the duration of the experiment, including procedures to be followed in the case that a meeting has to be cancelled. Additionally, this team will, in collaboration with the academic researchers, choose particular points in the project for facilitated reflections on how activities have worked, where things went well, and where they could be improved.

In Figure 2 of the main paper, Team 4 is the team with formal structure and with facilitated reflections.

File 5: Pre-/Post-Test Interview Guide

Example topic guide for semi-structured interviews:

The academic/external researcher will collect individual-level data from each interviewee:

- Number of years with the organisation
- Description of their current and previous roles within and outside of the organisation
- Knowledge of their own organisation and of the other organisation:
- Mandate and organisational objectives
- Role in the Pacific and in climate change adaptation in the region
- Portfolio of open and closed adaptation-related projects
- History and future of coordination efforts between both organisations, especially in view of the emergence and requirements of the GCF
- Resources at their disposal to carry out their day-to-day duties
- Nature of their interaction with the other organisation, including their participation in joint adaptation projects and programs, and thematic working groups

The academic/external researcher will pose questions relating to the nature, functionality and frequency of use of organisational inputs, components, linking processes and mechanisms:

- Joint organisational goal setting
- Qualifications and experience of officials carrying out coordination activities
- Resources assigned to support coordination activities
- Nature of joint adaptation projects and programs
- Volume, pace and effectiveness of communication also the channels used
- Information, research, technology and innovation sharing and exchange
- Inter-organisational capacity-building and learning
- Decision-making platforms

File 6: Mid-term Survey Questions

Half way through the proposal preparation phase of the project, each co-researcher will be asked to complete and email based survey. The surveys will comprise between seven and 10 open-ended questions and will target co-researchers' perceptions of how effectively they see their virtual team working, as well as the challenges to and opportunities for deeper and more effective coordination among team members. Mid-term survey questions will include:

- Do you enjoy working in your current team? Why/why not?
- Would you say your team works together well? Why/why not?
- How would you rate the level of coordination within your team? is it easy to work with team members from the other organization?
- Have you learnt anything new from working with team members from different organizations?
- Has working in this virtual team affected the way in which you conceptualize and design climate adaptation project proposals? Why/Why not?
- Aside from working closely with your team members, would you say there have been other events, activities or influences that has changed the way you and your team work together or controlled your team's working environment?
- Are there challenges (cultural, organisational/logistical, political) in working in these diverse virtual teams? If so, can they be addressed/overcome, and how?

File 7: Observation Schedule for Team Meetings

In addition to interviews and surveys, the action research project will also be monitored through recordings of meetings. Starting from the start of each meeting, meeting recording will take place for two minutes at every 15-minute time interval (i.e. minutes 0-2; 15-17; 30-32 etc ... will be recorded). Within these two-minute slices, the academic researcher will observe and record observations on the following observation schedule:

Observer name:	
Date of meeting and	
meeting number:	
Virtual team number:	
Time of recording(s):	 For each observation time, look for and record the following: Is there a person that leads or facilitates the discussion? What are the behavioural and other characteristics of this person? Is there a person that volunteers for roles? What are the behavioural and other characteristics of this person? Is there a person that dominates the discussion? What are the behavioural and other characteristics of that person? Is there individuals that remain quiet or operate on the periphery of the discussion? What are the behavioural and other characteristics of that person? Is the discussion task-focused? If yes, how? If not, why not? Is there discussion of milestones, member responsibilities, means and times for reporting, deliverables and/or timeframes?
e.g. 00.00 – 02.00	
e.g. 15.00 – 17.00	
e.g. 30.00 – 32.00	
e.g. 45.00 – 47.00	

File 8: Project Proposal Evaluation Grid

Evaluation criteria	Mark out	Additional		
Does the proposal ?				
Demonstrate impact potential				
Demonstrate paradigm shift potential				
Demonstrate sustainable development potential, or link to				
sustainable development priorities of PICTs				
Demonstrate clear understanding of recipient needs and capacities				
Demonstrate recognition of importance of country ownership and				
identify mechanisms for ensuing country ownership				
Identify appropriate mechanisms for ensuring efficiency and				
effectiveness of program delivery and outcomes				
Clearly tailor its justification and activities to the national				
circumstances of Pacific island countries and territories				
Clear demonstrate how the two organisations will coordinate on				
implementation				
Total mark				
Overall comments (including proposals for modifications and, in exceptional cases, possibilities				
for clustering or merging with other proposals):				

File 9: Budget

Item	Cost per item	No. of units	Cost
International travel (external researchers)	\$2,000.00	7	\$14,000.00
Regional travel (external researchers)	\$300.00	7	\$2,100.00
Ground transport (car rental etc)	\$2,470.00	1	\$2,470.00
Accommodation (external researchers)	\$180.00	28	\$5,040.00
Visas	\$100.00	14	\$1,400.00
Travel insurance	\$150.00	7	\$1,050.00
Staff time	\$120.00	240	\$28,800.00
Honoraria for evaluators	\$2,800.00	3	\$8,400.00
Software	\$2,970.00	1	\$2,970.00
		Sub-total	\$66,230.00
	Contingency (10%)		\$6,623.00
		TOTAL	\$72,853.00

A breakdown of the budget is below. All costs are in United States Dollars.

References

- 1. Wikström, P.-A. Sustainability and organizational activities three approaches. *Sustainable Development* **2010**, *18*, 99-107, doi:10.1002/sd.449.
- Balsiger, J.; VanDeveer, S.D. Regional Governance and Environmental Problems. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies, Marlin-Bennett, R., Ed. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2010; 10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.416pp. 1-27.
- 3. Robinson, S.-a.; Dornan, M. International financing for climate change adaptation in small island developing states. *Regional Environmental Change* **2017**, *17*, 1103-1115, doi:10.1007/s10113-016-1085-1.
- 4. Robinson, S.-a. Mainstreaming climate change adaptation in small island developing states. *Clim Dev* **2019**, *11*, 47-59, doi:10.1080/17565529.2017.1410086.
- 5. SPREP. SPC and SPREP seal partnership for resilient and sustainable Pacific development. Available online: <u>https://bit.ly/2TgPlUA</u> (accessed on February 18, 2018).
- Gilfillan, D. Governance Limits to Adaptation in Cambodia's Health Sector. In *Limits to Climate Change Adaptation*, Leal Filho, W., Nalau, J., Eds. Springer International Publishing: Cham, 2017; 10.1007/978-3-319-64599-5_3pp. 25-39.