



# End-of-Programme Evaluation of Building Peace in Climate Change- Affected Communities Programme

**FINAL REPORT FEBRUARY 2023**

**aline**a  
●●●

**REPORT PREPARED BY:**

Cristina de Nicolas Izquierdo, Katarina Atalifo and Lorissa Hazelman  
[alineainternational.com](http://alineainternational.com)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	6
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	10
1.1 Structure of the report.....	10
1.2 Context and overview .....	10
1.3 Scope and objectives .....	11
1.4 Methodology and approach .....	11
1.5 Limitations of the evaluation .....	12
CHAPTER 2: FINDINGS AND ANALYSES.....	14
2.1 Outcome 1 .....	14
2.2 Outcome 2 .....	21
2.3 Outcome 3 .....	28
2.4 Sustainability .....	33
CHAPTER 3: LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	36
3.1 Lessons Learned .....	36
3.2 Recommendations.....	40
ANNEXES .....	45
Annex 1: Ethical considerations, evaluation principles and quality assurance .....	45
Annex 2: Evaluation Framework.....	46
Annex 3: Detailed methodology.....	49
Annex 4: Key stakeholders consulted .....	52
Annex 5: Interview and Focus Group Discussion Guides .....	53
Annex 6: Guiding Questions.....	61
Annex 7: Evaluation and Consultancy Terms of Reference .....	63

This page is left intentionally blank

## ACRONYMS

ACFID	Australian Council for International Development
CCICD	Climate Change and International Cooperation Division
COVID-19	Corona Virus Disease 2019
CR	Conciliation Resources
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DCOSS	District Council of Social Services
EU	European Union
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (in English: German Corporation for International Cooperation)
GoF	Government of Fiji
HQ	Headquarters
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
IOM	International Organisation for Migration
KEQ	Key Evaluation Question
KII	Key Informant Interview
LGBTI	Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender and Intersex
MERL	Monitoring Evaluation Research and Learning
MFAT	New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSA	Non-State Actor
PaCSIA	Peace & Conflict Studies Institute Australia
PCP	Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding
PIANGO	Pacific Island Association of NGOs
PICS	Pacific Island Countries
PIFS	Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PWLD	Persons Living with a Disability
SI	Solomon Islands
SOGIESC	Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Gender Expression and Sex Characteristics
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
TO	Transcend Oceania
TOC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the key findings, lessons learned and recommendations of the end of programme evaluation of Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities Programme and its constituent projects, ‘Strengthening the role of Civil Society and Climate Change and JustPeace Communities in Fiji’, and ‘Building Peace in Climate Change-affected Communities’. Conciliation Resources commissioned the independent evaluation, which was conducted in November 2022-February 2023 by a three-member Alinea International evaluation team.

The Project ‘Building Peace in Communities affected by Climate Change’ is a three-year project (2020-2023), funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT); the project ‘Strengthening the roles of Civil Society and Climate Change and JustPeace Communities in Fiji’ is a two-year project (2020-2022), funded by the European Union (EU).

The programme was implemented by INGO Conciliation Resources, in partnership with Fiji-based NGOs specialized in peacebuilding and conflict prevention and management, Transcend Oceania (TO) and the Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding (PCP). The overall programme objective is that *Pacific Islanders have the knowledge, resources and skills to prevent and manage conflicts emerging as a result of climate change impacts.*

### **The programme’s three expected outcomes are:**

**Outcome 1:** *Communities in the Pacific experiencing climate change-related migration have the conflict analysis tools, knowledge, skills and relationships to analyse and prevent or manage climate change-related conflict.*

**Outcome 2:** *Regional Pacific civil society organisations have the knowledge, tools and skills to contribute to supporting communities in responding to climate change-related conflict.*

**Outcome 3:** *Community perceptions and concerns about conflict impacts are captured and contribute to knowledge in national, regional and international climate change policy-making arenas.*

### **In line with the Terms of Reference, this evaluation:**

- Assessed the progress made towards achieving programme outcomes,
- Identified and explained key learnings from activities and outputs that have contributed to the broad objectives of the programme, and
- Identified lessons learned that will inform and strengthen the design and implementation of future programming.

The evaluation focused primarily on implementation of the programme in Fiji, in line with the Terms of Reference (Annex 7). It also considered the planned expansion to Solomon Islands and exploration of potential work in Papua New Guinea.

The Evaluation methodology included: document review, semi-structured interviews with a variety of key informants, focus group discussions (FGD) with community groups, and field observations in one rural community (Vunidogoloa) on the island of Vanua Levu.

Overall, the evaluation found that the Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities Programme supported community leaders’ ability to manage local conflicts/tensions which were indirectly related to or impacted by climate change. It also strengthened, or more precisely expanded, the knowledge and capacities

of Fijian CSOs to support communities for that purpose. The programme contributed to the understanding and knowledge of diverse perspectives and experiences of climate-change related conflict in the context of Fiji, using action research and the Adaptive Peacebuilding Methodology. The diversity of the rural communities and informal settlements in the Programme, with different experiences of displacement and connected tensions and conflicts, has allowed a better understanding of different realities resulting from a common problem: the impact of climate change on communities in Fiji, particularly in relation to displacement and relocation.

The evaluation found that programme strategies were relevant to existing national priorities regarding climate change mobility in Fiji. The programme enabled varied stakeholders, including the Government of Fiji, funding and implementing partners, and regional and international organisations, to understand the challenges faced by climate-affected communities that have experienced displacement.

Evaluation findings indicate that outcomes 1 and 2 were met in Fiji as the community leaders' ability to manage conflicts exacerbated by the impacts of climate change, and the capacities of CSOs to support them in the process, significantly improved. These outcomes are not yet met in Solomon Islands as the programme did not expand there as planned, primarily due to the impact of COVID-19. There is a sense that scaling up this work in the future, involving those communities that have already participated, will be important in a context where relocation of communities affected by climate change will surely continue. In doing so, it will be important to continue actively engaging young leaders and reflecting on practical ways of including the most vulnerable community groups traditionally excluded from genuine participation in dialogues and decision-making.

Achieving outcome 3 has been more challenging. This is partly as result of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, and partly connected to the attention required for getting on the right track with outcomes 1 and 2. Active engagement with government, particularly at the national level, and with international organisations, mainly took place during the last year of the programme. The evaluation team found strong evidence that building relationships, trust and confidence among implementing partners, funding partners, communities, government, and international organisations, takes time and, whilst there may have been instances where opportunities to come together proactively were missed, while others were opportunities taken as they arose. Overall, there is a sense that this is an opportune time to systematically and intensely focus on supporting communities and government to engage with each other and work towards a rich and shared knowledge in national, regional and international climate change policy-making arenas.

**The following recommendations are informed by the evaluation findings, and the team's reflections on lessons learned for future programming.**

### To CR, TO and PCP

**Recommendation 1: high priority:** Continue to strengthen collaboration between implementing partners and create spaces for TO and PCP to jointly advocate for the work in climate displacement and conflict, nationally and internationally.

**Recommendation 2: high priority:** Develop an effective communication strategy for communicating the (evidence and resources) resulting from the work on climate change-displacement and conflict. Noting the success to date in implementing an innovative programme like this one, develop an effective strategy for communicating the evidence and practical resources that can be used by others in Fiji and globally. Consider, for example, involving and training local media experts and journalists in the programme.

**Recommendation 3: high priority:** Strengthen monitoring activities around climate change displacement, conflict outcomes and causality. This could include regular surveys on conflict and causality for relevant groups

targeted at outcome level e.g. community leaders, government authorities. Other activities could include *talanoa* / dialogue events to articulate climate-change impacts in relation to conflicts being experienced.

**Recommendation 4: medium priority:** Explore more formal collaboration/partnerships with other actors (INGOs and local CSOs) that could support and address other needs and issues of target communities. Explore the idea of establishing consortiums to maximize collaboration with other organisations or having a referral system where communities can be referred to specialized organisations that may deliver a particular service identified as a need by communities.

**Recommendation 5: high priority:** Develop CR and implementing partners' organisational and staff capacity to address the rights, needs and strengths of people with disability and diverse Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Gender Expression and Sex Characteristics (SOGIESC) in climate change-displacement and conflict programmes.

**Recommendation 6: medium priority:** Proactively engage in national and regional policy dialogue spaces to enhance the sharing of learnings and best practice with other partners and processes that are informing national and regional policy. Some opportunities include engagement in PIF-convened governance and technical forums, and the Steering Committee on Fiji's Planned Relocation Programme.

**Recommendation 7: low priority:** Continue to support community leaders (of relocated communities) to engage in national processes like the development and review of the Standard Operating Procedures for Planned Relocations.

**Recommendation 13: low priority:** In identifying programme goals and objectives, ensure strategic fit with Fiji Government's priorities where they are consistent with climate affected communities' needs. Consultation with government teams spearheading the "Fiji Planned Relocation Programme" is a good entry point for discussions around alignment and strategic fit etc.

**Recommendation 14: low priority:** Expand dialogue forums between government and communities to strengthen the rich exchange of information and best practice related to climate change, mobility, and conflict prevention/management.

**Recommendation 15: high priority:** Strategically strengthen relationships with and within government beyond existing relationships. Engage early with new government officials and understand where climate change and mobility will be placed and who are the actors relevant to engage with. Enhance partnerships with influential international actors such as IOM and GIZ, as a bridge to engaging and influencing the national government.

## To MFAT and EU

**Recommendation 8: medium priority:** Consider investing in longer-term programming to fully explore what is possible in realizing sustainable outcomes in conflict prevention in climate displaced affected communities. Noting conflict prevention and peacebuilding is a long-term process, this type of innovative and relationship, trust and partnerships-based work requires time.

## To CR and MFAT

**Recommendation 9: high priority:** Strengthen the learning partnership with MFAT, including through regular dialogue on progress at the outcome level and expectations, particularly in relation to the link between climate change and conflict. This is especially important in a programme that is adaptively managed.



## To CR, TO and PCP, MFAT and EU

**Recommendation 10: medium priority:** In addition to thematic specific funding support, explore other funding opportunities, including direct in-country funding specific for CSO-led programmes.

**Recommendation 11: high priority:** Ensure the programme design (objectives, expected outcomes) is realistic with the timeframe and budget, and considerate of implementing partners' capacity to execute and manage other programmes.

**Recommendation 12: high priority:** Strengthen reporting systems to improve communication of the richness of program progress, including to funding and learning partners. This should be an annual process in addition to Outcomes Harvesting processes.

The evaluation also incorporates recommendations informed by the evaluation findings on what key informants considered relevant aspects of the programme to be wound down, maintained, or expanded in future strategy and programming.

## Key recommendations for PNG and Solomon Islands

**Solomon Islands:** The evaluation team concludes that continued programme development in Solomon Islands could be beneficial and impactful if done with caution, and realistic in its expectations and ambition, designed and implemented collaboratively between CR, MFAT, Solomon Islands Government, and local implementing partners. It is expected that it would assist the Solomon Islands Government and all stakeholders to understand how climate change relates to conflict and peace issues in the country, and support policymaking for the urban expansion of informal settlements in peri-urban areas, particularly around Honiara.

**Papua New Guinea:** Although work in the areas of conflict-related climate change displacement is not as advanced in PNG as it is in Fiji, the need to better understand and support local actors in this area is clear. However, if deciding to start this work in PNG, it would be crucial to have a long-term commitment.

# CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

An **Executive Summary** provides an overview of the main findings and recommendations.

**Chapter 1** provides an overview of the context in which the ‘Pacific Climate Change Programme’ was implemented, and the evaluation framework. This includes the evaluation team’s understanding of the programme, an overview, and the context in which the programme was implemented, the objectives, methodology and limitations of the evaluation.

**Chapter 2** presents the findings of the evaluation in line with the key evaluation questions contained in the Evaluation Framework included in the inception report.

**Chapter 3** outlines lessons learned and recommendations.

## 1.2 CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAMME

The Pacific region’s recent history has been marked by conflict and instability, most notably in Papua New Guinea, including the Autonomous Region of Bougainville, as well as the Solomon Islands and Fiji. Many forms of conflict in the region are localised, while mechanisms to prevent, mitigate, and resolve conflict are primarily located in community-based governance and justice mechanisms<sup>1</sup>. In addition to the ongoing issue of conflict in Pacific Island countries (PICs), the region is experiencing the environmental effects of climate change, which are likely to increase in the coming decades. Climate change displacement is a major challenge for Pacific Islanders given that land and ‘place’ are at the centre of cultural and spiritual worldviews and often the primary source of collective forms of resilience<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, there are many economic, social, and psychological costs associated with climate change-related displacement, which are likely to increase in the near future<sup>3</sup>. The intersections between climate change and a broad range of social and political factors (for example, land and resource disputes, impacts of extractive industries, and weak national governance) pose a significant risk to peace and security in the region<sup>4</sup>.

In Fiji, the government is committed to supporting vulnerable communities manage the short and long-term effects of climate change.<sup>5</sup> A major climate change development policy process has been undertaken in the past decade, culminating in the development of the ‘Planned Relocation Guidelines’, which will soon be considered by Fiji’s cabinet. Six villages in Fiji have relocated with a further 42 communities earmarked for relocation in the next five to 10 years.

Conciliation Resources (CR) is an international organisation committed to stopping violent conflict and creating more peaceful societies, working in the Pacific on climate change and the conflict nexus within the Pacific

<sup>1</sup> Conciliation Resources, 2019, Building Peace in Climate Change-affected Communities, Full Programme Proposal.

<sup>2</sup> Conciliation Resources, 2022, Terms of Reference Evaluation Consultancy team for the Evaluation of Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities Programme.

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific Office, 2014, Climate Change and Migration Issues in the Pacific, available at: <https://www.ilo.org/dyn/migpractice/docs/261/Pacific.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Conciliation Resources, 2021, Climate Change and Conflict Risks in the Pacific, available at: <https://www.c-r.org/learning-hub/climate-change-and-conflict-risks-pacific>

<sup>5</sup> Conciliation Resources, 2022, Draft Outcomes Harvesting Analysis Workshop Outcome

region. CR's work is currently being implemented in the Melanesian sub-region, including the Solomon Islands, Fiji, Papua New Guinea including the Autonomous Region of Bougainville.

The programme's 3 intended outcomes include:

**Outcome 1:** Communities experiencing climate change-related migration have the conflict analysis tools, skills and relationships to analyse and prevent or manage climate conflict.

**Outcome 2:** Regional civil society organisations have the knowledge, tools and skills to contribute to supporting communities in responding to climate conflict.

**Outcome 3:** Community perceptions and concerns about conflict impacts are captured and contribute to knowledge in national, regional, and international climate change policy-making arenas.

The overall programme objective is that Pacific Islanders have the knowledge, resources and skills to prevent and manage conflicts emerging as a result of climate change impacts.

## 1.3 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

---

The evaluation covered the entire implementation period of the Programme Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities Programme and its constituent projects in Fiji and Solomon Islands, 'Strengthening the role of Civil Society and Climate Change and JustPeace Communities in Fiji', and 'Building Peace in Climate Change-affected Communities'. The implementation of the programme covers from January 2020 to April 2023, and January 2020 to June 2022 respectively.

In line with the Terms of Reference (see Annex 7), the evaluation:

- I. **Assessed** the progress made towards achieving programme outcomes.
- II. **Identified** key learnings on the contribution of activities and outputs towards the achievement of the programme objectives.
- III. **Identified** lessons learned that will inform and strengthen the design and implementation of future programming.

Annex 2 presents the Evaluation Framework, which shows the indicative sources of information, methods and tools identified to answer each evaluation question and sub-question accordingly.

## 1.4 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

---

This section outlines the evaluation methodology with additional details included in Annex 3 (together with an overview of stakeholders consulted, listed in Annex 4, interviews and FGD guides, refer Annex 5).

The point of departure for the evaluation was the seven evaluation questions proposed in the ToR, covering evaluation of the three programme outcomes, strengths and weaknesses, and additional evaluation criteria: partnership, inclusivity, and sustainability. For each of the evaluation questions, there were several sub-questions (a total of 18). During the inception phase, the evaluation team, CR and partners agreed to reduce the evaluation questions to six, covering programme outcomes, strengths and weaknesses, sustainability, future strategy and programming.


The end-of-programme evaluation used a qualitative method approach to gather data through the following methods: desk review and analysis of documents, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, and observation during field visits. The evaluation team sought both triangulation and complementarity between data sources and collection methods and employed a comprehensively consultative approach, engaging with a wide range of stakeholders (Annex 4).

Owing to its experimental and adaptive nature, the programme was implemented without any predetermined assumptions regarding the needs, priorities and potential changes of the communities and other stakeholders. However, for the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluation team used the draft version of the TOC (Annex 7) developed in the third year, to understand the outcomes identified, and the logic behind the development of the evaluation questions set up in the Evaluation Framework (Annex 2).

The evaluation adopted a consultative approach, seeking and sharing feedback with stakeholders at different stages throughout the process.


**Box 1 presents a summary of evaluation methods.**

**Box 1: Summary of evaluation methods**




**Desk review and analysis of documents**

47 documents reviewed, including: Projects proposals and reports, publications, advocacy and communications, analysis documents, outcome harvesting draft report, partnership documents; 13 episodes of Justpeace Talanoa Bure @COVID-19 Series.




**33 key informant interviews**

Semi-structured interviews with 33 interviewees (in some case, group interviews where two or more people from the same organization or institution were interviewed at the same time). A diverse range of stakeholders were interviewed from funding agencies, implementing partner organizations, community leaders and community members, Government of Fiji at local and national level, thematic experts in PNG and SI.



**7 focus group discussions (FGDs)**

FGDs were conducted with 21 participants in total, which included community groups such as women and youth leaders.



**On-site observation**

Indirect observation while visiting Vunidogoloa, the first village to be relocated under the climate change program. Field notes were taken, and informed questions included in the interview guide with key informants in the community.

## 1.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

**Time and resources:** The main limitations were related to the timing of the evaluation coinciding with the General Election and the end of the year holiday period in Fiji, as well as the relatively short timeframe and days available to the consultants, contracted at 35 days across a three-member team. During the data collection period, initially planned from 1st to 23rd December 2022 to comply with the evaluation timeline, some respondents (including government officials and community members) were unavailable to participate in interviews and FGDs and, as result, several consultations had to be put on hold. Consequently, the team was only able to complete the data collection on 11th January 2023. Additionally, due to these contextual constraints, in consultation with the partners in implementation CR, TO and PCP, decided to limit and focus

the site visits to one of the communities on the island of Vanua Levu (Vunidogoloa). Data collection with key informants from Naviavia and Vunisavisavi took place in Suva, during the community leaders' participation in TO's local and regional peacebuilding training called the Oceania Peacebuilding Institute (OPI), and in Savusavu, a group of community members from Naviavia travelled to participate in the evaluation.

**Stakeholder access:** In view of the tensions around the pre- and post-election periods, implementing partners working with communities in informal settlements advised against visiting the sites for data collection, and instead, met with key informants in the CSO partner's office or Alinea's office in Suva.

Despite the best efforts of all involved, it was not possible to meet with all desired stakeholders during the pre- and post-election period. Importantly, provincial authorities in Cakaudrove were unavailable for interviews, and only one key informant from the national government participated. In addition, international and bilateral organisations were contacted, namely IOM and GIZ, who were unavailable to participate in the consultation.

**Social inclusion:** While the evaluation team worked closely with CR and partners to carefully select evaluation participants, the selection of some key informants, including "hard to reach populations" (e.g., LGBTI persons, PLWD) proved to be challenging, particularly due to the purposive sampling method used to identify them, relying on communities' chiefs' invitation to participate in the evaluation. As a result, only a group of mothers of persons living with disabilities from one of the communities contributed to the consultations. This may mean that the findings may not completely capture the views of all potential stakeholders and communities.

**Qualitative nature of the evaluation:** The evaluation methodologies were qualitative, which means that the findings cannot be generalised and are largely based on limited evidence. However, the evaluation team used a form of evaluation matrix to conduct triangulation between different data sources (KII, FGD, programme records, notes from observation) and contextualise the analysis effectively.

**Gender equity:** over 80% of key informants were female. The evaluation team was composed of three women. Despite best efforts, gender bias is implicit.

**Terms of Reference:** key components of the terms of reference have evolved throughout the evaluation process, including after the draft report was submitted, which has limited the availability or quality of the data to assess aspects important to key stakeholders of the evaluation.

## CHAPTER 2: FINDINGS AND ANALYSES

This section presents findings in line with the key evaluation questions as refined during the inception phase and captured in the Evaluation Inception Report. The presentation of the findings by evaluation question is coloured as per KEQs in Evaluation Framework (Annex 2). Questions around partnerships and future strategy and programming are addressed in the findings to various questions, and as a sub-section in Chapter 3: Lessons Learned and Recommendations. Findings related to partnerships, future strategy and programming are addressed as a sub-section in Chapter 3: Lessons Learned and Recommendations.

### 2.1 OUTCOME 1

**Has the programme improved community leaders' ability to manage local tensions/conflicts related to climate change? How has the programme improved community leaders' ability to manage local tensions/conflicts related to climate change?**

**FINDING 1.1: The programme has improved community leaders' ability to manage local tensions/conflicts related to climate change.**

In speaking with community leaders and community groups, it was evident that the programme has improved community leaders' ability to manage local tensions/conflicts including those related to climate change. Community leaders have improved awareness and understanding of conflict drivers associated with climate change and in general. Leaders spoke with confidence about how the programme had provided the necessary training to adapt their leadership style to be more inclusive and apply good governance principles when engaging with their people on climate risks and conflicts they faced as a community.

*"I better appreciate my role as village-headman, and why we need to be inclusive and reflect good governance principles within our existing cultural governance system in the village. The new pressures, priorities that the relocation (due to climate change) has introduced, has made my role in managing and decision-making processes challenging, but thanks to the programme – I am in a better position to lead and work with my people".*

*[Village Headman]*

Community leaders learned to use new and innovative approaches to address conflict risks associated with climate change. TO as an agent of change, mentored leaders through the adaptive JustPeace Vanua Engagement methodology. Community leaders had a renewed sense that leadership was about the participation of all groups, and that the power was in the group, not the leader. Leaders recognised that they could adopt governance principles and new knowledge that would allow them to better support their people, especially when dealing with new threats like climate change.

**FINDING 1.2: Community leaders have acquired new tools, and are also using these in their communities, to address and manage diverse conflicts, including those related to climate change.**

Community leaders reported that the training introduced conflict analysis tools such as the conflict tree, mediation, dialogue, and advocacy and has enhanced their capacity to manage conflict/tension, including those associated with climate change. The conflict analysis tools have given leaders a generic ability applicable to all tensions and conflicts, including those resulting from climate change. The JustPeace Vanua Engagement methodology was effective in guiding leaders through the four phases of dialogue, reflection, understanding, action and learning which is complementary to indigenous cultural norms and practices.

The conflict resolution tools broadened the understanding of traditional leaders. Some of them acknowledged that the new-found knowledge in conflict analysis had helped them reassess their roles and how they could improve their consultation and negotiation approaches with their people and other stakeholders. It has made them confident to lead people despite conflicts.

*“I feel strongly that community leadership under these circumstances (climate change) is key. People look to their traditional leaders during these times and see them as playing a critical role in community governance and decision-making [...] one had to be well informed and have all the right facts and knowledge of climate change and its impacts, and understand the science behind climate change, so they could facilitate these discussions with people”.*

*[Women leader]*

*The activities of the project helped me to be a more effective leader, it gave me much-needed skills and knowledge on climate change and its impacts that could be used as a platform for peacebuilding consultations with his people. The project made me appreciate my own role as leader and enhanced my skills to mitigate and to facilitate critical discussions. The project also made me realize that I was lacking in some attributes that strong leadership ought to have, to provide support in JustPeace Methodology”.*

*[Community leader]*

Members of three climate-change affected rural communities participated in policy advocacy sessions facilitated by CR as part of the Comparative Learning and Climate Policy Engagement workshop in Savusavu. This resulted in community members reporting they had learnt about important processes and frameworks implemented by the Government of Fiji (e.g., Relocation Guidelines and the Climate Change Act) and how these affects informal settlements.

**FINDING 1.3: Community leaders have increased awareness and appreciation of enhanced dialogues and participatory approaches which are key to conflict resolution.**

Community leaders have a shared view that dialogue and consultations with their people continue to be crucial for progress. At the community level, leaders encouraged transparent and accessible dialogue through formal

*“It was positive that we all took part, and I learned some skills that would help me present my community’s needs to officials like provincial officers and government ministers. The trainings have taught me so many things like dialogue, advocacy – how to speak to local government, what kind of approach to take when you visit them, the words to use.”*

*[Community leader]*



governance structures in their communities and informally. They visited their people in their homes to understand aspirations and personal concerns, which was a shift in approach for the leaders. At the heart of their renewed approach was the principle of intentionality and inclusivity with all groups.

The JustPeace Vanua Engagement methodology provided the basis for these enhanced dialogues to take place. For example, CR and TO convened a moderated dialogue comprising key programme partners (Fiji government, MFAT, EU etc) enabling communities to address the government directly. The approach was different to the standard approach that communities were accustomed to, which involved government leading and directing the discussions with limited opportunity for proper two-way exchange. Meetings with government were usually limited to the village headman, however, in this instance, all groups were able to voice their own priorities without an intermediary. The national government representative appreciated the direct engagement with the communities at the workshop, as their lessons, experiences and challenges were critical to their work on the Standard Operating Procedures.

*Personally, my involvement with project communities was quite recent, however, listening to their input, lessons, and experiences in relocation was critical to the work of the SOPs and the review of the SOPs.*  
*[Government of Fiji informant]*

Naviavia community members reflected on TO’s response and support post-tropical cyclones Yasa and Ana. Programme staff conducted trauma-informed training, where community members (men, women, young people, and children) brainstormed and mapped definitions of trauma and linked these observations to the cycle of violence and psychological impacts that were occurring at the time. Communities valued the conflict resolution skills that could be applied when community relationships were under acute pressure while experiencing and recovering from disasters.

The presence of MFAT and EU at these workshops was equally crucial as funding partners to demonstrate their commitment to the communities. Communities reported that MFAT had effectively engaged in comparative learning events, dialogue workshops and policy advocacy opportunities.

The different strategies and approaches used for different groups proved useful to convey key messages and create effective spaces for dialogue. For example, one youth leader was able to use her advocacy skills in the Forum theatre activity.

*“With my active participation in the Forum theatre, I was able to use the advocacy skills to get through to the youth.”*  
*[Female youth leader]*

**FINDING 1.4: The confidence and trust that TO and PCP have established with communities has been crucial. They are considered valued partners by stakeholders, including communities.**

TO and PCP are well known in the peacebuilding space in Fiji. They have vast experience and expertise having worked on related projects in these communities. When working in new communities, TO and PCP used community-based approaches that built trust. PCP and TO used approaches that called for open consultation, engagement, and locally led and locally owned projects which helped build trust and confidence. Communities appreciated the scoping approach used by TO and PCP, which was participatory in nature and allowed communities to be involved in the planning.



Leaders also appreciated the fact that the two implementing partners were genuine about their support, unlike their perception of other organisations and researchers who visited their community in the past. Communities also reflected on TO's approach to first understanding the cultural context, and identifying existing governance mechanisms.

*“TO, as a local NGO understood the context of our situation, they had previous experience in dealing with other relocated communities, and their expertise and experience in working with local communities allowed us to build that trust quickly.”*

*[Community leader]*

**FINDING 1.5: TO and PCP’s approach and ability to tailor activities to needs is appreciated by communities. Both organisations were able to leverage partnerships from other projects to support community needs.**

Using CR’s adaptive peacebuilding methodology, TO was able to respond during crises (COVID-19 and tropical cyclones Yasa and Ana). This adaptive approach meant that TO made efforts to assist these communities during the crisis. PCP was able to do the same using other programme funds. This approach was crucial to the objectives of the programme, as it solidified the trust and relationship that TO and PCP had built with the communities. TO conducted a needs assessment that identified potential conflict risks and worked with communities to mitigate them, including conducting trauma awareness workshops to reduce the impact of the natural disasters. TO did not work in isolation during emergency response and leveraged existing partnerships with other non-government organisations to carry out their work. This approach should be replicated in future programming.

**FINDING 1.6: PCP and TO used culturally sensitive approaches to ensure active participation from community leaders and groups during the life of the programme.**

TO with CR developed a JustPeace Vanua Engagement methodology which promoted peacebuilding approaches to climate change impacted communities. The methodology was developed to ensure inclusive community participation in decision making on issues related to climate change, and community leaders appreciated the approaches which allowed them in turn, to have open and frank discussions with the TO

*“As a peacebuilding organisation, Transcend Oceania has always considered the climate change impacts on human life and the associated social, psychological, economic, relational, cultural and spiritual issues key to building peaceful and harmonious communities”.*

*[TO staff]*

teams.

Communities were provided financial support for catering and hosting project activities. Communities valued this approach and it helped to deepen trust. These communities are constantly challenged by the lack of livelihood to support family (food), *vanua (soli ni yavusa)* and church obligations. On a daily basis, all groups (men, women, and youth) are expected to be involved in food planting and income-generation activities, such as coconut broom making and food selling, to supplement their livelihoods. Without compensation for their time, community leaders and members would not have been able to invest the time required to engage on this project.

*Cultural conversations require compensation, as people are giving up their time. These are subsistence communities that need to provide for their families first and foremost. Allowances are important, and there is an expectation that you might want to help them first and take a dignified approach to consultations.*

*[TO staff]*

**FINDING 1.7: Community leaders in informal settlements had a greater understanding of the connection between climate change and conflict than rural communities.**

***Informal settlements***

Through the PCP-led action research which focussed on understanding the connection between climate change and conflict risks, leaders and participants were able to articulate conflict in relation to climate change. In discussions with leaders, they reflected that the action research approach helped them to reflect on their lived experiences of the connection between conflict and climate-change. The communities of Qauia, Nanuku and Maravu were engaged for seven days in the action research. At the time of this report, the action research report by PCP had not been finalised.

*“With the seawater coming into the community, we cannot plant where we used to, so when we plant near our homes, the neighbours complain that is their land even though it is not, this causes conflict”.*

*[Female informant in the informal community]*

***Rural communities***

Although leaders in rural communities were able to articulate the impacts of climate change (saltwater intrusion, floodings, drought, cyclones), there was some variation in their ability to connect climate change impacts and conflict. This variation reflected the status of climate change impacts on their immediate environment and livelihoods. For post-relocation communities, e.g., Vunidogoloa, their conflicts were social and economic in nature related to their relocation as a community. They also had first-hand experience of coastal degradation, loss of land and salt intrusion some years ago.

Communities that were undergoing relocation due to the impacts of climate change could make explicit links between climate change and conflict, however they also spoke to conflicts arising from forced relocation. Leaders were using conflict analysis tools and new approaches to also resolve the many conflicts unrelated to climate change (school dropouts and high internet use among youths).

New social challenges have emerged due to the relocation and displacement of communities. With increasing impacts of climate change the risk of conflict is exacerbated. As an intervention, the programme has been timely to introduce tools and approaches to assist communities manage emerging climate-change conflicts and conflict in general.

*“I admit that as a lead facilitator of my community, I am facing new challenges due to the sale of the land and possible displacement of our community – it is no easy feat. The tensions are complex, and leaders need to have the skills to mitigate and identify root causes of problems, analyse them, and find solutions to being about peace in the community”. [Community leader]*

**FINDING 1.8: Community leaders understand that climate change impacts increase the risk of conflicts in their communities, alongside other socioeconomic and governance factors.**

The evidence substantiates that climate change impacts have contributed directly and indirectly to increased conflict in the target communities, although this varies between the communities (refer table one below for an analysis by community). The level of understanding of the interconnectedness between climate change and conflict also varies between communities - depending on various factors including their status as a relocated community, their current and past experience to direct climate change-related events, and to some extent the various programme interventions at community level.

As outlined in Finding 1.7, communities experienced a broad range of tensions and conflict, as the contexts were different for each community. These are not always clearly linked to climate change, and this link is not always identifiable by communities themselves. While it is likely that many of the tensions and conflicts experienced are at the very least exacerbated by relocation and climate change related disasters, that link is often difficult to make with certainty. The onus for making an explicit link between conflict and climate change appears to lie with the community. This does not seem to serve the community and the desired outcomes of the programme.

*Through the research we have seen that climate change is a conflict driver. With relocation, there is limited infrastructure and services, and competition for the limited existed. On top of it all, in communities we see there is a lot of poverty. We are not looking in depth on the causes, assuming that the reason is many people coming together in a small space. Climate change is a driver of conflict, but an opportunity as well. In a context of movement and readjustment, in our work as peacebuilders, how to build social cohesion. [PCP Staff]*

However, through programme intervention, conflict analysis tools, and peacebuilding approaches enabled community leaders including youth and women leaders to better manage conflict and tension regardless of the source of the conflict. The interventions by the programme allowed community leaders, to understand and use conflict analysis and management tools including conflict tree, mediation, dialogue, and advocacy and practicing good governance principles when engaging with their community members in conflict management.

*The programme partners valued my knowledge of relocation and peacebuilding, and with the learnings I now have on climate change and conflict, I may assist my community make the connections between climate change and conflict. This is important. [Community Leader]*

The onus for linking conflict and climate change would better lie with external analysis applicable to the programme as a whole rather than with communities. The evaluation assesses the link between conflict and climate change at various points of the programme in Table 1 below.

**Table 1: Analysis of links between conflict and climate change**

	Informal communities	Rural communities
Cause of relocation and link to climate change	<p>Some of the residents of Nanuku and Maravu relocated to the informal settlement due to tropical cyclones.</p> <p>Relocation to Qauia was not related to climate change.</p> <p>Climate change may put pressure on the informal settlements to relocate in future.</p>	<p>Residents relocated to Vunidogoloa due to climate change.</p> <p>Residents relocated to Naviavia due to climate change impacts on Kiribati. This coastal continues to experience climate change impacts.</p> <p>Residents of Vunisavisavi are being impacted by rising sea levels and have been involved in adaptation. Relocation is a challenge because they have a traditional obligation to care for a sacred site of another tribe.</p>
Did the relocation cause or exacerbate conflict?	The relocation caused or exacerbated conflict in all three informal communities.	The relocation caused conflicts in the communities.
Is climate change an ongoing source of conflict?	Climate change is an ongoing source of conflict in all three communities to varying degrees, and increasingly so. This is related to the loss/destruction of land to plant and fishing grounds, the destruction of property and health impacts.	Climate change continues to impact their lives, however communities assess that the relocation itself (past, current and for the future) has presented a host of social, economic issues and created conflict more than those related to climate change. The climate change conflict nexus needs to be further explored.

## 2.2 OUTCOME 2

---

**Has the programme strengthened Fijian civil society organisations' capacities to support communities in responding to challenges resulting from climate change-related conflict? How has the programme strengthened Fijian civil society organisations' capacities to support communities in responding to challenges resulting from climate change-related conflict?**

**FINDING 2.1: PCP and TO are leading practitioners in peacebuilding, conflict management and prevention in Fiji. This program has enriched existing strategies, approaches, and tools that they have been using for many years. Through the programme, PCP and TO have strengthened their individual capacities to support communities to identify and manage climate change-related conflict.**

TO and CR produced a guide community engagement approach, the JustPeace Vanua Engagement methodology, which is both appropriate to the Fiji i-Taukei context, and to the ways in which TO and partners are working to ensure respectful and meaningful engagement with Fijian communities. TO staff are applying the principles of engagement in the Guide, to support and strengthen the work in JustPeace communities. The TO team is implementing inclusive community participation in decision making on issues related to climate change. Their strengthened practice of indigenous Fijian protocol and enhanced skills in contextualizing and assessing issues with communities is very effective in identifying where interventions might best be targeted. Their capacity to conduct research on climate change induced issues, and sense-make with the communities has ensured that the interventions designed have the input and validation of the affected people themselves.

Through effective facilitation by PCP staff and a well-informed research team, urban community members were empowered to talk about climate-change related issues (e.g. migration trend, impacts of climate change in their communities and issues surrounding service delivery, in particular, water and electricity, lack of employment opportunities, high number of school dropouts, drug and crime related issues, resilience, and the peace and conflict resolution methodologies that they used in their communities).

Community groups reflected that the mentoring support and the facilitation skills that PCP staff brought to the research and training events allow them to discuss the existing structures in their informal settlements (e.g., community leadership aligning closely with Methodist church). They have also been empowered to discuss challenges in the traditional structures in their community, the patriarchy in particular, and its impact on women.

**FINDING 2.2: CR provides the fiduciary capacity to PCP and TO to access this programme. CR plays an important role translating reports into donor language and formats and sharing results regionally and internationally.**

CR has played a bridging role as the leading implementing partner has capitalized on its ability to access funding and implement the activities partnering with local CSOs who may have found it too difficult to directly access this particular funding. This has also enabled funding partners to work with CSOs who are considered leading in this field.

CR has provided fiduciary capacity to PCP and TO. It has helped with programme management, including financial and narrative reporting to funding partners. This benefits both the funding partners and CSOs. It has meant that the requirements of various funding partners have been met. The funding partners, MFAT and EU, have further enhanced the visibility of the programme and learnings the CSOs are facilitating with communities, helping to deliver on programme outcomes. Through this modality and the lead role of CR, there is opportunity

for direct links between development partners, funding partners and the CSOs. CR has delivered this role very productively and with great respect, as outlined in Finding 3.

The programme has also strengthened TO staff and board of directors' capacity in strategic planning and development of ideas on where climate change work would fit into their existing peacebuilding work. Mentoring and technical advice was also provided to TO's management and staff on the following areas: activity planning, outcome-tracking, narrative reporting, programme safeguarding; and financial reporting.

*CR has enhanced our capacity to guide conversations that allow us to look at something from another angle. As well, CR has trained us a lot on MEL, and taught us about "do no harm", they helped us in interpreting data and designing our projects. CR helps us a lot in context analysis.*  
*Implementing Partner*  
*[PCP staff]*

**FINDING 2.3: CR has demonstrated respect for CSOs' knowledge and partnerships, and in doing so have supported the CSOs to challenge their thinking and identify opportunities to improve.**

CR engaged both implementing partners, PCP and TO, during the design and planning phases of the programme. The PCP team enhanced their scoping skills as a result and were able to meaningfully consult with community leaders and groups to identify some of the special considerations that were crucial to identify appropriate interventions.

As noted, CR supported TO to develop a JustPeace Vanua Engagement methodology, which is highly appropriate to the context. This helped TO to build trust and relationships with communities as it is grounded in traditional knowledge and culturally appropriate non-violent approaches to create just, peaceful, inclusive, participatory, sustainable, and resilient communities.

CR also facilitated initial consultations with the PCP team to identify and establish how the action research would be implemented and some very critical skills that the community facilitators and the research team needed to have before commencing the community surveys. PCP staff were supported through the "listening project" to enhance their skills in conducting community surveys, as a result the approach to talking and creating dialogues with community members was appreciated by community members.

*"CR was a good partner and came with a lot of expertise and experience around Conflict - Peacebuilding, this complemented the expertise and the rich experience of our organisation in this space, so there were many things learned by our team during the project. They brought many approaches that were new to us, and which our staff found very critical in moving the work forward, especially the research".* *Implementing partner.*  
*[PCP Staff]*

**FINDING 2.4: PCP and TO have increased their understanding and application of the nexus between climate change, displacement, and conflict.**

Through CR's close collaboration with PCP and TO, they have improved their understanding, and enhanced their knowledge in identifying and conducting community-level analysis of conflicts, including conflict drivers associated with climate change. Drawing on their extensive work with communities, partners were able to use

innovative approaches to conflict analysis that allowed them to better understand the connection between climate change and conflict, and how displaced communities were managing such conflicts. CR's expertise and approaches combined with their strong networks such as Toda Institute and other agencies, was beneficial to PCP and TO in building their own networks, understanding and exposure to other approaches and experiences.

*CR enhances our capacity to guide conversations that allow us to look at something from another angle. CR is very good in comparative learning providing lots of key information from other relevant contexts that we can look at, learn from and apply if relevant.*

*[PCP Staff]*

For example, Toda Institute together with TO and CR conducted a two-day international 'Comparative Learning on Climate Change, Relocation and Peace-Building in Fiji' conference. This was great exposure for the TO staff, as Toda Peace Institute brought network members, peacebuilding practitioners and other relevant people together to explore peace and conflict concerns around climate change and mobility in Fiji. The discussion centred on best ways of engaging on the need of relocation in the context of climate change and other environmental pressures, population growth and urbanisation. It enhanced TO staff's knowledge and approaches to working in climate change affected communities.

PCP's action research of conflict drivers and conflict management systems across the three informal settlements helped PCP staff and researchers better understand this link between climate change, displacement, and conflict. Informants reflected that CR's strength was the comparative learning approach they inculcated into their approaches with implementing partners.

*The insights of Conciliation Resources is a major contributing factor to the success of the project. It is when outsider and insider perspectives are shared, which is often very helpful in the overall management of the project as well as adaptive approaches that are more effective and responsive to the unique needs of communities affected by climate change.*

*[TO Staff]*

**FINDING 2.5: New relationships between implementing partners and regional and international organisations have facilitated increased capacity and opportunities to share expertise and experience of the programme and partners.**

Implementing partners were able to establish new working relationships and associations with key regional and international agencies working in the space. The 'Comparative Learning on Climate Change, Relocation and Conflict in Fiji' conference in October 2020 (and mentioned above) attracted key agencies and raised the profile of the implementing agencies. This was a networking opportunity which resulted in IOM engaging TO to develop a Guide on culturally relevant negotiation and dialogue materials in the Pacific. This partnership is ongoing, and key informants referred to the relationship as inclusive and consultative.



*CR and local partners TO and PCP are leading the work with communities in the climate mobility and peacebuilding space. Their work is critical and there is still more room for communities to be engaged directly and to feed into some of these processes and inform regional and national policy. Our engagement with CR began when we attended the first Comparative Learning Event, and it was there that we realized the value-add they could bring to the regional space.*

*[PIF Staff]*

MFAT and EU, as funding and learning partners, effectively engaged in comparative learning events, dialogue workshops and as well as policy advocacy opportunities that arose throughout the programme. Community members reflected positively on MFAT's participation at a comparative learning event.

IOM invited CR to join a regional technical working group on climate mobility. This is a good opportunity for CR to continue its advocacy, share its findings and mobilize resources to further support the work with communities and CSOs in this space, for Fiji and other PICs.

In conversations with regional and international agencies, including the PIFS and UNDP, they recognized implementing partners' expertise and experience in the climate mobility and peacebuilding space. Across interviews key informants referred to the interest in engaging more actively and systematically with programme staff and Directors in participating in national and regional policy and dialogue spaces. Regional partners, such as PIFS and UNDP, are very keen to learn from the approaches used by CR and partners and use their expertise and rich learnings of the programme at all levels (community, CSO and policy) to feed into policy development processes, such as the Regional Climate Mobility Framework.

*For Fiji, our regional project connected with CR and stakeholders, as we tried to research and strengthen the link between climate change and peacebuilding work. In the climate security risk assessments used by our Project, it was important to emphasize the peacebuilding work, the efforts that CR and stakeholders were leading in, to ensure that communities were given a voice, a platform etc in this space. We have added CR (TO and Pacicia) to the Consortium of Consultants.*

*[UNDP Staff]*

**FINDING 2.6: Efforts made towards inclusion in design and implementation of programme activities should be strengthened for any future programming.**

Community leaders have reflected that the voices of women and youth need to be better included in future programming. There was also recognition that other vulnerable groups (people with a disability, LGBTI, etc) also need to be included. The programme is yet to effectively include people who identify as LGBTI or PLWD. Consultations noted the awareness and sensitivities of effectively working with these groups can take time and relationships, and that implementing partners themselves may require up-skilling to effectively include these groups. Given the sensitivities in community settings related to LGBTQI, working through established NGO and CSO groups working with socially excluded groups is recommended.

Community members have varying perceptions and definitions of a person living with a disability. During a focus group discussion with women, the women identified only community members in wheelchairs as having a disability. However, several women in the group had a family member who also had a disability (loss of movement one arm, loss of an eye etc). There were no dialogue spaces for vulnerable groups, both in informal settlements and rural communities. PLWD recognised that there were spaces to seek support (church, women and men's group), however, there was a sense that their needs were private, and those spaces were not



appropriate. The parents of people living with a disability would often speak directly to a single person of influence (women’s leader for example) to obtain support, however, families felt that they were responsible for their own needs and left it to the discretion of the groups to assist. This observation was based on one community so it cannot be generalised for other communities.

*“This is the first time we have been interviewed as parents of people with a disability”.*  
*[Parent of person living with a disability]*

**Finding 2.7: PCP has demonstrated that the inclusion of the various ethnic groups is critical in informal settlements and must be continued in any future programming.**

PCP has drawn on its experience in other communities and projects to effectively work with people in informal settlements. Inclusion considerations have been and must continue to be extended to the multi-ethnic composition of informal settlements when designing people-centred approaches to conflict analysis. Power distribution is unequal between different ethnic groups in informal settlements. Access to dialogue spaces can be limited depending on ethnicity (e.g., Christian church groups). These considerations are important when designing interventions at the community level for future programming.

*In the design of our research, we always take into consideration which groups we believe would benefit from interventions and that is our inclusivity question, not only for the purpose of the research, but also to connect our work with government and with others. This not only in reference to SOGI, but for example, racial minorities. We ask Is there somebody else in that conflict that's keeping away? Why are they keeping away? Is it only always about the two main races? There are the minority races. How do we include them in the conversations as well? How are they seeing themselves disadvantaged?*

*[PCP Staff]*

**FINDING 2.8: There is scope for CSOs to better engage youth leaders, as they are an important stakeholder in conflict management and prevention in communities. Community leaders seek the strengthened participation of youth in conflict management.**

Community leaders have reflected on the importance of engaging youth in conflict analysis and peacebuilding, for climate-affected communities. The programme has allowed for in-depth knowledge and information on the impact climate change has as a driver of conflict. Youth members and in particular youth leaders have increasingly engaged in programme activities including training and advocacy events. Community leaders have shared a common sentiment that the institutional knowledge they have gained in the space (climate change, climate mobility, conflict, and peace building) needs to be passed down to young emerging leaders. The knowledge and tools learned through the programme was critical for the youth of their communities to understand and appreciate. Activities targeting youth leaders must be sustained and or enhanced in future programming.

*“As a youth leader, I feel my role is to keep the youth engaged in the conversation. Being a critical player in identifying solutions and advocating strongly for our plight is my main challenge. To engage the youth, my role is to also share the knowledge and learning on climate change, it impacts and solutions, as we are the future generation of (community)”.*

*[Youth Leader]*

**FINDING 2.9: To be effective, the programme relies heavily on face-to-face engagement. The Covid-19 outbreak slowed down programme implementation and new ways of working had to be developed. It also delayed engagement in the Solomon Islands and PNG.**

The COVID-19 pandemic significantly disrupted the implementation of the program. Travel restrictions obliged CR and implementing partners to develop new ways of working, the commitments made to partners and funders had to be adjusted, the programme had to be reviewed and adapted to the new circumstances. The objectives of this programme, peacebuilding, and conflict resolution, are about relationships between people, and about how communities interact with each other. There is only so much one can do from a distance. To truly transform relationships, one needs to build trust in each other through the activities of the programme, particularly the face-to-face dialogues

Despite the limitations, implementing partners in Fiji, including community leaders, appreciated the hybrid mode approach adopted during lockdowns and travel restrictions. These limitations included the access and ability to use reliable technology and internet. Community leaders found it challenging at times. For future programming, it is suggested that ways to promote digital inclusion be explored (e.g., providing free internet connectivity now that youth leaders and other community members have smartphones). Funding towards adaptive communication by CSOs and local groups could be explored, e.g., scaling up of resources, in terms of expertise, personnel and technical capacities, that would be required to support effective communication during a pandemic.

*COVID exacerbated problems, and conflicts that the communities were already faced with at the time e.g., Naviavia, Vunidogoloa. The Programme was impacted negatively, as community-targeted initiatives including consultations were not progressed as scheduled. – [CR Staff]*

Key informants from implementing partner organisations explained that although the programme initially intended to be implemented in Fiji and Solomon Islands, with scoping of PNG in year 3, the COVID-19 pandemic, and national and international measures established by governments to contain the spread of the virus delayed the commencement of planning in Solomon Islands. As recounted by CR’s key informants during the interviews, the organisation only managed to conduct a preliminary scoping visit to the country between the months of July and August 2022. The analysis and observations captured in a visit report completed by CR in September 2022 complement key recommendations of this evaluation. These recommendations were informed by interviews with a few key informants with expertise and experience in both contexts (see Chapter 3: lessons learned and recommendations).

The delays to expansion in Solomon Islands and PNG appear both reasonable and important given the circumstances, particularly in relation to a programme that requires effective engagement with stakeholders from first interactions.

***Conciliation Resources have outlined the impact of delays in engaging with Solomon Islands and PNG:***

*a. The programme started in January 2020 with engagement in Fiji because CR already had an ongoing relationship with local partners there from previous projects. CR did not yet have any partnerships in Solomon Islands.*

*b. Scoping work with target communities in Fiji began in March 2020, which is also when the COVID-19 pandemic began and Fiji closed its borders to international travel in March 2020. Australia also closed its borders in March 2020, including restrictions on people leaving Australia, which prevented effective scoping*

*in Solomon Islands that required in-person travel to the country. Planned programme work had to be adapted and activities shifted online as much as was possible.*

*c. The pandemic also prolonged the recruiting process for CR's programme staff with a new programme director and project manager only being recruited in May 2021.*

*d. COVID-19 reached Solomon Islands in October 2020 and the government-imposed travel restrictions for non-Solomon Island citizens with entry possible only with the approval of the Prime Minister or on humanitarian grounds. MFAT Wellington introduced CR to MFAT post in Honiara on 26 October 2021 to support potential programme scoping in Solomon Islands. International travel out of Australia began to resume in November 2021 and CR considered then the option of applying for permission to enter for the purpose of programme development but inquiries to Solomon Islands Government went unanswered and were unsuccessful.*

*e. Solomon Islands only fully opened its borders to non-Solomon Islands citizens on 1st July 2022. The Pacific programme director travelled to Solomon Islands for the first time for preliminary scoping on 9th July 2022, as soon as possible after the border reopening.*

*f. Based on the first trip in July 2022, CR was able to draft a preliminary scoping report and liaise with MFAT Post Honiara as well as some potential civil society partners about ideas for developing a climate mobility and conflict programme in Solomon Islands. 7 members of two NGOs (Dignity Pasifik and Dreamcast Theatre) from Honiara took part in Transcend Oceania's climate change & peacebuilding course in Suva in November-December 2022, which significantly strengthened the relationship with potential partners in Solomon Islands (as well as regional cooperation) and paved the way for future programme development there.*

*g. Given that development of the programme in Solomon Islands had been delayed, CR has limited to beginning discussions on options for the development of a climate mobility in PNG in future.*

## 2.3 OUTCOME 3

**Has the programme improved understanding and knowledge of diverse Pacific perspectives and experiences of climate change-related conflict and challenges associated? What groups has the programme reached?**

**FINDING 3.1: The programme shared lessons and best practice with other regional, and international processes and fora. This has enhanced regional understanding of the perspectives and experiences of communities in Fiji dealing with climate-change related conflict.**

The Adaptive Peacebuilding Methodology employed by CR to deliver the programme ensured that the experiences and stories from the community level were connected to the national, regional, and global scales. Opportunities to share knowledge and best practice of the programme was facilitated through comparative learning events, dialogue workshop and policy advocacy events. Through these events, the rich learnings and knowledge on adaptive peacebuilding approaches implemented at the community and the CSO-level were shared with local, national, regional, and international stakeholders participating in the sharing and exchange.

Through these events, implementing partners, community beneficiaries, and funding partners were able to share and advocate on the adaptive peacebuilding methodology and what worked well for communities and CSOs in Fiji.

The programme has also facilitated learning events to share lessons with important stakeholder groups. Using an innovative hybrid format - where participants attended online and in-person - researchers, practitioners, policymakers and representatives of international organisations, funding agencies and non-governmental organisations were able to share knowledge and information, and learnings on diverse Pacific perspectives and experiences of climate change-related conflict and challenges. The Fiji experience of the programme was shared widely at such learning events.

The Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS) has continued to update CR on opportunities and/or entry points for engagement at the regional policy space, including various regional mechanisms that PIFS convenes. CR is now a member of the technical working group of the Pacific Resilience Programme (PRP). PIFS reflected on the merits of CR's inclusion, and the valuable contribution it can make in this space.

*"We also see CRs value-add in the High-level Dialogue on the new Regional Framework on Climate Mobility. CR can share Fiji perspectives of the programme, as well as inform peacebuilding initiatives, through their engagement".*

*[PIFS staff]*

Implementing partners TO and PCP are also engaged in the regional policy space convened by PIFS, the Toda Peace Institute with other regional NSAs. This has also presented an opportunity for the sharing the learnings of the programme to a robust network of regional CSOs.

**FINDING 3.2: Translation of programme learnings to national policy should be strengthened.**

While the programme has made some progress in finding opportunities to translate learnings into national policy, this could be strengthened. A key success has been the invitation from government to community leaders to be part of the steering committee for the national relocation SOPs. These relationships will influence long-term policy and actions post-relocation.

Through the programme, community leaders have been presented the opportunity to share their experiences as affected communities, as well as their and improved conflict analysis tools and approaches with the government-led planned relocation process. As mentioned, the opportunity to become part of the steering committee of the Fiji Planned Relocation SOPs process by a village headman in 2022 was seen as a positive unintended outcome that the programme contributed towards. The invitation to join the steering committee was made by the Fiji Government climate change representative following a learning event facilitated by CR and TO.

*“It is essential that the entire planned relocation process involves an inclusive range of relevant sectors and stakeholders including women, elderly, and persons with disabilities. Our relocation guidelines will be supported if we have everyone coming together. Including the expertise, ideas, and action among a variety of experts and institutions, in the fields of development, humanitarian assistance, human rights, disaster risk management, environment, climate change, and urban and regional planning, as well as affected. The inclusion of village headmen in this process, through the steering committee is welcomed. For the first time, we can get their insights of the programme and the learnings around conflict analysis and management, but also their traditional knowledge and coping strategies. And integrate this into our SOP”.*

*[CCICD Staff]*

Comparative learning events organized by the programme have allowed the Fiji Government to be part of the sharing of lessons. Local and government authorities including Divisional Commissioners, Provincial officers (Northern and Central) as well as the Ministry of Economy (Climate Change Unit) have noted the opportunities to inform national processes through this programme. They have encouraged the continuation of these events where they are able to hear from the community leaders, CSOs and funding agencies of the learnings and the new perspectives that can effectively inform how the Fiji Government will support relocated communities currently and in the future.

For future programming, CR and partners could explore how best to include other key Government of Fiji Sectorial Ministries that are already supporting the Planned Relocation process and collaborate with them in the planning and designing of interventions.

**FINDING 3.3: The programme partners are engaging in regional policy spaces, to inform the development and implementation of policy instruments.**

Through the programme, new regional partnerships and relationships have been forged between stakeholder groups. Partners are also drawing on existing relationships to create opportunities to share the programme’s lessons and experience and inform regional policy.

Implementing partners TO and PCP have been active members of the PIFS NSA policy space, convened by the PIFS. This dialogue space allows regional NSAs to participate in the designing, implementation, and monitoring of regional policy by governments of the PIF member states. The space has allowed both TO and PCP to advocate for effective policies in the conflict and peacebuilding thematic area, climate change, and climate mobility.

Alongside other regional NSAs like the Pacific Conference of Churches, and the Pacific Island Association of NGOs (PIANGO) and others, PCP and TO have utilized this space to advocate for the people-centred approaches to community conflict analysis as well as sharing the rich findings of the programme.

**FINDING 3.4: Regional and international stakeholders are keen to learn from the lessons of this innovative programme. There is potential for the programme to contribute to national processes supporting planned (climate change) relocation for Fiji communities in the coming years.**

*SI and PNG have special considerations and conflict-related challenges that the region needs to respond to collectively. It is very critical that CSO-led initiatives like CR (TO/PCP) have some input and make some meaningful contribution to design and implement like-initiatives for SI and PNG communities affected.*

*[UNDP staff]*

Regional and international stakeholder respondents reflected how the conversation around climate mobility and peacebuilding is gaining momentum in Fiji and in the region. Key informants expressed the need for the programme to capitalise on opportunities for sharing what it has learned. It offers an evidence base for the risks that will be experienced by climate-affected communities and strategies that could help manage these risks, both for Fiji and potentially other countries in the region. It is a new space where peacebuilding efforts of local CSOs can be enhanced to support communities that will increasingly be affected by climate change relocation. Development partners, government and international agencies have reflected the need for the lessons of the programme to be shared widely. Academia is also likely to be interested in the practical linkages and challenges connecting climate change and conflict.

*For Fiji, our regional project connected with CR and stakeholders, as we tried to research and strengthen the link between climate change and peacebuilding work. In the climate security risk assessments used by our Project, it was important to emphasize the peacebuilding work, the efforts that CR and stakeholders were leading in, to ensure that communities were given a voice, a platform etc in this space. We have added CR (TO and Pacicia) to the Consortium of Consultants*

*[UNDP Staff]*

In conversations with regional and international agencies, including the PIFS and UNDP, they recognized implementing partners' expertise and experience in the climate mobility and peacebuilding space. Across interviews key informants referred to the interest in engaging more actively and systematically with programme staff and Directors in participating in national and regional policy and dialogue spaces. Regional partners, such as PIFS and UNDP, are very keen to learn from the approaches used by CR and partners and use their expertise and rich learnings of the programme at all levels (community, CSO and policy) to feed into policy development processes, such as the Regional Climate Mobility Framework.

The Fiji Planned Relocation Guidelines in 2018, and the follow-up Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) document for Relocating Communities, are part of the Government of Fiji's long-term view for working with

*The development of the Regional Climate Mobility Framework is ongoing, and this is the best time for CR and partners to come in and have some meaningful input in this process, given their experience and expertise in this space, and especially the experience of already relocated communities and their lessons learned and rich knowledge that can inform policy processes. CR and partners have started to research and strengthen the link between climate change and peacebuilding work, including in informal settlements. This evidence can be critical in climate security risk assessments, and an entry point to emphasize the peacebuilding work, the efforts that CR and stakeholders were leading in, to ensure that communities were given a voice, a platform etc in this space.*

*[UNDP Staff]*



climate-change affected communities. Although the SOP is nearing finalization, pending Cabinet approval, it is a living document which can continue to adopt new lessons and findings, including from this programme. There is good evidence and results from the CR Project that can feed into, and inform the procedures for needs assessment consultations, how to engage with communities / stakeholders in the relocation space, how to reach consensus and make decisions when dealing with affected communities etc.

**FINDING 3.5: The proactive sharing of programme learnings (action-research) with the police, by PCP, has strengthened the police’s understanding of informal settlements, and informed the revision of community policing strategies for informal settlements.**

In informal settlements there are many different groups of people. There is diversity in terms of ethnicity, age, education background, interests, and values. In addition, there are no established leadership structures in the community or at local government level, particularly as compared to formal settlements. Whilst climate change has caused people to relocate to informal settlements, conflict is being driven by competition for scarce resources and limited access to services. Because there is no clear leadership in the community nor at local government level, conflicts are frequent.

The first responders to conflict in informal settlements are the police. However, there is little trust between the police and communities. By engaging the police, PCP has increased their knowledge of informal settlements, so they understand how and why conflicts arise in that context. Police have requested PCP to support them in developing their SOPs and reviewing the language used to write them.

*Through the proactive approach of our trusted partner PCP, the findings of the research were used in two trainings provided to the police by PCP, at both operational and strategic levels. Since then, the Police Commissioner has initiated work on updating outdated (1990s) police SOPs to reframe language used and encourage police to engage communities more sensitively.*

*[Fiji Police Staff]*

**FINDING 3.6: The importance of involving female police officers in supporting victims of GBV in informal settlements was, in part, identified through the programme.**

The COVID-19 pandemic has had gendered effects that hinder peacebuilding efforts. Women have experienced increased incidents of domestic violence during the pandemic, notably in urban contexts and informal settlements. PCP has been able to leverage its relationship with the police to share its knowledge of these gendered impacts and preference for engaging with female police officers, in ways that support discussion of conflicts with less fear, and with dignity.

**FINDING 3.7: Partners valued the approach to moderated dialogues (community advocacy events) which brought together community, development partners, local government, and national government. The dialogues helped to break down silos and improved understanding and knowledge across these groups.**

*PCP has continued to make connections between programmes, research and potential communities and individuals that can benefit from connecting. This has resulted in creating and increasing networks (e.g., forming networks of police officers, women officers, women, and then introducing them to each other to improve addressing the gender violence that goes unreported, particularly in remote communities where women rely on a male relative for assistance to go to a police station and report violence).*

*[Fiji Police Staff]*

The programme has supported the new dialogue spaces as well as new and innovative approaches to facilitation of these same dialogues. Women groups as well as youths have been given spaces to advocate on issues affecting them and climate change-related conflicts that they would like to see addressed. There have been several instances where women’s participation in learning events and community advocacy meetings has effectively raised community issues to relevant authorities including the divisional commissioner, provincial officials and police.

The community advocacy workshops brought together representatives from each of the three target communities to map out governance structures and analyse their climate change-related challenges and needs. The ability to bring representatives from the Government Northern Divisional Planning Officer, as well as representatives of MFAT and the EU to engage with community representatives in a dialogue was reflected by communities and the Fiji Government as successful. It was empowering for the communities to also hear from others who were also affected by climate-related relocation experiences. Sharing their capacity and knowledge allowed them to better prepare for their presentations to the government and funding and learning partner representatives.

*This was a safe space – we were able to articulate better our concerns and we prepared on how we would advocate these to the government teams and others that were coming to share with us. Also useful was the visual mapping of governance structures and “Forum Theatre”, where TO showed us how to practice negotiations with the government teams.*

*[Community Leader]*



## 2.4 SUSTAINABILITY

---

**To what extent has the programme established key partnerships with stakeholders necessary to facilitate the continuation of processes started by this intervention? (Ownership of programme objectives and outcomes); What's the degree of commitment/capacity of all stakeholders involved to maintain the outcomes of the programme?**

**FINDING 4.1: There programme has established critical partnerships to sustain future programming. The role of funding partners is critical in securing strategic partnerships as well as contributing to the learning environment for partners.**

Several of the programme's outcomes are likely to be sustainable over the long term, namely: improved ability of community leaders to manage local tensions and conflicts arising from the impact of climate change and an experience of internal displacement; CSO's strengthened capacity to support communities in responding to challenges resulted from climate change and displacement related tensions and conflicts.

The broader and long-term contributions of the program to the prevention and management of conflicts arising from the impact of climate change and internal displacement are inherently difficult to measure due to the complexities involved in causal attribution. Women, youth and village leaders, do however report that the skills and knowledge acquired through the programme is actively contributing to peacebuilding efforts in their communities. This is through identifying and resolving conflicts, advocating with and engaging conflict parties in dialogue and mediation. Communities further report that they would continue utilising these skills in leading their communities.

Implementing partners have reflected that the programme has created various opportunities for communities, government, funding agencies, international organisations and academia to share experience and learnings as well as bring new perspectives into the "learning". The participation of MFAT and EU as funding and learning partners in Outcome Harvesting and Comparative Learning events was a positive reflection of the value-add they brought as development partners to the conversation.

**FINDING 4.2: There was progress in strengthening dialogue between the government and communities with the support of programme partners. The strengthened involvement and engagement with the Fiji Government is key, particularly given the planned relocation programme.**

Implementing partners and community leaders recognised the contribution of the programme to the participation of community leaders in the national Steering Committee on SOPs for relocation. At the same time, it is important to recognize that TO and PCP already had solid relationships with government institutions and international stakeholders (including with IOM and other international organisations like Toda Peace Institute) before the start of this programme. The intervention has come as an opportunity to strengthen these ones, in particular with authorities and institutions working specifically in the area of climate change and related impacts.

Interview respondents reported that, considering the consequences of climate-change displacement and related conflicts and tensions is a long-term issue that goes beyond relocation, there is a need to establish stable relationships and trust between communities and authorities, not only for understanding and dialogue, but towards a genuine commitment to follow up on the needs and challenges faced by communities after they have experienced relocation.

*“There is a sense that the relationships established between community leaders will influence long-term policy and actions post-relocation beyond the programme)”.*

*[CCIS Staff]*

In going forward, stronger relationships between communities, government, including various Ministries, and other local and international organisations will be required.

**FINDING 4.3: Funding partners, communities and implementing partners (TO and PCP) are committed to the programme objectives. However, sustainability will depend on the availability of resources and support. In addition, capacity to maintain outcomes varies across communities.**

Funding and learning partners, communities and implementing partners have invested significant resources to the existing programme through a challenging period. The three-year programme has built strong connections and established effective mechanisms for future engagement with community groups and the government. The first iteration of the programme, while innovative, has been exploratory in appealing to various stakeholder groups.

Without the support of funding agencies, communities will have limited ability to address conflict exacerbated by climate change leading to increased gender-based violence, increased poverty and instability of social governance structures. Community leaders and groups in informal settlements and rural communities envisage that a next phase will involve women empowerment programmes, income-generation and targeted support and training for people and families living with a disability.

With CR involvement, TO and PCP have gained valuable skills set in peacebuilding. This makes them important local partners for Fiji’s (and the Pacific) climate security efforts. Peacebuilding is a unique area for climate change. The climate crisis is evolving, and this programme has been timely in sensemaking for community leaders about its potential to maintain stability and keep communities united in the face of crises.

The programme has gained the attention of the Fiji Government and valued the involvement of community stakeholders in relocation efforts and national planning. Funding agencies are well-placed to use the programme to address national (Fiji’s Climate Change Policy) and regional efforts (Boe declaration).

*“The work of CR has complemented the work that the national government is doing. The dialogue with the communities and the rich insights that communities and informal settlements bring, provide a lot of good practice and lessons that are useful and critical to inform national planning”.*

*[CCICD, Ministry of Economy Staff]*

**FINDING 4.4: Robust partnerships with institutions like the police should be capitalized on.**

Implementing partner PCP has strong connections to civil society networks and through this programme, they effectively leveraged on the trust they had built with their partner networks and the trust with the communities, to engage meaningfully with the community groups.

The programme's engagement with the Fiji Police Force through the community policing unit has been mutually beneficial for implementing partners, informal settlements and the police. Similar synergies can be replicated with other valued stakeholders. There is potential to strengthen synergies between the work of peacebuilding actors, development agencies, and relevant local and national government agencies.

*"PCP is a highly valued and trusted partner, and we see them as a highly experienced NGO in the peacebuilding sector and has proven extensive experience working on violence with diverse communities".*

*[member of the Fiji Police]*

**FINDING 4.5: The sustainability of the programme depends on a combination of various factors specifically relevance, effectiveness, and resource availability; of these, resource availability and the capacity of implementing partners strategically accessing and managing funds may be most relevant.**

Key informants from implementing organisations reflected on the importance of being proactive and thinking strategically about how the programme fits into their work in the areas of climate-change related conflict, and what additional capacity is required to respond to the requirements of funding and learning partners. A funding source that assesses and approves this link from the outset, with annual reviews if needed, may assist programming.

# CHAPTER 3: LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 3.1 LESSONS LEARNED

The section below aims to provide detail on the key lessons learned during the programme.

**Climate-Related Mobility and Conflict Programming:** conflict prevention, conflict management and peacebuilding is a very long and ongoing process. It is also understood that some climate change mobility and conflict prevention funding is intended for testing innovative approaches. It may be that considerably more time is needed in contexts like Fiji, the Solomon Islands and PNG to build trusting relationships and partnerships, and to align to existing peace capacities in those countries. This may require doubling or even tripling the programme length to fully explore what is possible in conflict prevention in communities affected by climate displacement.

**The Pacific Climate Change Programme Design:** From the onset, programme design and planning should have involved the Government of Fiji more effectively. In addition, to ensure design and implementation plans are conducive of the dynamics of the communities, future planning for engagement should include people representing different community groups (women, youth, PLWD, etc.).

**Challenges in programme implementation:** The implementation of the programme was challenged by factors including change of persons' positions and new team members being recruited during the programme, especially within the CR team, and the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic that brought new challenges and caused delays in implementation, temporary cancellation of certain activities, and a need to shifting of activities and introducing new priority areas. Despite these, due to effective coordination and communication between stakeholders involved in implementation, the programme has been very flexible, and developed its internal strategies to respond to new circumstances. A challenge difficult to overcome was ensuring that, while responding flexibly to the new needs of communities as result of the pandemic, the programme remained focused on the prevention and management of conflicts emerging as result of climate change-related displacement.

*“(With COVID-19) We learned that we need to be proactive in adapting the work to possible disruptions by factors like this one”.*

*[CR staff]*

**Communities, CSOs and Government cannot work in isolation:** each has a role to play. Communities bring unique perspectives, skills, and a wealth of knowledge to the challenge of strengthening resilience and addressing climate change. Community leaders can set priorities, influence ownership, and design and implement programs that are responsive to their community's own needs. Civil Society organisations like TO and PCP have a central role to play in engaging and being the bridge between communities and government at all levels. In the absence of resources for systematically raising awareness, building capacities and creating an enabling framework for communities' engagement and policy change, the role of CSOs in building up their capacities and empowering them as active participants in decision making processes remains important. The complexity and scale of the social and political tensions exacerbated by climate change calls for knowledge sharing and coordinated efforts of all stakeholders.

**Participation of women and youth:** The promotion of women and youth participation in conflict preventions and peacebuilding processes progressively leads to empowerment and emancipation for both, women and men, especially those in leadership positions. In the rural communities where this programme has been implemented, women and youth have expressed the importance of the initiative.

## PROGRAMME STRENGTHS

The following key strengths and unintended factors contributing to the outcomes of the programme identified through the evaluation apply to each of the outcomes.

### Partnerships

#### **Partnerships with leading CSOs working in conflict prevention and management, and localization of the approach. CSOs' participatory approach to implementation.**

The relationship established between CR and Fijian partner organisations, TO and PCP, both Fijian CSOs experienced in conflict prevention and peacebuilding with communities, and with placing the needs and priorities of those affected at the centre of their approach, proved to be critical in achieving the programme outcomes, particularly Outcomes 1 and 2.

Moreover, the participatory approach of TO and PCP in working with these communities appeared to be crucial, not only for their engagement and motivation, but also in ensuring the ownership of the learning and utilization of knowledge and skills acquired through the programme.

The roles in the partnership are clear: local CSOs lead the work and CR supports and accompanies them in the process.

*“Our world views, Western and Pacific, often clash. We must work in the Pacific (or any other context) valuing the world view of the locals and not valuing one view above the other. Only then, when we go into the communities, we will be able to understand their needs and listen to the solutions they identify”.*

*[CR staff]*

#### **Programme partnerships were built on trust.**

The complementarity of respective partners was a major strength of this programme. MFAT, EU, CR, TO and PCP utilised their combined expertise, networks and knowledge base to progress programme outcomes. CR's international and regional expertise in advocacy and peacebuilding, TO and PCP's expertise in sustainable peace and preventing and transforming violence and conflict respectively, and MFAT and the EU for prioritising funding support and funding and learning partner insights to advance the agenda on peace building and climate change in communities. Partners did not work in silos, but rather sought to complement each other in the programme's implementation by participating in each other's trainings and sharing their specific expertise in the design and implementation of the intervention.

**Establishment of new partnerships, such as TO and IOM, and community members participating in the national working group for relocation SOPs.**

Bringing together a variety of stakeholders to activities in the programme by partners in implementation has opened the doors to unexpected new relationships, collaboration, and the establishment of formal partnerships between actors already working to support climate-displaced communities. The proactive establishment of new partnerships is work-in-progress. It has taken time, but initial results show that it is possible and should continue.

**Programme design**

**Programme design is adaptive, evidence-based, and community-led. It began without preconceived ideas and allowed the programme to evolve and reflect the reality of communities. Allows respectful relationships.**

The adaptive peacebuilding approach used in the design and implementation of this programme focused on processes rather than final outcomes and on the resilience of communities and national institutions. This appeared to be appropriate and well-received. It is suitable in working with communities in Fiji affected by climate-related conflicts. The programme progressively and actively engaged with other stakeholders, the Government of Fiji in particular.

How funding partners and implementing partners have embraced this adaptive approach, avoiding preconceived ideas and assumptions, allowing the programme to evolve, reflect and then continue, despite the time and resources that it entails, it has overall proven to be effective in generating an emergent understanding of the system as it evolves.

**Alignment with climate relocation and displacement priorities in Fiji.**

The programme aligns well with funding and learning partners' (EU and MFAT) and the Government of Fiji's strategies addressing climate mobility, which is considered crucial.

Interviews with key informants show that the programme is aligned with the existing Fiji government priorities on climate change and the intersection between climate change, security and displacement.

*“The work (of CR, TO and PCP) has complemented the work that the national government is doing. The dialogue with communities brings many good practices and lessons that are useful and critical to inform national conversations, and useful to complement the ongoing work of the government in developing guidance and frameworks”.*

*[Government staff]*

**Timely and relevant. Strong need for learning from the triple nexus of climate change, displacement and conflict management.**

Research is providing increasing evidence of how climate change amplifies and compounds existing sources of economic, social and political risks that drive violence, as well as the potential links between climate change, displacement and increased risk of conflict. However, there is a need for more practical evidence resulting from the implementation of programmes that link climate change, displacement and conflict that can pragmatically inform policy. In a context where climate change, displacement and therefore different forms of violence and conflicts are expected to grow, there is a need to continue learning about the nexus.

The consultations with key informants in Solomon Islands and PNG also concluded that there is this strong need for learning from this triple nexus, particularly because of the challenges in connecting climate change-

displacement and conflict the triple connection between the three areas. Programmes that pragmatically address the issues arising from communities and contexts where all, climate change, displacement and conflict are a reality, and bring the learning from experience to inform policy, are necessary.

## PROGRAMME WEAKNESSES AND OTHER UNINTENDED FACTORS

### **Contextual challenge: conflict prevention and peacebuilding may not always be the top priority need of communities.**

In reflecting with communities about their concerns and main priorities, often conflict and tensions are the result of not being able to resolve or address their priority needs. Communities' priorities are linked to situations of poverty and lack of or limited access to livelihoods and basic infrastructure for living. Whilst the evaluation teams understood that implementing partners constantly made efforts to understand the connection and links between the sources of the tensions in the community, and basic needs, at the end of the day, their area of expertise is peacebuilding and conflict prevention, not on supporting communities with the other needs. In the future, there is a need to reflect on how to practically manage expectations and competing priorities, while maintaining focus on programme objectives.

### **Social inclusion: some community members did not feel included.**

The evaluation team found that inclusion of men, women and youth leaders (particularly male) in the programme across communities in Vanua Levu and informal settlements was a relevant contributing factor to the achievement of the outcomes, particularly outcome 1. However, evidence shows that inclusivity is not completely understood by CSOs and communities. Inclusivity goes beyond participation. It refers to the extent and way in which the views and needs of all groups and stakeholders are represented, heard and integrated into any space to build peace or resolve conflict<sup>6</sup>. Informants explained that in rural communities, reliance on traditional structures often means that traditionally excluded groups remain excluded from dialogue – this applied, for example, to parents of children with a disability who did not feel engaged in the programme or affected by the outcomes of the programme.

As expressed by several respondents, including those populations directly affected, not all community groups or persons meaningfully participated in the program. In rural communities, mothers of PLWD felt excluded and expressed that their experiences and the challenges they and their children face were not heard or incorporated. Participation of LGBTI persons was very limited or non-existent. Programme reports<sup>7</sup> show some involvement in activities in the action research in informal settlements and the television series around the impact of COVID-19 on different groups. While a specific mention or anecdotal participation of sexual and gender minorities in activities is a first step toward recognition and inclusion, it risks tokenistic or piecemeal responses that fail to genuinely involve them in participating in the programme.

While CR and implementing partners reported increased awareness of the need to integrate disability and sexual orientation and gender identity, there was still a need for guidance on how to practically integrate this into the programmes.

<sup>6</sup> UN Security Council, Peacebuilding in the aftermath of conflict: report of the Secretary-General, 8 October 2012, A/67/499-S/2012/746, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/50Bfd382.html>

<sup>7</sup> Building Peace in Climate Change-affected Communities 2021 Annual Report; Building Peace in Climate Change-affected Communities 6-month Interim Report: January – June 2022; Justpeace Talanoa Bure @COVID19 episode 4.



**Reporting mechanisms do not allow capture of the richness of the knowledge produced, and the detailed processes involved in the life of the programme.**

Implementing and funding partners all reported that whereas the reporting system is useful for accountability and transparency purposes, it is not efficient to capture the richness of the knowledge and learning produced, particularly considering the adaptive approach and consequent need to understand how the programme evolves and what changes are required to move towards positive outcomes. The standard reporting system of regular narrative and financial reports does seem to be insufficient to inform decision-making and overall impact. Key informants shared that additional informal reporting in form of ‘Talanoa’ is useful, but also time consuming and not always possible.

**Strategic communication and dissemination of learnings, and the capacity to inform policy.**

CR’s increasing participation in various regional and international forum and processes has allowed for more opportunities to share and disseminate the experience and learnings of the programme and contribute to growing knowledge on climate change displacement and conflict. Respondents indicated that the strategy to communicate and disseminate the wealth of evidence efficiently remains frail,

In 2022, CR developed an advocacy strategy to influence responses to the climate change- conflict nexus in the Pacific. Whilst the strategy is an important first step, a more detailed analysis and contextually appropriate advocacy strategy could be developed identifying the actors with the power to change policy and those able to influence policymakers, reflecting on which strategies help produce most change, focusing on specific institutions and wider contextual trends, and learning how to frame and communicate the evidence from programme activities and research not only on completion, but strategically at the right time.

## 3.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The following recommendations are based on insights generated during data collection and informed by evaluation findings. They are intended to support the learning and development of CR and implementing partners, and guide CR, TO, PCP, Fiji Government, and funding partners MFAT and EU to strengthen future strategy and programming.

### To CR, TO and PCP

**Recommendation 1: high priority:** Continue to strengthen collaboration between implementing partners and create spaces for TO and PCP to jointly advocate for the work in climate displacement and conflict, nationally and internationally.

**Recommendation 2: high priority:** Develop an effective communication strategy for communicating the (evidence and resources) resulting from the work on climate change-displacement and conflict. Noting the success to date in implementing an innovative programme like this one, develop an effective strategy for communicating the evidence and practical resources that can be used by others in Fiji and globally. Consider, for example, involving and training local media experts and journalists in the programme.

**Recommendation 3: high priority:** Strengthen monitoring activities around climate change displacement, conflict outcomes and causality. This could include regular surveys on conflict and causality for relevant groups targeted at outcome level e.g. community leaders, government authorities. Other activities could include talanoa / dialogue events to articulate climate-change impacts in relation to conflicts being experienced.

**Recommendation 4: medium priority:** Explore more formal collaboration/partnerships with other actors (INGOs and local CSOs) that could support and address other needs and issues of target communities. Explore the idea of establishing consortiums to maximize collaboration with other organisations or having a referral system where communities can be referred to specialized organisations that may deliver a particular service identified as a need by communities.

**Recommendation 5: high priority:** Develop CR and implementing partners' organisational and staff capacity to address the rights, needs and strengths of people with disability and diverse Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, Gender Expression and Sex Characteristics (SOGIESC) in climate change-displacement and conflict programmes.

**Recommendation 6: medium priority:** Proactively engage in national and regional policy dialogue spaces to enhance the sharing of learnings and best practice with other partners and processes that are informing national and regional policy. Some opportunities include engagement in PIF-convened governance and technical forums, and the Steering Committee on Fiji's Planned Relocation Programme.

**Recommendation 7: low priority:** Continue to support community leaders (of relocated communities) to engage in national processes like the development and review of the Standard Operating Procedures for Planned Relocations.

### To MFAT and EU

**Recommendation 8: medium priority:** Consider investing in longer-term programming to fully explore what is possible in realizing sustainable outcomes in conflict prevention in climate displaced affected communities. Noting conflict prevention and peacebuilding is a long-term process, this type of innovative and relationship, trust and partnerships-based work requires time.

### To CR and MFAT

**Recommendation 9: high priority:** Strengthen the learning partnership with MFAT, including through regular dialogue on progress at the outcome level and expectations, particularly in relation to the link between climate change and conflict. This is especially important in a programme that is adaptively managed.

### To CR, TO and PCP, MFAT and EU

**Recommendation 10: medium priority:** In addition to thematic specific funding support, explore other funding opportunities, including direct in-country funding specific for CSO-led programmes.

**Recommendation 11: high priority:** Ensure the programme design (objectives, expected outcomes) is realistic with the timeframe and budget, and considerate of implementing partners' capacity to execute and manage other programmes.

**Recommendation 12: high priority:** Strengthen reporting systems to improve communication of the richness of program progress, including to funding and learning partners. This should be an annual process in addition to Outcomes Harvesting processes.

### To CR, TO, PCP

**Recommendation 13: low priority:** In identifying programme goals and objectives, ensure strategic fit with Fiji Government's priorities where they are consistent with climate affected communities' needs. Consultation with government teams spearheading the "Fiji Planned Relocation Programme" is a good entry point for discussions around alignment and strategic fit etc.

**Recommendation 14: low priority:** Expand dialogue forums between government and communities to strengthen the rich exchange of information and best practice related to climate change, mobility, and conflict prevention/management.

## WHAT SHOULD BE WOUND DOWN, MAINTAINED, EXPANDED?

The following recommendations are informed by the evaluation findings and capture what key informants considered important aspects of the program to be wound down, maintained, or expanded.

During consultations with all stakeholders, **no specific aspects of the programme were identified as needed to be wound down or discontinued.** Everyone acknowledges that this is a work-in-progress, and some areas, particularly around outcome 3 (community perceptions and concerns about conflict impacts are captured and contribute to knowledge in national, regional and international climate change policy-making arenas) need to be strengthened.

### Aspects of the programme that should be maintained:

- **Working with partners who have strong expertise and relationships with various stakeholders.** Continue working with the implementing partners focusing each on their area of expertise, TO working with rural Indigenous communities, and PCP in informal settlements and multi-ethnic communities.
- **Adaptive, evidence-based and localized approach to programming, led by community priorities and aligned with government processes/systems.**
- **Strong and trusted relationships between partners (in implementation and funding) as a foundation.**

### Aspects of the programme that should be expanded:

- **Scale up interventions with communities being relevant and appropriate to the context** (even more so considering the planned relocation of more communities and increasing population displacement to informal settlements).
- **Capitalize on engagement with national policy machinery** to strengthen influence as opportunity arises.
- Further **connect communities with government processes and people.**
- **Linkages with other actors** (INGO, CSO, etc.) to whom communities could be referred to for assistance to address other priority needs.
- **Understanding and practically approaching inclusion** by strengthening partnerships with other organisations specialized in working with specific groups (e.g., LGBTI, PLWD).
- **Consider expanding the gender lens** to better understand the different experiences of women, men, boys and girls, in the context of climate change displacement and conflict.
- **Targeting ‘youth’** as a key stakeholder in conflict management and prevention.
- **Dialogue forums bringing together government and communities** in the same space and explore potential for these in informal settlements.

**Recommendation 16: high priority:** Strategically strengthen relationships with and within government beyond existing relationships. Engage early with new government officials and understand where climate change and mobility will be placed and who are the actors relevant to engage with. Enhance partnerships with

influential international actors such as IOM and GIZ, as a bridge to engaging and influencing the national government.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PNG AND SOLOMON ISLANDS

The following key recommendations are informed by the interviews conducted with four key informants with expertise and knowledge of PNG and Solomon Islands, as per a list of relevant stakeholders in both countries provided by CR. The interviews conducted with two members of the CR team in the broader context of the evaluation, also informed the following recommendations.

### Solomon Islands

Although the direct link between climate change and conflict is not obvious, there is a growing recognition that the impacts of climate change are intensifying existing conflict drivers in Solomon Islands. The conflict drivers include among others:

1. Governance challenges, which besides having a direct impact on any programmes implemented, affects the development of close relationships, crucial in working in this and other contexts in the Pacific, but also potentially the continuity of relationships established with key stakeholders in government, in a context of continuous turnover.
2. The management of land and state-community relations.
3. Conflict legacies and intergenerational trauma.

In addition, with the physical environment rapidly changing as a consequence of climate change, the potential loss of land and other resources is generating conditions for conflict. There are communities that are already facing issues related to climate change, including as result of the rise of sea levels and food insecurity. Since atoll communities depend entirely on island ecosystems for their livelihoods, climate change poses serious socio-economic and environmental challenges for them, making it very difficult for atoll dwellers to sustain their livelihoods. Such an adaptation measure has the potential to pose a conflict risk between islander populations. For example, the rising pattern of climate-induced migration from Malaita to Guadalcanal, is causing significant inter-ethnic conflict in Solomon Islands. Also, considering how migration is already resulting in community-led reallocation, issues over land rights for settlements and food cultivation start creating conflict with landowners and these are likely to increase in the near future. The government, aware of the situation is considering relocating people to bigger islands like Malaita, where a relevant challenge is finding land where communities can be relocated. However, communities are refusing this alternative as the option is areas located in the bush and away from the coast.

Despite all these challenges, the context also offers opportunities. Continuing with programme objectives in SI, if done cautiously and realistic in its ambition, collaboratively and through local partners, it will be beneficial for the Solomon Islands Government and all stakeholders to understand how climate change relates to conflict and peace issues, including for policymaking. It may also provide CR and partners (MFAT, implementing partners, government, churches, etc.) the opportunity to better understand the connection between climate change, internal displacement and migration patterns, but also other driving forces (e.g., loss of livelihood) that may be exacerbated by climate change, like the continuing pressure of urban expansion of informal settlements on peri-urban areas, particularly around Honiara.

In expanding to SI, it is important to consider the high cost of living and operating in SI, particularly knowing that working in peacebuilding and conflict resolution is a long-term commitment and investment.

## Papua New Guinea

In the case of PNG, with approximately seven million inhabitants (by far the biggest population among the Pacific Islands countries), potential conflict drivers include, among others,

- governance challenges,
- the consultation process for the outcome on Bougainville's referendum,
- rural-urban migration,
- policing and community security,
- increasing disputes over land management

The Autonomous Region of Bougainville in PNG is particularly affected by environmental degradation, coastal erosion and food and water insecurity. The Autonomous Bougainville Government did make a few relocation attempts in 1984 and 1997. In 2007, the former Council of Elders (now replaced by the Community Government structure) created a local NGO named Tulele Peisa ("Sailing the waves on our own") with the objective of overcoming the state's limited capacity and inability to manage successful climate change mitigation and relocation programmes.

At present, the main patterns of internal displacement/migration are, in summary:

- Planned community relocation, organised by Tulele Peisa, trying to support people from the Bougainville Atolls to settle on mainland Bougainville, in the coastal parts of Tinuput district in north Bougainville.
- Family-led "informal migration" (relocation) to major urban centres creating a form of diaspora in places like Buka.

Each movement brings different types of challenges, tensions, and potential conflicts. So far, only planned relocation has been given attention.

Although there is no existing policy framework that specifically deals with people displaced by climate change, at present, the governments of PNG and Bougainville are showing an increased commitment to organise and fund relocation, including the identification of potential sites for relocation in the context of a government program. In aiming at broadening the Programme, it would be important to understand more in depth where this process is at, who are the stakeholders involved, and whether any concrete plans have been developed.

It would also be important to conduct an analysis of the local governance structures and conflict resolution mechanisms in coastal communities affected and possibly targeted for future relocation. In the case of Bougainville, it would be important to understand how climate change related risks intersect with existing conflict dynamics including unresolved division from the Bougainville crisis and state and nation building processes.

Identifying CSOs already well established, trusted by these communities and people affected, it would be important. CR, TO and PCP could collaboratively adapt and introduce to local PNG CSOs the community-based conflict analysis and other tools that may be useful in identifying and understanding the needs.

Although the work in the areas of conflict-climate change-displacement is not as advanced in PNG as it is in Fiji, the need to better understand and support local actors in this area is clear. However, if deciding to start this work in PNG, it would be crucial to have a long-term horizon.

## ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1: ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS, EVALUATION PRINCIPLES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE.

The evaluation was planned and conducted in accordance with the Principles and Guidelines for Ethical Research and Evaluation in Development<sup>8</sup>. This includes giving appropriate consideration to:

- **Informed consent:** All participants in consultations were provided with a verbal overview of why they were being consulted, how the information would be used and that their participation was voluntary prior to the consultation. Consultations were only undertaken once verbal consent was obtained.
- **Privacy, confidentiality, and risk of harm:** The identity of any program beneficiaries involved in the evaluation will be protected. Key informants in professional roles are referred to by their position title in the report where explicit consent has been obtained; otherwise, they will be referred to as a representative of the organisation they work with.

The evaluation design has taken into consideration the potential of harm to the participants, the evaluation team, and the wider community. The harm can range from physical, resource loss (including time), emotional, and reputational. When considering the potential for harm, the approach was considered in descending order, to eliminate, isolate, and minimize the risk, with the participants being fully informed on what the risks are and planning any steps accordingly.

#### **Evaluation principles**

To maximize the use and ownership of findings by CR and its implementing partners (TO and PCP), government partners, civil society partners and other key stakeholders, the evaluation was underpinned by the following principles:

- **Utilisation-focused:** Keeping a line of sight to the key users of the evaluation and their knowledge needs to ensure the evaluation serves its original purposes.
- **Strengths-based:** Identifying what has worked well and why and focusing on how to build on these strengths to overcome any challenges encountered.
- **Participatory:** Key Stakeholders were involved and consulted throughout the evaluation. They were briefed on preliminary findings and invited to help shape recommendations.
- **Inclusive:** How projects and programs have sought to address, and their impact on, gender equity and social inclusion was considered.
- **Learning-orientated:** The evaluation sought to identify why particular outcomes were achieved (or not), and what can be learned from experiences to inform future programming.

#### **Quality Assurance**

The members of the evaluation team, based in Fiji and Australia, remained in close contact with each other and with CR throughout the evaluation. CR input was welcomed at all stages of the evaluation process and, where needed, meetings were held to discuss progress or issues.

Alinea quality assurance team provided a sounding board for the team throughout the evaluation, anticipating and navigating challenges, and provided quality assurance on deliverables, including the evaluation report.

<sup>8</sup> ACFID, 2017, Principles and Guidelines for ethical research and evaluation in development, available at: [https://rdinetwork.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/G2321\\_ACFID-RDI\\_PG2017\\_WEB\\_compressed.pdf](https://rdinetwork.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/G2321_ACFID-RDI_PG2017_WEB_compressed.pdf)



## ANNEX 2: EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Key Evaluation Question	Evidence/information required	Data sources	Data collection and analysis approach
<p><b>1. Outcome 1</b></p> <p><b>1.1</b> Has the programme improved community leaders' ability to manage local tensions/conflicts related to climate change?</p> <p><b>1.2</b> How has the programme improved community leaders' ability to manage local tensions/conflicts related to climate change?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Documented theory of change</li> <li>▪ Information on subsequent changes</li> <li>▪ Information on program context</li> <li>▪ Examples on how community leaders were able to manage local tensions and conflicts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme design documents</li> <li>▪ Draft Theory of Change</li> <li>▪ Programme progress reports and outcome harvesting</li> <li>▪ JustPeace Talanoa Bure @ COVID-19 (tv show)</li> <li>▪ Draft advocacy strategy, communications, and community policy briefs</li> <li>▪ Climate change story database analysis</li> <li>▪ Case studies - database</li> <li>▪ Key stakeholders (programme managers &amp; collaborating partners)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Desk review of available documents.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with key stakeholders (community leaders, community members, programme staff)</li> <li>▪ Focus group discussions with gender and age disaggregated community groups</li> <li>▪ Thematic analysis of findings from different sources</li> <li>▪ Sense-making workshops with PCP, TO , CR and community groups (respondents)</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Outcome 2:</b></p> <p><b>2.1</b> To what extent has the programme strengthened Fijian civil society organisations' capacities to support communities in responding to challenges resulting from climate change-related conflict?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Identification of types, delivery processes, and outputs of technical support and capacity building provided in the frame of the programme</li> <li>▪ Evidence of how the capacity strengthening have been used to support effective response to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Programme design documents</li> <li>▪ Programme progress reports</li> <li>▪ Programme progress reports (including narrative reports from</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Desk review of available documents.</li> <li>▪ Interviews with key stakeholders (community leaders, TO programme staff and PCP research team)</li> </ul>



<p><b>2.2</b> How has the programme strengthened Fijian civil society organisations' capacities to support communities in responding to challenges resulting from climate change-related conflict?</p>	<p>challenges resulting from climate change-related conflict</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data on Fijian civil society organisations' key personnel benefiting from technical support and capacity building provided by CR and partner (Toda Peace Institute).</li> </ul>	<p>TO and PCP) and outcome harvesting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus group discussion with programme staff</li> <li>Triangulation of findings from different sources</li> <li>Sense-making workshop with PCP, TO and CR</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Outcome 3:</b></p> <p><b>3.1</b> To what extent has the programme improved understanding and knowledge of diverse Pacific perspectives and experiences of climate change-related conflict and challenges associated?</p> <p><b>3.2</b> What groups has the programme reached?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documented theory of change</li> <li>Information on subsequent changes</li> <li>Information on program context</li> <li>Perspectives of programme staff</li> <li>Perspectives of donors</li> <li>Perspectives of programme partners (churches, regional CSOs)</li> <li>Perspectives of Fijian Government authorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme design documents</li> <li>Programme progress reports</li> <li>Programme publications</li> <li>Actor mapping</li> <li>Draft Advocacy Strategy</li> <li>Climate change story database analysis</li> <li>Case studies - database</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Desk review of available documents.</li> <li>Interviews with key stakeholders (i.e., churches, community groups, regional CSOs)</li> <li>Focus group discussions with programme staff</li> <li>Triangulation of findings from different sources</li> <li>Sense-making workshop with Donors, Fijian Government, CR</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Strengths &amp; weaknesses:</b></p> <p><b>4.1</b> What are the programme's strengths that contributed to specific outcomes?</p> <p><b>4.2</b> What are the unintended factors (positive and negative) that have contributed to the outcomes of the programme?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perspectives of programme beneficiaries/participants and other stakeholders on the benefits of the Program</li> <li>Perspectives of beneficiaries/participants and key stakeholders on ways to address the identified gaps and increase positive impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme progress reports</li> <li>CR's internal Outcome Harvesting analysis workshops 2021</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with key stakeholders</li> <li>Focus group discussions with programme staff</li> <li>Triangulation of findings from different sources</li> <li>Sense-making workshops</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of unintended effects when comparing data collected with the programme design.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5. Sustainability:</b></p> <p><b>5.1</b> To what extent has the programme established key partnerships with stakeholders necessary to facilitate the continuation of processes started by this intervention? (Ownership of programme objectives and outcomes)</p> <p><b>5.2</b> What's the degree of commitment/capacity of all stakeholders involved to maintain the outcomes of the programme?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Information on program context</li> <li>Perspectives of community leaders, community members</li> <li>Perspectives of government authorities, other CSOs working in the thematic areas of the programme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme design documents</li> <li>Programme progress reports (and narrative reports from TO and PCP to CR)</li> <li>Key stakeholders (programme managers &amp; collaborating partners)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with key stakeholders (implementing partners, CR, MFAT, EU)</li> <li>Focus group discussions with key stakeholders (implementing partners, CR, MFAT, EU)</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Future strategy and programming:</b></p> <p><b>6.1</b> What aspects of the programme should be wound down?</p> <p><b>6.2</b> What aspects of the programme should be maintained?</p> <p><b>6.3</b> What aspects of the programme should be expanded (developed further)? (In consistent with CR values in peacebuilding)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perspectives of beneficiaries and community actors on areas for improvement of the Program</li> <li>Perspectives of key stakeholders (i.e., CR and partners, MFAT, EU, other INGOs and local CSOs, programme staff in implementation and research)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key development partners' strategies in country</li> <li>Fijian National strategies, frameworks and plans related to climate induced mobility, climate change and adaptability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with key stakeholders</li> <li>Focus group discussions with programme staff</li> <li>Triangulation of findings from different sources</li> <li>Sense-making workshops with CR, TO, PCP and MFAT, EU, Government and TO</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 3: DETAILED METHODOLOGY

---

**The point of departure for the development of the methodology for this evaluation was the evaluation questions proposed in ToR covering questions and sub-questions related to programme outcomes, and criteria of partnership, inclusivity and sustainability.**

An evaluation framework was developed based on the evaluation questions following a collaborative revision of these ones between the evaluation team, CR and partners during the inception phase. The framework provided overall guidance for the evaluation and ensured a systematic approach. For each evaluation question information required, sources and data collection tools were identified. The tools included qualitative tools: document analysis, interviews, FGDs and observation (see Annex 5 for details). The different tools applied were used to triangulate and validate data in order to provide as accurate a picture of the program as possible.

**The evaluation consisted of 4 main phases:**

- Inception and desk review phase with analysis of intervention logic, development of evaluation framework and methodology, detailed analysis of documents, initial meetings with CR and partners (donors and CSOs in Fiji), and preparation for the field missions.
- Field phase with collection of data in Fiji.
- Sense-making workshops to share insights and understanding of evaluation findings, and to explore feasible recommendations.
- Report writing.

The evaluation was conducted by a team of Alinea International consultants composed of 2 national experts, and 1 international expert. The national consultants provided background/context-specific information with the added value of one of them speaking fluently I-Taukei. All three consultants were female.

All the data was collected between December 2022 and January 2023. Fieldwork was conducted in communities in Vanua Levu between 1-23 December 2022, and 6-11 January 2023 in Suva.

### **Evaluation tools**

The evaluation tools consisted of a document review, semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and on-site observation, as described in more detail below.

#### **📄 Document review**

After having access to the folder of documents related to the program prepared by CR, and to a table with the details about each document, as well as its relevance in the answer to each evaluation question, the evaluation team conducted a desk review of all the documents to understand the situational and programmatic context. The evaluation team developed an analysis matrix, organizing desk review findings by document source, mapping them against each evaluation question. This matrix allowed the evaluation team to highlight gaps in the literature that could be further probed during data collection. The evaluation team also utilized the desk review findings to inform the data collection guides (Annex 5) and as a source of triangulation for primary qualitative data collected during fieldwork.

#### **📄 Semi-structured interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a wide range of informants. Included were:

- Programme donors: EU staff, MFAT staff at HQ and country level (Fiji and SI),
- Implementing partners' staff in Australia and Fiji (CR, TO, PCP)
- Government officials (national and local level)
- Fiji Police
- Community leaders and mothers of PLWD
- International organisations (PIFS, UNDP)
- Context experts SI and PNG

“Purposive sampling” was used to identify interview participants. This approach allowed the evaluation team, with guidance from CR, TO and PCP to subjectively consider and identify specific organisations and individuals best positioned to opine on the evaluation questions.

**Selection Bias:** Given the purposive nature of the selection of informants and participants in the FGD and the coordination support provided by the implementing partners, there is some risk that the evaluation team was guided toward key informants that had favourable experiences of the programme or others were excluded.

The interviews were conducted either face-to-face or virtually using interview guides initially designed in English and translated in I-Taukei where necessary. The guides served as a reminder of the interview topics and ensured conformity when interviews were conducted by different evaluation team members. The questions were not phrased exactly as in the guides but adapted to the specific interview, and the sequence of the questions also varied according to the flow of the interview. Different interview guides were developed for different categories of interviewees. The interview guides are included in Annex 5.

33 interviews (21 women; 12 men) were conducted during the evaluation. Interviewees were requested for their consent to record the interview for the purpose of the evaluation and being assured confidentiality, reason the list included here does not provide identifiable details.

### **Focus Group Discussions**

7 FGDs were held with 21 participants in total (19 women; 2 men), including with women and youth in the communities of Vunidogoloa and Naviavia, in the island of Vanua Levu; and in the informal settlements of Nanuku, Maravu and Qauia in Suva.

Participants in the FGD were identified by community leaders and implementing partners based on their participation in activities in the programme, and availability.

Similarly, to the interview informants, participants were assured confidentiality and their consent was requested to participate and be recorded prior to the discussion taking place. To guide the discussion, the FGD were facilitated using the FGD guides included in Annex 5. FGD guides were initially designed in English and translated in I-Taukei. The discussions were facilitated and recorded in I-Taukei, and transcripts produced in English.

As previously indicated, due to the purposive selection of participants from the communities in the FGD, certain groups were not included and their voices have not informed this evaluation or, if so, only anecdotally (i.e., people living with a disability and LGBTI persons).

### **Observation**

Direct observation could be done by the local evaluation team in Vunidogoloa. Observations were used to validate information on the use of the community space for dialogue built with the support

of TO under another programme, and the two toilets located behind the community hall built under this programme.

### **Data analysis**

The evaluation team systematically analysed the qualitative data. During fieldwork, they took KII notes and, where informed consent was given, interviews and FGD were recorded. Daily, the data was extracted and coded in a Microsoft Excel-based coding structure, organized by evaluation question and sub-question. Recordings in I-Taukei had to be translated in English for extraction in the table, prior to coding. The data extracted was disaggregated by stakeholder type, respondent gender and location to capture divergences. Particular attention was given to other unexpected themes not captured in the evaluation questions that could arise from the data.

The content analysis was augmented with constant comparative analysis. Information from the desk review, interviews and FGD was integrated to facilitate comparisons and identify common trends connected to the evaluation questions.

### **Sense-making**

Two two-hour sense-making workshops (one with each implementing partner, TO and PCP respectively due to the distinct geographical areas of intervention and nature of their interventions) were conducted on 23 January 2023 as an exercise to present and discuss the relevance and applicability of the evaluation findings, provide an opportunity for stakeholders to identify any problems of ambiguity, resolve any misunderstandings, and suggest possible recommendations for future strategy and programming.

Due to the limited duration of the sessions, there was no time to discuss the recommendations suggested by the evaluation team, included in this report. Therefore, the list of recommendations included in Chapter 3 of this report constitutes an exhaustive list of recommendations to be discussed and validated among stakeholders.

## ANNEX 4: STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

### Key Informant Interviews

Institution/Community	Stakeholder Type	Gender	
		F	M
MFAT HQ	Donor	3	
MFAT Suva	Donor		1
MFAT Honiara	Donor	1	
EU Suva	Donor	1	
Dignity Pasifik	CSO SI-Thematic expert	1	
Ministry of Economy - Climate Change and International Cooperation Division	Government	1	
Fiji Police Force	Government		1
District Council of Social Services	Government	1	
Live & Learn	CSO SI-Thematic expert	1	
PaCSIA	INGO-Thematic expert		1
CR HQ	INGO-Implementing partner	2	1
CR Fiji	INGO-Implementing partner	1	
TO	Fiji CSO-Implementing partner		1
PCP	Fiji CSO-Implementing partner	4	3
The Pacific Islands Forum	Regional inter-governmental organization	1	1
UNDP	UN Agency	1	
Village Head	Community	1	2
District chief	Community		1
Mother of PLWD	Community	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>21</b>	<b>12</b>
		<b>33</b>	

### Focus Group Discussions

Gr0up	Community/informal settlement	Gender		
		M	F	Othe r
Women	Vunidogoloa		2	
	Naviavia		5	
	Nanuku		2	
	Maravu	1	2	
	Qauia		2	
Youth	Vunidogoloa		4	
	Maravu	1	2	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>
		<b>21</b>		

## ANNEX 5: INTERVIEW AND FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDES

---

### **DONORS**

1. Could you please introduce yourself, the organisation, and your role in the organisation?
2. How is your role in EU/MFAT related to the project ‘Strengthening the role of Civil Society and Climate Change and JustPeace Communities in Fiji’ (EU) / ‘Building Peace in Climate Change-affected Communities’ (MFAT)
3. How does the project align to EU/MFAT strategy on climate change mobility and conflict prevention and peacebuilding in Fiji specifically?
4. In your view, what is the strategic fit of the project with the Government of Fiji?
5. How does the project complements and fits with other EU/MFAT projects in Fiji? What about in the Pacific region? Have linkages or partnership(s) established between the different projects in this thematic area established at country level?
6. In your view, how well have been different beneficiary groups priorities incorporated into this project (civil society organisations, communities, government -local and national-)?
7. Considering the results achieved so far, do you think the project design was realistic?
8. What are in your opinion the strong elements of this programme design?
9. How have inclusivity issues been addressed in the project design and during implementation?
10. What is one thing you would you improve in the design of this project, if you could?
11. To what extent do you think the expected outcomes are likely to be achieved?
12. How do you think this project has benefited the different beneficiary groups (civil society, community leaders and groups, local government in particular)?
13. What are the changes, if any, that you have observed regarding relationships between the Government of Fiji (local and national) and project implementing organisations (TO, PCP)? Any changes regarding strengthen relationship between international organisations (e.g. IOM) and civil society organisations (PCP, TO)?
14. In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the project have the greatest achievements you think? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
15. Are there any unintended outcomes of the project that you are aware off?
16. Is the management and governance arrangement of the project adequate? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all stakeholders involved?
17. How effectively have TO/PCP/CR monitored project performance and outcomes? Is a monitoring & evaluation system in place and how effective is it? Is relevant information systematically collected and collated? Is the data disaggregated by gender, age?
18. In your opinion, are all relevant stakeholders involved in an appropriate and sufficient manner?
19. Have you observed progress in local partners’ capacity (TO and PCP) to carry forward the project and is there a growing sense of ownership (at community and national level)?
20. Are there any aspects of the project that you think could be adapted with modifications to other contexts in the region?



21. Looking into the future, what is EU/MFAT strategy in working with/through civil society in the areas of climate-change mobility and social cohesion in Fiji?
22. What should have been different, and should be avoided in a similar project?
23. What good practices can be learned from the project that you would like to see maintained in a similar project on the same theme?

### **MFAT PNG & SI**

1. Could you please introduce yourself and your role in MFAT SI/PNG?
2. Could you briefly explain the nexus between climate change, conflict and displacement/migration in the context of SI/PNG?
3. What are the priorities of MFAT in the areas of climate displacement and conflict in the SI? (*prompt: who are main partners? who should be prioritized in the support: communities?*)
4. Is MFAT currently funding any intervention(s) in SI/PNG working with communities affected by displacement-conflict-climate change?
5. Who do you see as key existing partners in advancing those priorities in the SI/PNG? (*prompt: government, civil society, etc.*)
6. Do you see an added value on working with INGOs and local civil society organisations in supporting communities facing challenges related with climate change displacement and conflict in the SI/PNG?
7. How familiar are you with the programme funded by MFAT in Fiji ‘Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities’, implemented by CR in partnership with TO and PCP?

### **COMMUNITIES**

**Target Key Informants:** Community Leaders, Community Groups (women, youth, persons living with disabilities, LGBTI persons), church leaders.

Remember to:

- Introduce the team and our purpose – take special care not to raise expectations.
- Thank people for making time to participate in the interview/group discussion and share information.
- Seek their consent (to participate and be recorded)
- Reassure the group that information shared during the discussion will not be attributed to any one individual.
- At the end, thank people for their time and remind them that no comments will be linked with individuals.

#### Community Leaders

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your role in the community.
2. In your view, what are the main issues worrying community members?
3. Are there other organisations supporting your community in addressing those issues
4. What challenges do you face in your role in the community?
5. How do community members raise and share their main concerns? Do they raise them with you in particular or with someone else? Who with?

6. How different are things now here as compared to before (relocation)?
7. How has your role helped your people manage the challenges?
8. Have the activities (training, workshops) in which you have participated supported you in your role as community leader? How did they help?
9. Have you changed the way you communicate and engage with the different groups of people in your community? How? Which groups in particular?
10. Have there been opportunities to share the priorities and needs of the community with local authorities? With whom in particular? Was that a unique occasion or a regular space for sharing?
11. Have the training activities facilitated by TO allowed you to advocate with confidence on behalf of your community with local Government (Roko Tui, District Officer)?
12. Have you observed an increased interest in local government to support your community with some of the challenges previously discussed?
13. (Question specific to leader(s) of Naviavia) Has this project have any negative impact or worsen existing tensions/conflict in the community?
14. Overall, how relevant were the activities of this project to support you in your role?
15. How do you think a project like this could further support you in your role in future?

Final question: Are there any other issues relating to the Programme that you would like to mention that we have not covered?

## **LOCAL AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITIES**

**Target Key Informants:** Climate Change and International Cooperation Division (CCICD) of the Ministry of Economy; Fiji Police; TO- Local government (Roko Tui Cakaudrove); Divisional Planning Officer Northern; PCP-District Officer in Suva (Roko Tui Rewa); District Council of Social Services (DCOSS) Lami

### **A. About the institution and the respondent**

1. What is your position in this [Office/Division/Department/Council]?
2. Can you briefly describe how your role in particular engages with communities affected by climate change?

### **B. Understanding of the needs/challenges of climate vulnerable communities**

3. In your view, what are some of the crucial concerns and needs of communities affected by climate change?

### **C. Communication/relationships/Engagement within Government structures and with/to communities**

4. [Question for Central Government] How would you describe/explain the roles of the different levels of Government regarding decision-making around climate change in communities particularly affected?
5. [Question for Central Government] How does the Dpt./Division relate/ communicate with local government to identify and address the issues affecting communities affected by climate change?

In your opinion, how do you think this could be improved?

6. [Question for Central Government] What do you feel would be the best approach to engage and consult with specific communities?
7. [Question for Central Government] Could you please talk about existing governance mechanism or processes to engage communities in decision-making around issues that affect them regarding climate change?
8. [Question for local Government] What has been your office's experience in relating/communicating with [NDMO? CCICD?] to discuss and address the effects of climate change in your communities? How do you think these could be improved?
9. [Question for local Government] Can you describe existing processes or initiatives for consultation with communities regarding their concerns, challenges and needs to be able to respond to climate change? How do you think these could be improved?
10. [Question for local Government] Could you please share your experience participating in dialogue directly with communities?

## **IMPLEMENTING ORGANISATIONS**

**Target Key Informants:** Conciliation Resources; Transcend Oceania; Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your role in the organisation?
2. Can you briefly describe what is your role in this particular programme 'Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities' and how it has evolved over time?  
*(Prompts: Encourage the key informant to briefly describe the activities that they specifically were responsible for or actively participated in).*

### Transcend Oceania & Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding

3. What issues has this programme tried to address?
4. How were the communities involved / engaged in identifying the issues?
5. Please describe the evolution in the programme's design, from its inception to the end, and the contextual and other factors that necessitated any changes. In retrospect, how useful do you think these changes were in reaching the outcomes (and overall objective)?
6. What role did TO/PCP play and what factors went into its design?
7. What challenges did the programme and how were they managed? What lessons did the programme learn through this process? *(Prompt: refer specifically to challenges faced during the COVID-19 pandemic)*
8. To what extent has the scope of the programme contributed to achieving short and midterm outcomes? What realities of implementation have constrained this? What factors have enabled? Are there major differences among communities in the outcomes?
9. What, in your view, are factors related to management and partnership, that have contributed to or hindered the success of the project?
10. Inclusion of different community groups and populations appeared to be a key element of the programme. What is your assessment of the extent of success in this regard? What were the key challenges and to what extent have they been overcome/not achieved? *(prompt: what groups has the programme identified and include? What populations were hard-to-reach and did not have access?)*

11. Overall, what could have been done better, in terms of design and implementation, to identify and manage key assumptions?
12. If the programme was to continue in the future, what would you look forward to accomplishing? What would you do differently, and why?

### Conciliation Resources

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your role in the organisation?
2. Can you briefly describe what is your role in this particular programme ‘Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities’ and how it has evolve over time?  
*(Prompts: Encourage the key informant to briefly describe the activities that they specifically were responsible for or actively participated in).*
3. Please describe the process of project design. What do you find very successful, and where were the challenging issues? How did the designing project team address these issues? What was the role of national and main project teams during project design?
4. In your opinion, how this project design was well suited to the context and objectives in terms of the promotion of peacebuilding and conflict prevention related to climate change? Were there some aspects of the project that should be set differently and why?
5. How did CR assess that the objective if the project is aligned with current national policies related to climate mobility?
6. Do you think that project interventions are designed adequately to the needs and potentials of rights holders to actively contribute to preventing and managing conflicts emerging as result of climate change impacts in Fiji?
7. Have external developments affected implementation of the Programme *(Prompt: how flexible and responsive was the Programme Team in addressing the COVID19 pandemic and its implications? Are there other examples of flexibility?)*
8. Do you think that some important areas that can contribute to the promotion of peacebuilding and conflict prevention related to climate change were left out of the project scope? If YES, what were those, and why?
9. To what extent has in practice the Programme incorporated principles of gender equality and inclusion in its design and implementation? Please provide your opinion and some examples.
10. When designing the programme, did you have in mind the need of establishing synergies with other similar initiatives? If YES, which ones? If NOT, why not?
11. To what extent did the programme complement other interventions focused on impacts by climate change and displacement implemented by other actors (local and INGOs, UN, etc.)?
12. In your opinion, how effective was the implementation of the programme? What were the main achieved outcomes? Are there any shortcomings? Are there any unforeseen positive or negative outcomes?
  - a. How has the programme contributed to skills-development of the targeted groups?
  - b. Do you think that the Programme was effective in strengthening partnerships between community leaders, community groups, civil society organisations and government?
  - c. Do you think that the Programme effectively reached and engaged marginalized groups (i.e., LGBTI minorities, persons with disabilities...) in addressing stereotypes and divides?
  - d. Has the Programme been effective in supporting learning across communities in the country? Please provide some examples.

13. Has the Programme team used management systems that facilitated efficient implementation of the Project? Have the management practices, policies, processes and decision-making capabilities contributed to the efficiency of the Programme?
14. What were the main challenges face in the day-to-day management of the programme? What support would your team need to improve?
15. How innovative was the Programme approach? What are innovative practices and approaches captured in the implementation process?
16. Has the Programme contributed to an enabling environment for peacebuilding/conflict prevention climate change and displacement related including mechanisms for continued improvement of the situation in the country? (*Prompt: Please provide examples On what evidence you base this opinion?*)
17. What are the main benefits for the target groups, including for vulnerable groups? On what evidence you base this opinion?
18. To what extent do you think key stakeholders/beneficiaries are satisfied with the Project implementation, specifically in terms of the partnership support and what are specific expectations for the potential follow-up assistance? On what evidence you base this opinion?
19. Has the programme contributed to sustainable partnerships and capacities of stakeholders to continue working towards long term outcomes in Fiji?
20. To what extent are the programme outcomes sustainable? How could the Programme outcomes be further expanded?
21. What would be future priority interventions to ensure long-term sustainability of the Programme achievements?

## **THEMATIC/CONTEXT EXPERTS**

### PNG

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your affiliation with (institution)
2. Can you describe how were you involved in this programme ‘Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities’ (in Fiji)? (*Prompts: briefly describe the activities that you were directly involved in*).
3. Do you have any observation/reflection about the suitability of the programme design and how it was implemented?

The remaining questions will focus on CR’s interest and potential to expand this type of intervention to PNG/Bougainville.

4. Could you briefly explain the nexus between climate change, conflict and displacement/migration in the context of PNG and Bougainville in particular?
5. What is the existing space in PNG and Bougainville specifically for community grassroots programmes addressing this nexus between conflict, displacement and climate change? (*Prompt: who are best positioned actors to work with communities in designing and implementing these programmes?*)
6. Do you know about current community-based programmes in PNG/Bougainville addressing these nexuses? If so, to your knowledge, how are they perceived, accepted and relevant?
7. Who are the main actors relevant to engage if interested to work in community conflict-climate displacement space in PNG/ Bougainville? (*prompt: besides communities, government, what other local organisations would be important to COLLABORATE with and to PARTNER with?*)

8. An organisation like CR, what factors would they need to take into consideration if interested in working in this space in PNG/ Bougainville? (*prompt: potential barriers and enablers*)
9. What strengths do you see in CR and partners in Fiji, TO and PCP that would be relevant to the PNG/ Bougainville contexts?
10. Do you think is worth CR further exploring concrete interventions in PNG/ Bougainville? (*Prompt: any red flags indicating an intervention like this one would not work in this context?*)

### SI CSOs

1. Could you please tell me about yourself, your organisation, and your role within your organisation?

The remaining questions will focus on CR's interest and potential to expand this type of intervention to SI.

2. Could you briefly explain the nexus between climate change, conflict, and displacement/migration in the context of SI?
3. What is the existing space in SI for community grassroots programmes addressing this nexus between conflict, displacement, and climate change? (*Prompt: who are best positioned actors to work with communities in designing and implementing these programmes?*)
4. Is your organisation involved and/or do you know about current community-based programmes in SI addressing these nexuses? If so, to your knowledge, how are they perceived, accepted and relevant? (*Prompt: if respondent refers to particular examples, explore BARRIERS and ENABLERS known to implement such interventions*).
5. Who are the main actors relevant to engage if interested to work in community conflict-climate displacement space in SI?
6. What factors would CR need to take into consideration if interested in working in this space in SI? (*Prompt: potential barriers and enablers*)
7. What strengths do you see in CR that would be relevant to the SI context?
8. Do you think is worth CR further exploring concrete interventions in SI? (*Prompt: any red flags indicating an intervention like this one would not work in this context?*)

### INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

**Target Key Informants:** UNDP Fiji; *Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)*

#### UNDP

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your role in the organisation?
2. Tell me about the work UNDP is doing in the areas of Climate Change and climate-related displacement in Fiji (*prompt: specifically with communities and in bringing together communities and government*)
3. Who are UNDP partners in the work in climate change-displacement and how they collaborate? (*prompt: refer to any existing synergies or collaboration established with implementing partners in the context of the Programme 'Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities' in Fiji*)



4. Does UNDP play a role in coordinating interventions in this area in Fiji? If so, what does the role consist of?

Explain a bit to the respondent about CR Programme in Fiji. Then, enquire:

5. What type of collaboration/coordination exists between UNDP and CR in Fiji? (*Prompt: identify strengths and areas to improve more generally between local and international civil society organisations, and UNDP in the frame of climate change and displacement*)
6. How could this one be strengthened?
7. In your opinion, how does the work around conflict prevention and peacebuilding sit in the broader development work on climate change and environment in Fiji?

*Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)*

1. Could you please tell me about yourself and your role in the organisation?
2. Tell me about the work PIFS is doing in the areas of Climate Change and climate-related displacement in Fiji (*prompt: specifically with communities and in bringing together communities and government*)
3. Who are PIFS partners in the work in climate change-displacement and how they collaborate? (*Prompt: refer to any existing synergies or collaboration established with CR and partners in the context of the Programme 'Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities' in Fiji*)
4. How does PIFS work with other actors intervening in this area in Fiji? (*Prompt: how work with Fijian communities impacted by climate change has been feeding into regional processes like those you work with in PIFS?*)
5. In your opinion, what are the strengths in the work being done in this area with communities and those that need to be strengthened in the future?
6. In your opinion, how does the work around conflict prevention and peacebuilding sit in the broader development work on climate change and environment in Fiji?
7. How relevant is this work around peacebuilding/conflict prevention in the context of climate change-related displacement and migration in Solomon Islands and PNG? Why?



## ANNEX 6: GUIDING QUESTIONS: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS

### GUIDING QUESTIONS

#### A. Identifying top relevant issues for the community group

1. What are some of the biggest problems or concerns for (refer to each specific group: women, men, young persons, persons living with a disability and their families, LGBTI persons) in this community?
2. PROBE: are trauma, social tensions, housing, education some of them? How are they related to your community's experience of relocation?
3. I heard you say that the most pressing concerns for (women/men/youth, PLWD, etc.) in your community are ... [List what you heard them say] of these, if you had to pick 1 or 2 top concerns, what would those be?
4. How different are things now here as compared to before (specifically for each population group)? (PROBE: refer to the community's previous locality)
5. How have these issues affected *you* (*being a woman, man, mother of a person living with a disability or to your child living with a disability, LGBTI person, etc.*)?
6. PROBE: Are some people or populations more affected by these issues than others? In what way?
7. What are the consequences to the community in not addressing these issues?
8. How should these issues be addressed?

#### B. Community spaces and participation in decision-making

1. How do (refer to each group: women, men, PLWD, LGBTI, youth) raise and share your main concerns within the community? Who do you raise them with?
2. Can you describe what mechanisms (space, process, etc.) exist in the community for you to share your concerns and worries?
3. What has been the role of the village/chief leader in addressing your concerns?
4. What activities have you been involved related to the programme supporting climate change-affected communities implemented by Transcend Oceania (refer specifically to Paulo or TO).

Tell us about the **positive experiences** resulting from your involvement in these activities. (*Solicit separate experiences from different groups and everyone in the group*).

Women's positive experiences	
Men's positive experiences	
Mothers and PLWD' positive experiences	
Youth positive's experiences	
Other's positive experiences (LGBTI...)	

Tell us about any **negative experiences** resulting from your involvement in these activities. *(Solicit separate experiences from different groups and everyone in the group).*

Women’s positive experiences	
Men’s positive experiences	
Mothers and PLWD’ positive experiences	
Youth positive’s experiences	
Other’s positive experiences (LGBTI...)	

**C. Have you observed changes in the way village leaders (village head, woman leader, etc.) communicate and engage with you (refer to women, young people, families and persons living with a disability)? How?**

(PROMPT: encourage the respondents to give examples of physical and figurative dialogue spaces existing or recently created in the community -to talk about trauma, tensions, conflict-)

1. What makes your community leader(s) better prepared now to support you (refer to specific group of population) with a space to talk about your worries, support in finding solutions?
2. Have there been opportunities for the village leaders to share your concerns and needs (in reference to those of the specific group) with local authorities? With whom in particular? Explain how it happened.
3. What changes have you observed in the capacity of your community leaders to discuss and engage with local Government (Roko Tui, District Officer)? (prompt: encourage to provide examples of situations lived).
4. Has this project with TO have any negative impact or worsen existing tensions/conflict between (refer to the different population groups) in the community?
5. What should be done differently to support (refer to population group: women, youth, PLWD, etc.) in tensions arising from the experience of relocation?
6. How do you think a project like this one (in reference to TO) could further support your group (refer to specific population) in addressing and finding solutions to your concerns?

Final questions: Are there any other issues relating to the Project that you would like to mention that we have not covered? Is there anything that you wanted to add that you did not get a chance to bring up earlier?

CLOSING: Thank you very much for your time and sharing your opinions. We really value your feedback.

## ANNEX 7: EVALUATION CONSULTANCY TOR

---

### Evaluation consultancy team for the

### Evaluation of Building Peace in Climate Change-Affected Communities Programme

#### 1. OVERVIEW

Conciliation Resources requires an external team of evaluation specialists to complete an end of programme evaluation for two concurrent projects within the one programme: the Building Peace in Communities affected by Climate Change project supported by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and the Strengthening the roles of Civil Society and Climate Change and JustPeace Communities in Fiji project supported by the European Union (EU).

**Location:** Ideally Pacific-based, with availability to travel to Fiji

**Duration:** Up to 3 months (October - December 2022)

**Total Days:** Up to 35 days (spread over the contract duration and team members)

**Reporting to:** Pacific Programme Director

#### 2. BACKGROUND

##### About us

**Conciliation Resources (CR)** is an independent organisation working with people in conflict to prevent violence, resolve conflicts and promote peaceful societies. Through collaborating with partners, we help to build the capacity of local organisations and communities to deepen understanding of conflict drivers and to develop non-violent approaches to addressing and preventing conflicts. We also act as a bridge to promote dialogue on all levels – local, national and regional. CR is the lead implementing organisation for the Building Peace in Communities affected by Climate Change project which supported by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and the Strengthening the roles of Civil Society and Climate Change and JustPeace Communities in Fiji project supported by the European Union (EU).

##### About the programme

Conciliation Resources in partnership with Transcend Oceania and the Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding, has embarked on a new path of peacebuilding to address growing social, political and environmental conflict risks associated with climate change. Climate change displacement is a major challenge for Pacific Islanders given that land and 'place' are at the centre of cultural and spiritual worldviews and often the primary source of collective forms of resilience. Based on the knowledge gained from working closely with community members, Conciliation Resources and Transcend Oceania have developed a conflict analysis and action peacebuilding resource which is designed to engage with community members in a contextually sensitive way. This Adaptive Peacebuilding Methodology tool consists of five phases that centres community engagement within community worldviews or the – *Vanua* Context - and is inclusive of different intersectional identities. We have begun to carry out phases of this methodology in three communities: Vunidogoloa, Vunisavisavi and Naviavia. With the Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding, CR have designed and conducted action research in three informal settlements in and near Suva, Fiji, to explore the impact of climate change on these communities as well as the related challenges they face. There has also been work with both partners on developing peacebuilding resources (curriculum, training modules) that can enhance the capacity of peacebuilders and communities to manage climate change and other pressures effectively and non-violently. The final component of this programme focuses on policy and advocacy, including the sharing of learning from this work across the Pacific and to wider audiences, and will be included in the scope of the evaluation.

The overall programme objective is that Pacific Islanders, particularly in Fiji, have the knowledge, resources and skills to prevent and manage conflicts emerging as a result of climate change impacts.

The programme's 3 intended outcomes include:

1. Communities in Fiji experiencing climate change impacts have the conflict analysis tools, knowledge, skills and relationships to analyse and prevent or manage climate change-related conflict.
2. Regional Fijian civil society organisations have the knowledge, tools and skills to contribute to supporting communities in responding to climate change-related conflict.
3. Community perceptions and concerns about conflict impacts are captured and contribute to knowledge in national, regional and international climate change policy-making arenas.

#### Key partners:

**Transcend Oceania (TO)** is a Fiji-based NGO committed to advancing sustainable peace and development through justice and non-violence in the Pacific, by creating opportunities for transcending conflict, silence, differences, gender, while developing Pacific concepts of peacebuilding. It aims to build resilience at both the individual and community levels.

**Pacific Centre for Peacebuilding (PCP)**, is a Fiji-based NGO that works with communities to reduce, prevent and transform violence and conflict with the aim that Pacific communities embrace cultures of peace, justice and non-violence. Established in 2007, PCP offers a range of services in areas such as dialogue facilitation, peacebuilding training, conflict analysis and prevention.

### 3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The primary purpose of the evaluation is to assess what progress the programme has made towards achieving its outcomes, and to identify key learnings on the contribution of activities and outputs towards the achievement of the programme objectives. It is expected that the evaluative findings will enable CR to strengthen future programming and feed into the next phase of the programme.

#### Key Evaluation Questions (EQs):

1. *Outcome 1:* Has the programme improved community leaders' ability to manage local tensions/conflicts related to climate change? If so, how? And what were the enabling factors? If not, why?
2. *Outcome 2:* Has the programme improved Fijian civil society capacities to support communities in responding to climate change-related conflict challenges? If so, how? And what were the enabling factors? If not, why?
3. *Outcome 3:* Has the programme improved understanding and knowledge of diverse Pacific perspectives and experiences of climate change-related conflict and challenges? If so, whom has this reached and influenced? And what were the enabling factors? If not, why?
4. *Strength & weaknesses:* What are the programme's strengths (where it influenced change) and weaknesses (gaps and any areas that have been overlooked that should have been a priority)? Including identification of any other factors that contributed to the achievements/gaps of the programme.
5. *Partnership:* How has the programme partnership/accompaniment approach supported peacebuilding outcomes?
6. *Inclusivity:* How has the programme impacted people differently? Has it opened spaces for any previously marginalised groups? And what were the enabling factors if so?
7. *Sustainability:* What aspects of the programme should be: wound down; maintained; or expanded / developed further?

#### 4. METHODOLOGY

The consultant team is responsible for developing the evaluation design and learning methods, in collaboration with Conciliation Resources. The final evaluation design and methods will be agreed upon by the consultant and Conciliation Resources, partners and donors. At this stage we expect the evaluation design to include (i) consultation with CR staff, programme partners, programme beneficiaries, donors and other relevant stakeholders, (ii) assessment of the programme’s logframe, harvested outcomes, indicators and expected results, (iii) an assessment of programme management and partnership arrangements, and (iv) a systematic review/mapping of the available sources of information against the EQs.

CR employs participatory processes with partners and stakeholders, and we envision an evaluation team that has demonstrated expertise in participatory approaches which are culturally appropriate and contextually relevant. This will help to ensure that the evaluation is transformative (e.g. it develops the capacity of those involved) and provides opportunities for learning between CR programme teams and between CR staff and partners.

As peacebuilding takes place within a highly complex and evolving environment, interactions and change are highly dynamic. Conciliation Resources is open to adaptive evaluation approaches that are able to deal with, and capture, complexity.

Conciliation Resources has been using Outcome Harvesting (*methodology outlined in Annex 1*) as a monitoring and evaluation approach to gather evidence. Ideally external consultants will use KII to substantiate the outcomes identified by the programme team.

#### 5. SPECIFIC TASKS AND DELIVERABLES

<b>Project/Activity</b> <i>List of key activities to be carried</i>	<b>Deliverable</b> <i>Specific deliverable/output related to each activity</i>	<b>Indicative Consultant Activities</b> <i>Breakdown of tasks to conduct this activity and output</i>	<b>Estimated work days</b>
<b>a. Evaluation Design &amp; Inception report</b>	Inception report – outlining the evaluation design, methodology, reporting milestones and work plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Review programme documentation, monitoring and evaluation data</li> <li>▪ Consult with programme management team</li> <li>▪ Design evaluation: define questions in consultation with CR, perform a stakeholder mapping, outline evaluative methodology, plan approach and timelines</li> <li>▪ Design supporting engagement documentation [participation forms etc]</li> <li>▪ Write inception report</li> </ul>	6-8 days
<b>b. Evaluation implementation – in country assessment</b>	Conduct primary data collection for programme evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Organise logistics for in-country consultations</li> <li>▪ Conduct interviews and evaluation with key stakeholders according to agreed</li> </ul>	8-10 days

<b>Project/Activity</b> <i>List of key activities to be carried</i>	<b>Deliverable</b> <i>Specific deliverable/output related to each activity</i>	<b>Indicative Consultant Activities</b> <i>Breakdown of tasks to conduct this activity and output</i>	<b>Estimated work days</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>methodology and approach</li> <li>Primary Data collection</li> </ul>	
<b>c. Evaluation implementation – analysis 1</b>	Preparations for sense-making workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyse and synthesise data from evaluation process</li> <li>Identify key findings, learnings and themes</li> <li>Prepare materials to conduct a follow up sense-making workshop with CR and partners</li> </ul>	5-7 days
<b>d. Evaluation implementation – analysis 2</b>	Sense-making workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct a sense-making workshop with partners in Fiji</li> </ul>	1 day
<b>e. Evaluation report – Draft</b>	Draft evaluation report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Write draft evaluation report based on findings from in-country evaluation and sense-making workshop</li> </ul>	6-7 days
<b>f. Evaluation report - Final</b>	Final evaluation report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discuss draft report with CR team, refine according to feedback from CR and partners</li> <li>Finalise evaluation report</li> </ul>	2 days
<b>Total number of days: Up to 35 days</b>			

## 6. PERSON SPECIFICATION

- Experience of designing and implementing peacebuilding evaluations (essential)
- Experience and knowledge of facilitating qualitative research methods in cross-cultural contexts (essential)
- Knowledge and experience in the Pacific region, preferably in Fiji (essential)
- Consultants based in Fiji would be preferred for this role (desirable)
- Sound knowledge and understanding of community-led peacebuilding structures (desirable)
- Knowledge and experience in outcome harvesting methodology (desirable)
- Interpersonal skills backed by knowledge and experience that evokes trust and openness with a range of evaluation participants (essential)
- Ability to establish strong working relationships with programme teams and partner organisations (desirable).
- Strong verbal and written English language skills (desirable)

The post holder may be expected to undertake some travel to the region. The post holder will be expected to be committed to CR's safeguarding practices and positively engage with practices which help us all to keep people safe.

## 7. APPLICATION PROCESS

To apply please submit:

- a brief CV outlining the relevant experience of the team; and
- a cover letter detailing your suitability for the consultancy, brief intended evaluation approach including expected daily rates of the team members.

All proposals should be emailed to [aurecruitment@c-r.org](mailto:aurecruitment@c-r.org) with the headline 'Evaluation of Building Peace in Climate Change- Affected Communities Project' by **30 September 2023**



