MID-TERM EVALUATION

ENHANCING URBAN RESILIENCE TO
CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS AND
NATURAL DISASTERS: HONIARA,
SOLOMON ISLANDS

A mid-term evaluation report on the Adaptation
Fund project

Client: UN-Habitat

October 2020

Authors:

Katherine Drakeford, Consultant
Sara Vargues, Consultant

| October 2020

kdrakeford08@gmail.com
smvargues@gmail.com

Cover Photo: UN-Habitat, Inga Korte (2020)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction   The *Climate Resilience Honiara (CRH)* project financed by the Adaptation
                        Fund provides support in addressing climate change and disaster risk issues,
                        with a strong focus on vulnerable hotspot communities in the greater
                        Honiara Area. This is a four-year project implemented by UN-Habitat and
                        executed by the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey (MLHS), the Honiara
                        City Council (HCC) and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT).
                        The overall objective of the project is to increase the resilience of
                        communities in Solomon Islands that are highly vulnerable to climate
                        change and disaster risks.

Methodology   The mid-term evaluation utilized a desk review of project documents,
                        questionnaires and structured interviews with key informants to collect the
                        data that is used to inform this report. Key informants were identified
                        through stakeholder mapping and were selected based on their role and
                        involvement in the project activities to date.

Results

Relevance   There have been no changes to the project's objectives nor the project
                        rationale. The changes in context that have occurred since the project's
                        inception, namely COVID-19, have resulted in greater vulnerabilities in
                        informal settlements and thus this evaluation finds that the project is even
                        more relevant. Additionally, the project is aligned with the principles laid
                        out in the Paris Agreement of the UNFCCC, the Sendai Framework for
                        Disaster Risk Reduction, and the New Urban Agenda. The project aligns well
                        to the priorities of the government and complements the priorities laid out
                        in the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey's legislation for informal
                        settlements. The mid-term evaluation identified challenges regarding
                        prioritization of activities and overall ownership by the project's executing
                        partners due to the limited capacity and resources locally available.
                        However, there is overall a good awareness in the Honiara City Council
                        about how the project can support the Council's priorities. Lastly, the lack

of community organisation was identified by key informants as a main barrier to increasing community ownership over the project.

Effectiveness The achievement of results at the time of the mid-term evaluation varies significantly by component and output. However, a significant number of outputs are delayed due to a number of different factors. The main issues affecting the achievement of results are: limited institutional and technical capacity locally available; lack of human resources within HCC and MLHS; importance of institutional engagement, governance and capacity building; long/ complicated bureaucratic procedures; and the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite the challenges that are present, the project has seen some successes. The major achievements to date include cultivating partnerships/cooperation between other organisations and initiatives in Honiara as well as providing support to the City Council to build on their awareness of climate and disaster related risks and begin to develop solutions for addressing these. However, more significant outcomes are to be achieved in the following phases with the implementation of proposed climate resilient actions.

Efficiency The project's overall performance is considered average. The partnership with RMIT and use of a NZ volunteer have both resulted in advantages and disadvantages in regards to delivering activities and outputs in a cost-efficient and timely manner. Furthermore, the project has been comprehensive in its consideration and application of ESS and Gender Policy. However, the challenges that are discussed in the previous section also impact the project's efficiency.

Sustainability There are several factors that currently impact the sustainability of the project results which need to be addressed. Along with the issues described earlier regarding ownership and effectiveness, limited institutional and technical knowledge locally available has been identified as one critical issue affecting sustainability. However, there are also factors present which can promote the longevity of results. One positive factors that is likely to contribute to the sustainability of the results is the project team's focus on aligning project activities with Government work plans so that the findings

would be better positioned to be mainstreamed into policies and practices in Honiara. Furthermore, the integration of both bottom-up and top-down approaches into climate resilient community development plans has been greatly contributing to informing communities on future development and thus promoting the sustainability of results. These activities have been contributing to strengthening communities' capacities and increase their involvement and ownership of the project.

Recommendations

1. MLHS and HCC must invest in human resources to address challenges of ownership and prioritization of activities.

2. UN-Habitat and executing partners to improve communication in the implementation of next phases.

3. Continue regular meetings to check progress of work plans.

4. Engage additional executing partners for physical works and capacity building activities to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of the project.

5. A strong capacity development strategy would help to streamline engagement and promote consistent communication with communities, thus establishing greater ownership over the project.

6. Hard and soft components should be designed in a way that could be easily replicated in additional settlements across Honiara.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AF	Adaptation Fund
AoC	Agreement of Cooperation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CPAP	Community Profile and Action Plan
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DTCP	Department Town and Country Planning
ESGY	Environmental, Social, Gender and Youth
ESS	Environmental and Social Safeguards
CRH	Climate Resilience Honiara
HHS	Household Survey
HCC	Honiara City Council
KI	Key Informant
MLHS	Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey
MECDM	Ministry of the Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management & Meteorology
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
RMIT	Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programm

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROJECT BACKGOUND AND CONTEXT

The *Climate Resilience Honiara (CRH)* project financed by the Adaptation Fund provides support in addressing climate change and disaster risk issues, with a strong focus on vulnerable hotspot communities in the greater Honiara Area. This is a four-year project implemented by UN-Habitat and executed by the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey (MLHS), the Honiara City Council (HCC) and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT).

The overall objective of the project is to increase the resilience of communities in Solomon Islands that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks. To achieve this, the project has four components:

1. Community-level actions
2. Ward-level actions
3. City-level actions
4. Knowledge management and Advocacy

The project has a total budget of US$4,395,877 and focuses on 5 hotspot communities located in five different wards: Kukum Fishing Village (Vura), Ontong Java (Mataniko), Aekafo Planning Area (Kola'a), Gilbert Camp/Jabros (Panatina) and Wind Valley/White River (Nggosi).

Informal settlements are often located in hotspots of natural hazards, such as riverbanks and wetlands. Additionally, informal settlements are characterized by poor living conditions, limited access to urban services such as water, sanitation, electricity, lack of open spaces, insecure housing structures, etc. The high levels of physical, economic, social and environmental vulnerabilities in combination with poor levels of disaster preparedness and adaptive capacity often lead to high climate-related hazard impacts in these areas.

1.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the project is to increase the resilience of Honiara and its inhabitants to current and future climate impacts and natural disasters, with a particular focus on pro-poor adaptation actions that involve and benefit the most vulnerable communities in the city. This will be achieved by:

Community-level

    I. To support the implementation of prioritized resilience actions in vulnerability hotspot communities;

II. To strengthen the capacity of local communities to respond to climate change and natural hazards through awareness raising and capacity development training.

Ward-level

III. To support the implementation of resilience actions that target women, youth, urban agriculture and food security, and disaster risk reduction;

IV. To strengthen the capacity of ward officials/councils to lead climate change adaptation and DRR planning activity, in support of increased urban resilience.

City-wide

V. To strengthen institutional arrangements at the city-level to respond to climate change and natural disasters through mainstreaming improved partnerships between key stakeholders.

1.3 PURPOSE AND FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION

The mid-term evaluation of the Climate Resilience Honiara (CRH) project is in accordance with the requirements laid out by the donor, the Adaptation Fund. The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide the Adaptation Fund the implementing partner and executing partners with an assessment of the performance of the CRH project to date, based on the agreement, logical framework, activities and budget. It is expecting to access the overall performance of the project with regards to its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Furthermore, the assessment will identify lessons learned and recommendations.

The key objective of this evaluation, as stated in the ToR, are to:

a) Assess the implementation progress made in activities towards achieving the planned results;
b) Assess the continued relevance, effectiveness and impact of the project in supporting local government/settlements in increasing resilience of informal urban settlements in Fiji and engagement of stakeholder groups in implementation actions;
c) Recommend strategic, programmatic and management considerations for implementing the remaining part of the project.

2 PROJECT RATIONALE

Aiming at achieving the abovementioned objectives, the CRH project adopts a comprehensive framework built upon 4 main components.

Component 1, *Community-level* is aligned with the Adaptation Fund's outcomes 3 and 4[1], and focuses on reducing vulnerability of hotspots communities to climate-related hazards and threats while strengthening awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes as well as capacity to implement at local level. It also aims at increasing adaptive capacity within relevant development and natural resources sectors. These outcomes are to be achieved through:

Community-level actions

- In addition to existing community action plans developed as part of the Honiara Urban Resilience and Climate Action Plan (HURCAP), complete community climate action plans for Wind Valley and Gilbert Camp/Jabros;
- In-depth community profiling for the hotspot case studies;
- Scoping and feasibility studies of prioritized local actions for each hotspot community;
- Implementation of screened/agreed resilience actions in each hotspot community (hard component).

Community-level capacity strengthening

- Training on conducting community profile self-assessment;
- Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues.

Component 2, *Ward-level*, is aligned with the Adaptation Fund's outcomes 2, 3, 4 and 5[2], and focuses on increasing ward-level climate, disaster and ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress while strengthening institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate induced socio-economic and environmental losses. It also aims at increasing adaptive capacity within relevant development and natural resources sectors. These outcomes are to be achieved through:

Ward-level actions

- To develop a women-focused climate risk communications program;
- To integrate climate change into educational programs for youth and children;
- To implement ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood management, etc. (hard component);
- To develop climate resilience community spaces, including productive open spaces and community evacuation centres (hard component).

---

[1] See annex A
[2] See annex A

<u>Ward-level capacity strengthening</u>

- o Providing 'Planning for Climate Change' training for nominated 'resilience officers' in each of Honiara's wards, and integrate training with DRR knowledge (what to do and where to go);
- o Pilot best practice participatory approach to city government, NGO, and community collaboration in climate action planning;
- o Assess locally appropriate land administration options for peri-urban locations.

Component 3, *City-wide governance and capacity strengthening*, is in line with the Adaptation Fund's outcome 2[3] and focuses on strengthening institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socio-economic and environmental losses. This is to be achieved by:

- o Capacity development needs assessment to be conducted in Honiara with focal Ministries and Honiara City Council;
- o Develop and run capacity development workshops for planners and other urban and related professionals in support of urban resilience: planning, land administration and GIS risk mapping;
- o Employ a climate adaptation and resilience officer, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group and provide support for regular meetings;
- o Develop and support more effective partnership networks, including for cross-border issues, and provide support for increased participation;
- o Policy and stakeholder mapping, and a whole-of-government review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy (including land use plans and building codes).

Component 4, *knowledge Management and Advocacy*, is in line with Adaptation Fund's guidelines[4]. This component aims at ensuring that the project implementation is fully transparent, all stakeholders are informed of products and results and have access to these for replication. This is to be done through:

- o Climate change training and knowledge exchange;
- o Advocacy materials;
- o Knowledge sharing platform;
- o Project learning mechanism.

---

[3] See annex A

[4] Adaptation Fund – Knowledge Management Strategy and Action Plan (2016). Retrieved from: https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/KM-strategy-action-plan.pdf

3   APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

3.1   MID-TERM EVALUATION APPROACH

The mid-term evaluation was undertaken over a period of one month and involved three methods of data collection. A desk review of project documents, an email questionnaire, and structured interviews. Key informants were provided the option of responding to an email questionnaire or participating in an in-person or phone interview. The approach of using multiple methods of engaging key informants was taken to increase the probability of receiving responses as this was highlighted as a potential challenge prior to the start of the evaluation. The questions developed for the questionnaires and interviews were informed by the analysis of key project's documents and were based on the evaluation questions as laid out in the ToR:

- *Are the project's adopted strategies pertaining to each Result and overall objective still valid?*
- *Are the delivery of activities and outputs contributing to the achievement of the Results and overall objective?*
- *What is the efficiency of the implementation to date?*
- *To what extent are the project effects towards building capacity sustainable?*

A stakeholder mapping was facilitated by UN-Habitat team members and key informants' selection was based on the level of involvement and role within the project. In order to gain a holistic view of the project, stakeholders working at different levels and stages were selected as key informants. Additionally, where possible, multiple stakeholders in similar roles were identified as key informants in order to triangulate the data collected.

3.2   MID-TERM EVALUATION METHODS

3.2.1   Desk review of project documents

The initial desk review enabled the evaluation team to acquire a comprehensive understanding of the project's approach and methodology, as well as, gain an understanding of work plans, budgets, indicators and targets. Relevant documents have been provided by UN-Habitat and complementary documentation was gathered by the evaluation team from online sources.

- Project/programme proposal to the Adaptation Fund document
- Wind Valley: Climate Resilient Community Development Plan – August 2020
- Aekafo Planning Area: Climate Resilient Community Development Plan – August 2020
- Kulum Fishing Village: Climate Resilient Community Development Plan – August 2020
- Ontong Java: Climate Resilient Community Development Plan – August 2020

- Jabros: Climate Resilient Community Development Plan – August 2020

- Local Engineering Actions: priority needs and proposed implementation plan – April 2020

- Institutional analysis: policy and actor mapping

- Capacity needs assessment – May 2020

3.2.2 Key informant interviews and consultations

In addition to documentation review, the information gathering techniques included:
- Interviews with CRH team members:
  - Mr. Bernhard Barth, Programme Manager, Human Settlements Officer, UN-Habitat
  - Ms. Inga Korte, Project Team Leader Urban Climate Resilience, UN-Habitat
  - Mr. Steve Likaveke, Project Coordinator, UN-Habitat
- Interviews with key stakeholders/officials involved in the project
  - Ms. Cindrella Mede Vunagi, Chief Physical Planner, Honiara City Council
  - Mr. Buddley Ronney, Deputy Secretary (Technical), Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey
  - Mr. Chanel Iroi, Undersecretary (Technical), Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management & Meteorology (MECDM), and National Designated Authority of the Adaptation Fund
  - Ms. John Clemo, Climate Change and Resilience Advisor, based in Honiara City Council (volunteer role with Volunteer Service Abroad)
  - Mr. Darryn McEvoy, Project Lead Coordinator, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
  - Mr. Alexei Trundle, Technical Advisor and sub-contracted Climate Change Adaptation and Community Consultation Specialist, Research Fellow in Sustainable Urban Development, University of Melbourne

3.2.3 Field visits and phone interviews with representatives from informal settlements to assess communities' perceptions on implemented activities

Field visits have been conducted in the 3 of the 5 hotspot communities that are part of the CRH project: Ontong Java, Aekafo Planning Area, and Wind Valley/White River. Interviews have been carried out with the community leaders/focal points of those three settlements:
- Mr. Philemon Kaola, Community Secretary of Ontong Java
- Mr. Steven Taniamae Bunabo, Chairman of Jericho 2 Community, Aekafo Planning Area
- Mr. Teiba Manu, Community Secretary of Wind Valley

3.3 MID-TERM EVALUATION LIMITATIONS

The main limitations of this mid-term evaluation are related to the methods of data collection. As previously noted, key informants were given the option of answering a questionnaire or participating in a phone interview. The majority of key informants chose the questionnaire, however, in some cases responses were not detailed. Therefore, the time that key informants dedicated to answering the questionnaires and thus providing comprehensive and thoughtful answers is seen as one potential limitation. Furthermore, in both interviews and questionnaires, there was a risk that key informants' responses would be biased towards portraying an overly positive view of the project as they are direct beneficiaries and thus would be hesitant to criticise. It is important to be aware of the potential for biased answers particularly for RMIT and MLHS responses as key executing partners.

4 RESULTS

4.1 RELEVANCE

4.1.1 Rationale of the results and its objectives

The overarching objective of the project is to enhance the resilience of Honiara and its inhabitants to current and future climate impacts and natural disasters, with a particular focus on pro-poor adaptation actions that involve and benefit the most vulnerable in the city. According to the information collected from the key informants (KIs) and the analysis of project documents, it is fairly clear that **the objectives remain broadly in line with those outlined in the original proposal and that the project's rationale is still valid and very relevant**. Increasing pressures to the urban system mainly due to rural-urban migration and localised worsening climate stressors are largely contributing to the growth of the project's importance/relevance. Hence, the continuing expansion of informal settlements is exacerbating existing climate vulnerability and is putting further strain on the capacities of the council, which already lacks an integrated approach to enhancing climate and urban resilience. Lastly, to improve national policies and guidelines for the upgrading of informal settlements, the project is contributing to strengthening existing governance frameworks from the community through the Ward level to the Honiara City Council.

4.1.2 Relationship to the SDGs, Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, Paris Agreement and the New Urban Agenda and 'Next Steps'

Both desk review and consultations illustrated that **the majority of the SDGs have been included throughout all stages of the project** while following a comprehensive and inclusive approach. Nonetheless, it is worth highlighting the most evident links to specific goals such as: 3 (health and wellbeing); 5 (gender inequality); 6 (clean water and sanitation); 10 (reduced inequalities); 11 (sustainable cities); 13 (climate action); 15 (life on land) and 17 (partnerships). Additionally, **the project appears to be aligned with the principals laid out in the Paris Agreement and Sendai Framework** as specifically focuses on an integrated approach to climate adaptation and DRR while assessing gender responsive disaster planning. Lastly, by focusing on the Greater Honiara area – city, ward and community level – with particular emphasis on the urban poor in informal settlements, **the project aligns with the principles of the New Urban Agenda.**

4.1.3 Changes in result context during implementation

In terms of changes in result context during implementation, according to the KIs, the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic has been the most substantive challenges and has been impacting the project in various ways. The travel restrictions are impacting both project's team leader oversight missions –

currently based in Suva, Fiji – and the engagement of RMIT scientific team in carrying out local activities as initially planned. Since existing implementing capacities in Honiara are considerably low, current travel restrictions will impact the following phases of the project. Additionally, the declaration of State of Emergency in Honiara hindered public gatherings which had impacted the progress of project workshops. This situation has also resulted in many people returning to their home islands which has directly affected the household surveys by creating potential limitations on the representativeness of the household sample. Furthermore, international travel restrictions have also impacted the work plan and scheduled activities such as the professional short course organized by RMIT, to be held in Melbourne, which has been postponed until 2021. Lastly, the current situation led to the departure of the New Zealand Volunteer that was directly involved in the project's implementation within the HCC. **Overall, the continuing uncertainty regarding the pandemic poses significant challenges to the project and it is likely to largely affect the project's results.** At the community level, uncertainties related to the implementation timeframe are likely to impact communities' expectations which may contribute to affect their level of involvement and support.

The recruitment of more staff – both local and international – on the ground could be a potential measure to mitigate challenges regarding oversight missions. However, current uncertainty regarding overseas travel may impede this recommendation in the short to medium term.

In addition to the global COVID-19 pandemic, the KIs also noted that a change in the political context, with the election of new Honiara City Councillors has influenced the project. The new councillors have yet to fully understand the project and thus their role within the project and how activities support the settlements within their Ward.

4.1.4   Institutional and partner priorities

The project aligns well to the priorities of the government. The KIs note that, while the project is targeting settlements in Honiara, it will generate important lessons learnt that MLHS can use to replicated activities in informal settlements that are expanding in other urban areas of the Solomon Islands. **Furthermore, the project complements the priorities laid out in MLHS's legislation for informal settlements.** KIs stated that, in order for MLHS to better prioritise the project, improved coordination with the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change is required. Furthermore, the limited capacities at MLHS means that there are no staff dedicated to the project and it is thus not incorporated into the priorities of the ministry work.

The KIs described how climate change is relevant to all the Honiara City Council (HCC)'s activities and is addressed in a multidimensional manner through the physical planning division, waste

management, health, education, youth and women, works/infrastructure, and finance. As a result, it is important to engage with all heads of division so they can understand how project activities align with their specific priorities. For example, the project involved all heads of division in a two-day climate change and disaster workshop facilitated by RMIT and the Project Coordinator.

While there is overall a good awareness in the HCC about the project and how CRH can support the Council's priorities, the limited capacity and resources at the HCC are major challenges. The difficulty in communicating with key focal points at the HCC, such as the City Clerk and Major, affect the HCC's ability to effectively and consistently engage with the project. Therefore, it is seen as a critical priority to appoint a Climate Resilience Officer, who can provide a link between the Council and the project, as well as central government ministries, and ensure that the project activities align with government priorities.

4.1.5   Ownership by national and local stakeholders

The main project's executing entities are the Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey (MLHS), the Ministry of the Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM) and the Honiara City Council (HCC). All entities are represented on the project management committee; however, the level of involvement differs from stakeholder to stakeholder. According to the information gathered during the interviews, having a local project manager embedded in the MLHS has increased the level of engagement of the ministry with the project. However, it has also been highlighted that MLHS is currently under-resourced and existing capacities cannot be allocated to taking the project activities forward. **Currently, the project is not perceived as a top priority by MLHS' staff who see the project's activities as additional tasks on top of their existing responsibilities.** Additionally, the lack of proper internet connection has also been impacting communication between the various stakeholders. However, the local project coordinator has been playing an important role in this matter by engaging and facilitating meetings with relevant partners. MLHS is central to the coming phase of project implementation, especially in regards to the subcontracting of upgrading activities and thus will need to increase their level of involvement for the successful completion of this phase. Similarly, integration with MECDM and improved engagement with NDMO experts would greatly strengthen the project.

At the local level, HCC is a key partner in the project and has been proactively engaged since the beginning of the project. This level of engagement has been reinforced with the involvement of a New Zealand (NZ) volunteer within the HCC who has been fully involved in the project for 12 months. However, the level of coordination and communication has been affected since this staff had to leave

the country in May 2020 due to COVID-19. This partnership will continue to be critical in the next phases of the project particularly during the implementation of actions. **Hence improvements in communication and coordination need to be discussed in order to ensure that strong engagement will continue.** In addition to HCC, Guadalcanal Provincial Council is also in a good position to engage local communities and deal with ward-level structures. Nevertheless, it was highlighted by the KIs that a cross-border cooperation mechanism between HCC and Guadalcanal Provincial Council should be developed to strengthen governance and capacity building as well as to reinforce engagement.

At the community level, key informants illustrated that the project is seen as critical in the settlements as they recognize the magnitude of the potential impacts of climate related hazards in their communities. **However, the key informants also highlighted that the lack of community organisation is a main barrier to increasing community ownership over the project.** Households are often less willing to participate in community projects as they prioritize individual activities that will help address their specific household needs. Due to the lack of resources within the settlements there is little opportunity for the communities to organise themselves to coordinate communal projects. **Therefore, the project should prioritize building capacity of community governance systems so they are able to successfully take ownership of the project moving forward.**

4.2 EFFECTIVENESS

4.2.1 Actual or expected achievement of results at the time of the mid-term evaluation

> EFFECTIVENESS: score **2.9** out of 5

The project is halfway through its planned duration. At the time of this mid-term evaluation, the results achieved are as described/listed below (see Annex D Work Plan and Implementation Schedule Progress):

1. Component 1 (community level actions and community level capacity strengthening): outputs 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2 have been completed. Output 1.2 is still ongoing since the household surveys are expected to be conducted mid 2021. Output 1.4 (implementation of screened/agreed resilience actions in each hotspot) is to get started in the first semester of 2021.

2. Component 2 (ward level actions and ward level capacity strengthening): outputs 3.1 and 3.2 are being implemented and are to be completed by July 2021. Outputs 3.3 and 3.4 (hard component) are yet to be implemented.

3. Component 3 (city-wide governance and capacity strengthening): outputs 5.1 and 5.5 have been completed. Outputs 5.2 and 5.4 are being implemented and are to be finished by mid 2021. Output 5.3 is yet to be implemented.

4. Component 4 is a constant activity throughout the project – **ONGOING**

4.2.2 Factors and processes affecting the achievement of results

According to the information gathered during consultation, the main factors and processes affecting or likely to affect the achievement of the results are related to: **i) limited institutional and technical capacity locally available; ii) lack of human resources within HCC and MLHS; iii) importance of institutional engagement, governance and capacity building; iv) long / complicated bureaucratic procedures; and (v) the COVID-19 pandemic.**

Limited institutional and technical capacity locally available has been identified as one critical issue affecting the project. However, executing parties have been identifying experts within the Ministries and with external organisations to fill the identified gaps. Trainings to support local capacity building (e.g. GIS workshops, training of local enumerators, urban design studios, urban organic farming, etc.) have also been carried out by the RMIT team. These activities have the potential to create ongoing local change through the upskilling of key staff within ministries and local government. Additionally, geospatial contributions and analysis have been particularly beneficial to the project's effectiveness. However, it is not expected for the local governments to have the range of technical knowledge required to design and implement the wide spectrum of project activities (e.g. engineering, urban design and landscape architecture, advanced GIS, etc.).

With regards to the lack of human resources, as mentioned in previous sections, MLHS is currently under-resourced and does not have enough staff to support the project to the extent that is required. Although MLHS is well positioned to support land-specific and cross-boundary issues within the project (either through the Physical Planning Division, Commissioner Lands or the Permanent Secretary), collaborative cross-ministry efforts between MLHS and MECDM, the Ministry of Infrastructure and potentially the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination would greatly contribute to an effective implementation of the next phase of project.

Long/ complicated bureaucratic procedures have been identified as one of the main challenges affecting the achievement of results. For example, long delays by MLHS on establishing a local bank account for the project have been hindering the transfer of funds to and through the Ministry. This situation has been directly affecting the project's implementation timeframe and creating distrust in MLHS' capacities.

As mentioned, the COVID-19 outbreak has greatly impacted the project's implementation and represents a huge barrier to carrying out activities on the ground. Hence, having local staff with

technical knowledge to run activities such as workshops, data collection, trainings, etc., would be crucial to ensure the effectiveness of results.

4.2.3 How appropriate and effective are the partnerships and other institutional relationships?

The project includes partnerships between various stakeholders at the community, local (ward and city) and national level, and across both government, academia and civic society entities. **Based on KIs' inputs, cultivating partnerships has been one of the project's greatest achievements.** Strong alignment and cooperation with other organisations and ongoing projects in Honiara (e.g. ICLEI, SPREP, World Bank, UN-Women, UNDRR, NGO's, etc.), as well as with the case study communities have been also identified as major positive outcomes. These strong working relationships have been crucial to ensure the project's continuity during the international travel restrictions currently in place. The level of engagement with MECDM should be strengthened in order to improve the effectiveness of project's results. Based on the data collected, the coordination by RMIT has been fairly effective and has contributed to a high level of engagement and motivation from the different stakeholders involved throughout all implementation's phases. **Nonetheless, clear instructions and guidelines on methodology as well as frequent monitoring are important to ensure that partners are following the agreed implementation approach.**

4.2.4 Outcomes to date on the project partners

The project is at its pre-implementation stage and it has been focusing in the capacity building project components. On this note, some activities (such as video training with women and youth groups, GIS training, urban design workshops, training on urban organic agriculture, enumerator training, etc.) have been carried out by executing partners which aimed at contributing to local capacity building of Government officials and broader society groups. Conceptual designs for actions at community and ward levels will be tested and validated with local partners and communities in the coming phases. **According to KIs, more significant outcomes are to be achieved in the following phases with the implementation of proposed climate resilient actions.**

4.2.5 Outcomes/foreseen impact on local collaborating partners, consultants and professionals involved in the implementation of the project

All project activities target improving local knowledge and practice of local stakeholders on planning for climate change and reinforcement of partnerships. Based on the information collected, improvements include climate action and disaster planning at the community level; development of techniques for community profiling; technical support for engineering actions (water and sanitation,

waste management, flood and landslide risk management); guidance on land administration; urban organic gardening best practice; urban greening and landscaping designs; evacuation centres; and community training for improved housing to be more resilient to extreme events. An element the project has been considering as essential is the establishment of strong evidence basis prior to implementation as a way to avoid potential implementation failures. **Hence, based on KIs' input, many of the most successful project outcomes are related to preliminary assessments and analysis** (e.g. link the project with other initiatives to create broader spatial analysis, clarifying land tenure for peri-urban communities and triangulated with customary owners, etc.). These processes have been adopted to build a more accurate understanding of community-level conditions and capacities.

At a local level, the project has been focusing on improving HCC's knowledge and awareness in particular relating to climate change impacts. KIs highlighted that it is crucial to consider this as an ongoing process throughout the project as existing level of technical knowledge is fairly low. **A key achievement of the project identified by one KI has been providing support to the HCC to build on their awareness of climate and disaster related risks and begin to develop solutions for addressing these.** For example, the project has been working with the physical planning division on developments which could be higher risk, as well as, explaining the need for ward councillors to engage with their communities to determine existing disaster and climate change vulnerabilities/concerns. KIs reported that training in survey techniques has been less successful, in particular due to the limited resources available on the ground to support this over the project period within MLHS, and turn-over of trained staff. **According to consultations, a more suitable way forward would be, for example, to conduct future capacity building activities through community youth groups that are linked to the Honiara Youth Council.**

4.2.6 Are vulnerable groups and crosscutting issues of gender, youth, climate change and human rights integrated in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?

The information gathered through desk review and KIs indicated that **vulnerable groups and crosscutting issues of gender, youth, climate change and human rights have been explicitly considered in all stages of the project to date.** The project framework follows a participatory approach and gender is at the forefront of all community engagement (see 4.3.2). According to KIs, youth engagement is culturally more nuanced and a specific project stream has been developed to address this. Additionally, it was highlighted that engagement with people with disabilities has been challenging due to the lack of a strong advocacy body. However, it could potentially be improved through a wider partnership with civil society.

4.3 EFFICIENCY

4.3.1 Action on progress compared to plans, budget and overall performance

The desk review and KIs detail the major delays that the project experienced as a result of the previously mentioned challenges regarding: the roles and responsibilities of partners; long/ complicated bureaucratic procedures; extremely slow project management / ownership in Honiara by CRH team; the lack of human resources in Honiara to implement on the ground; and reliance on RMIT missions to implement activities. Based on the abovementioned challenges, the **project's overall performance is considered poor.**

4.3.2 Translation and application of donor policies such as Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy

According to the information collected during the interviews and from project documents' review, **Environmental and Social Safeguards and Gender Policy have been considered and applied to the activities implemented which targeted mostly data collection, community engagement, trainings and awareness raising.** The project has been openly engaging with different stakeholders such as Government, NGOs, CSOs and local communities. For example, the CRH has engaged directly with the Ministry of Health in order to produce climate risk information and climate actions will also benefit human health and wellbeing. Furthermore, the KIs explained that all activities have been designed to deliberately engage with vulnerable groups (e.g. women, youth, elderly, people with disability, etc.) and the workshops followed a bottom-up participatory approach. Additionally, particular attention has been given to empowering women and capacity development workshops have also been held with a Vois Blong Mere, a women's empowering group.

Furthermore, all activities are screened against the 15 environmental and social risks to mitigate any potential negative impacts on people and the environment. Also, all subprojects will be screened according to ESS principles prior to approval by the Project Management Committee (PMC). Additionally, large scale infrastructure actions will follow an environmental impact assessment in order to prevent potential negative effects.

4.3.3 Were the activities and outputs delivered in a cost-efficient and timely manner?

The partnership with RMIT and use of a NZ volunteer have both **resulted in advantages and disadvantages in regards to delivering activities and outputs in a cost-efficient and timely manner.** Firstly, the number of technical experts that can be sourced through RMIT is an extremely cost-

efficient model. However, RMIT works remotely from Australia and thus incurs high travel costs to implement and oversee activities. However, this is fundamentally offset by very significant in-kind contributions as most experts donate their time to the project. Further, detailed analysis, for example of geo-spatial data is done by graduate students. Additionally, the RMIT missions also impact the timeliness of implementing activities as planning is complicated by the logistics of international travel.

The role of the NZ volunteer within the HCC was also seen as a cost-efficient method of supporting project coordination at the municipal level. Conversely though, the reporting lines (the NZ volunteer did not report to UN-Habitat but rather HCC and the Government of New Zealand) meant that there was also a lack of accountability to the project. Therefore, to better support the timely delivery of activities and outputs, it is recommended for the project to employ full-time staff based in Honiara entirely dedicated to the project.

4.3.4   Implementation efficiency

In terms of efficiency, challenges and opportunities have been reported during consultations. There are various factors that have negatively impacted the efficiency of the project implementation. The lack of qualified project staff, lack of oversight in Honiara and limited communication among the different partners and the project staff were highlighted as main constraints impeding the efficiency of the project. Additional challenges regarding the project's efficiency include: the replacement of UN-Habitat's team leader based in Fiji, which impacted the implementation process as the project had no supervision from August to November 2019; civil unrest during local elections which resulted in field visits being cancelled; the lack of local budget that led to some activities postponed and/or cancelled; the recent impact of COVID-19, as previously mentioned; limited access to information and communications technology as well as high costs for resources such as data. On the positive side, existing project staff are well-placed within government, which contributes to strengthening relationships among partners both at national and local levels. RMIT's level of engagement and motivation has also been reported as a positive factor contributing to the project's efficiency. While it is noted above that there is a lack of technical capacity based in Honiara, the project coordinator who is based there has been able to follow up on actions has been a positive feature that has contributed to improved efficiency as people prefer face to face interactions rather than remote communications. Lastly, collaboration with other projects and initiatives has been reported a great opportunity to increase efficiency by sharing resources and knowledge to deliver trainings (e.g. the joint Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)/Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) training workshops for wards councillors; the aligning design studios with SPREP's Honiara case studies, etc).

4.4 SUSTAINABILITY

4.4.1 Factors affecting or likely to affect sustainability of the results

One positive factors that is likely to contribute to the sustainability of the results is the project team's focus on aligning project activities with Government work plans so that the findings would be better positioned to be mainstreamed into policies and practices in Honiara. Furthermore, by following a participatory approach throughout the different phases (e.g. community consultations, co-design of solutions, etc.), the actions implemented are more likely to strengthen community ownership and hence achieve sustainability in the longer term. Lastly, the development of locally appropriate methods, and training activities with key local stakeholders (including CSOs), also means that knowledge and activities could continue beyond the lifetime of the project. However, limited technical capacity to implement and monitor the physical infrastructures being proposed could also be a barrier for the sustainability of the project. Hence, a clearer involvement and ownership from MLHS will be crucial to ensure the sustainability of the results. Additionally, a community capacity development strategy should be clearly defined in order to continue building capacities within the communities. This would help in managing communities' expectations and support organisation; hence, mitigating a potential decrease in their level of involvement and cooperation.

4.4.2 Established networks among institutions

According to KIs, **RMIT, the Project Coordinator and NZ volunteer played a key role in developing links between institutions**. As mentioned earlier, RMIT has established strong networks with other organisations working in Honiara, such as, ICLEI, SPREP, World Bank, UN-Women, UNDRR, and NGO's. For example, RMIT has developed links with, Kustom Garden, a local farming training institute, which can support urban farming activities in informal settlements. The work of the NZ volunteer in strengthening networks between RMIT and government was also noted as crucial to building sustainability of RMIT missions.

4.4.3 From "built capacities to building capacity"

Different levels of knowledge transfer have been reported during consultations. RMIT consultants have been building capacity of local staff by providing training on surveying technology and household engagement techniques. At the council level, project consultants have been promoting consultations with HCC on climate change/environmental law knowledge and informal settlements, as well as the overflow into Greater Guadalcanal Province's peri-urban areas. Additionally, workshops on climate change and disaster management with the City Clerk, councillors and heads of division were also carried out by the project's consultants. These workshops focused on building capacity and

encouraging ward councillors to engage with their communities to develop disaster risk reduction strategies and determine key vulnerabilities which could be addressed by HCC. The NZ volunteer embedded in the HCC also facilitated the selection of the City Mayor for the UN-Habitat Mayor's academy which targets the mayors from across the Asia and Pacific regions. By attending international sessions, the mayor had the opportunity to strengthen his knowledge on urbanisation and climate change while building bonds with other cities in the region. With regards to building capacity of communities, both project consultants and local project staff have been conducting frequent community workshops and consultations developing climate actions, transect walks to identify to identify key community features and vulnerable areas, and promoting engagement with local leadership. **These activities have been contributing to strengthening communities' capacities and increase their involvement and ownership of the project.**

4.4.4   Using new knowledge to build up confidence

The engagement with three of the five communities started during the implementation of the Honiara Urban Resilience and Climate Action Planning (HURCAP) in 2015 and it has played an important role in building community confidence. According to KIs, communities are appreciative of sustained engagement, and to be part of the identification of vulnerabilities, the local capacity development needs and the prioritization and co-design of actions. **The integration of both bottom-up and top-down approaches into climate resilient community development plans has been greatly contributing to informing communities on future development**, including beyond the timeframe of this project. Throughout community assessment and mapping, the project has ensured equitable assess, ongoing project support and community ownership over actions while strengthening relationships between community member and the project team.

4.4.5   Implementing capacity of the cooperation partners to take the activities forward

As mentioned in previous sections, **limited institutional and technical knowledge locally available has been identified as one critical issue affecting the project.** Although MLHS does have the capacity to take forward actions/activities of their competence, more project staff fully dedicated to the project would highly contribute to increase the sustainability of the results. Additionally, engagement with other implementing entities to support the different activities proposed by the project (e.g. engineering actions, awareness raising activities, implementation of evacuation centres, etc.) would be crucial to take the actions forward. RMIT is to continue supporting the project with technical expertise by developing full engineering solutions for the implementation of actions, producing landscape designs for ecosystem-based adaptation and nature-based solutions, defining an

evacuation centre plan for the city (including new building design and retrofitting guidance and training, and assessment of land administrations for selected project actions. According to KIs, potential small scale interventions should be considered as a short-term mechanism to ensure ongoing community engagement and project support between implementation phases. Lastly, improved communication and increased monitoring visits once travel restrictions are lifted by UH-Habitat have been highlighted as crucial to ensure the success of the next phases of implementation.

5   LESSONS LEARNED

Implementation

The diversity and complementarity of expertise offered by the "task force" mobilized by the RMIT, and the smooth and good interaction with the project team in Honiara has a great potential to efficiently implement the project and to achieve the expected results. The team members' willing to multiply interlinkages, and to share data and lessons learnt is highly contributing to this positive outcome.

The project requires on-site project oversight as well as frequent missions by the main implementing partner. Physical presence is an important factor for timely implementation; without it, project implementation is severely impacted. This lesson learnt has and will continue to result in the recruitment of more project staff in Honiara to provide on-site support in order to ensure the effectiveness of results.

Long/ complicated bureaucratic procedures have been identified as one of the main challenges affecting the achievement of results. This must to be taken into consideration when designing the implementation modalities for the coming 2 years. For example, outsourcing of the implementation of some infrastructure projects, or partnering with other organisations/initiatives are potential solutions.

Planning for sufficient staff is of critical importance: resources and capacities of implementing partners are limited and require extensive guidance and procedures for recruitment take extremely long. Additionally, constant community engagement and frequent consultations with several stakeholders represent a critical component of the project. Hence, frequent in-person monitoring is required.

Thorough community mobilization and capacity building remains critical. The majority of the settlements do not have a formal governance structure and require extensive support in order to set up community committees. These structures would be crucial in guiding the project implementation in a more transparent and inclusive way.

Community/National Impact

- **Community Governance:** Community organization has and will to continue to drastically improve, leading to increased social coherence;
- **Linkages**: Connecting target communities with HCC as well as national government has been important for the target communities;
- **Climate Resilient Assets:** Building community assets that are urgently needed;
- **Advocacy:** The project highlights the importance of climate resilience incremental informal settlements upgrading to a wide range of stakeholders through continued advocacy, potentially leading to an increase in programming targeted specifically at informal settlements;
- **Increased awareness:** through continued engagement and capacity development, communities have benefitted from awareness raising actives on a range of topics. The integration of both bottom-up and top-down approaches into climate resilient community development plans has been greatly contributing to informing communities on future development.

6   RECOMMENDATIONS

Having analysed the project's implementation process, the evaluators consider that the project is performing well on its way and it has been contributing to increasing the resilience of informal urban settlements in Solomon Islands that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks. To improve the process, the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the project's implementation, the evaluation team has some recommendations which are presented in the following sections.

6.1   ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF ALL INVOLVED STAKEHOLDERS

Human resources

As mentioned in previous sections, the limited staff locally available to dedicate time to the project has been highlighted as a major issue impacting the project's implementation. The recruitment of a Climate Resilient Officer for Honiara City Council would largely contribute to increase the effectiveness of the project. Also, according to KIs, additional staff with particular expertise (a project manager, an urban planner and a lands' officer) should be recruited by MLHS. The establishment of a Project Committee within MLHS headed by a Deputy Secretary was also reported as key to ensuring the achievement of project's objectives.

Improving communication among all stakeholders involved in the project is to be prioritized in the implementation of next phases. More regular formal meetings with project's stakeholders (UN-Habitat, RMIT, MLHS, MECDM, HCC, etc) are to be included in the revised work plan. Additionally, regular check-ins with the council to update them on the project progress and suggestions on how they can further support the project are highly recommended. For example, quarterly trainings/updates for city councillors and/or engaging HCC staff in workshops/meetings on relevant topics. Lastly, frequent follow ups with the communities while planning/designing the next phases would be strongly advisable in order to ensure continued community engagement which would highly contribute to the project's effectiveness and efficiency. Specific recommendations for stakeholder engagement include:

- Monthly meetings between UN-Habitat and City Clerk;
- Monthly meetings with project's stakeholders;
- Quarterly training activities/follow ups with city councillors and/or heads of division;
- Ongoing regular UN-Habitat meetings, documented with minutes and actions.

Executing partners

The involvement of one or two more non-governmental executing partners (depending on further agreements) to move the implementation forward is strongly recommended. For example, ensure ongoing engagement with waste management division to discuss biodigester at Central Market or supporting the HCC and MLHS in updating the Local Planning Scheme which is due this year.

Additionally, executing partners should ensure that the project is included in their work plans so that activities would no longer be considered external.

Capacity Development Strategy

A strong capacity development strategy is needed to ensure community support and involvement in the project activities moving forward. The strategy should be clearly defined and compliment the hard components being proposed while focusing on building community governance systems. It is also recommended to involve different groups within the communities, such as women's groups and community youth groups that are linked to the Honiara Youth Council. Having a capacity building strategy would help to streamline engagement and promote consistent communication with communities, thus establishing greater ownership over the project.

6.1 MODELS TO BE APPLIED IN FUTURE PROJECTS – EASY REPLICATION

It is recommended that in the design and implementation of hard and soft components, the project ensure that processes and actions are appropriate for scaling up. By utilizing the project to identify a set of hard and soft components that can be replicated in additional settlements, the project could contribute to the climate resilience of a greater number of informal settlements. Furthermore, government ownership would likely increase if the project partners could see how activities could be applied to their mandate.

ANNEX A – RELEVANT ADAPTATION FUND'S OUTCOMES

Outcome 1	Reduced exposure at national level to climate-related hazards and threats
Outcome 2	Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socio-economic and environmental losses
Outcome 3	Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level
Outcome 4	Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development and natural resource sectors
Outcome 5	Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress

ANNEX B – EVALUATION MATRIX

COMPONENT	RELEVANCE: Are the project's adopted strategies pertaining to each result and overall objective still valid?					EFFECTIVENESS: Are the delivery of activities and outputs contributing to the achievement of the Results and overall objective?						EFFICIENCY: What is the efficiency of the implementation to date?				SUSTAINABILITY: To what extent are the project effects towards building capacity sustainable?				
	Rationale of Result and its objective	Relationship to the SDGs, Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, Paris Agreement and the New Urban Agenda and 'Next Steps'	Changes in Result context during implementation (5 - no change, 1 - large change)	Institutional and partner priorities	Ownership by national and local stakeholders	Actual or expected achievement of Results at the time of the mid-term evaluation	Factors and processes affecting the achievement of Results	How appropriate and effective are the partnerships and other institutional relationships?	Outcomes to date (positive/negative, foreseen/unforeseen) on the project partners, (including network partners, local governments, and national governments and their related local institutions; and other stakeholders)	Outcomes/foreseen impact (positive/negative, foreseen/unforeseen) on local collaborating partners, consultants and professionals involved in the implementation of the project?	Are vulnerable groups and crosscutting issues of gender, youth, climate change and human rights integrated in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?	Action progress compared to plans, budget and overall performance	Translation and application of donor policies such as Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy	Were the activities and outputs delivered in a cost-efficient and timely manner?	Implementation efficiency	Factors affecting or likely to affect sustainability of the Results	Established networks among institutions, local authorities; established partnerships	From "built capacities to building capacity": utilising programme team, consultants, partners and trained municipal staff as multipliers	Using new knowledge to build up confidence; owned, further disseminated and applied	Implementing capacity of the cooperation partners to take the activities forward
			4,0					**2,9**						**3,0**				**3,3**		
1 Community Level	5	5	3	4	3	4	2	3	3	4	4	2	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	3
2 Ward Level	5	5	5	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
3 City-wide Governance and Capacity Strengthening	5	5	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3
4 Knowledge Management and Advocacy	5	5	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Component 1 – Community Level

Community level actions

Outcome:
- Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes as well as capacity to implement at local level
- Increasing adaptive capacity within relevant development and natural resources sectors

Output:
- 1.1 In addition to existing community action plans developed as part of the Honiara Urban Resilience and Climate Action Plan (HURCAP), complete community climate action plans for Wind Valley and Gilbert Camp/Jabros
- 1.2 In-depth community profiling for the hotspot case studies
- 1.3 Scoping and feasibility studies of prioritised local actions for each hotspot community
- 1.4 Implementation of screened/agreed resilience actions in each hotspot

Community level capacity strengthening

Outcome:
- Reduced vulnerability at the city-level to climate-related hazards and threats

Output:
- 2.1 Training on conducting community profile self-assessment
- 2.2 Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues

Component 2 – Ward Level

Ward level actions

Outcome:
- Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes as well as capacity to implement at local level
- Increased ward-level climate, disaster and ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress
- Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development and natural resources sectors

Output:
- 3.1 To develop a women-focused climate risk communications program
- 3.2 To integrate climate change into educational programs for youth and children
- 3.3 To implement ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood management, etc. (hard component)
- 3.4 To develop climate resilience community spaces, including productive open spaces and community evacuation centres (hard component)

Ward level capacity strengthening

Outcome:
- Strengthening institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate induced socio-economic and environmental losses

Output:
- 4.1 Providing 'Planning for Climate Change' training for nominated 'resilience officers' in each of Honiara's wards, and integrate training with DRR knowledge (what to do and where to go)
- 4.2 Pilot best practice participatory approach to city government, NGO, and community collaboration in climate action planning
- 4.3 Assess locally appropriate land administration options for peri-urban locations

Component 3 – City-wide Governance and Capacity Strengthening

Outcome:
- Strengthening institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate induced socio-economic and environmental losses

Output:
- 5.1 Capacity development needs assessment to be conducted in Honiara with focal Ministries and Honiara City Council
- 5.2 Develop and run capacity development workshops for planners and other urban and related professionals in support of urban resilience: planning, land administration and GIS risk mapping
- 5.3 Employ a climate adaptation and resilience officer, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group and provide support for regular meetings
- 5.4 Develop and support more effective partnership networks, including for cross-border issues, and provide support for increased participation
- 5.5 Policy and stakeholder mapping, and a whole-of-government review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy (including land use plans and building codes)

Component 4 – Knowledge Management and Advocacy

Outcome:
- Project implementation is fully transparent, all stakeholders are informed of products and results and have access to these for replication

Output:
- 4.1 Climate change training and knowledge exchange
- 4.2 Advocacy materials
- 4.3 Knowledge sharing platform
- 4.4 Project learning mechanism

STATUS
- Not started
- In progress
- Complete

RATING
- 1 Very poor
- 2 Poor
- 3 Average
- 4 Good
- 5 Excellent

Outputs	Activity	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
		Jun-18 Jul-18 Aug-18 Sep-18 Oct-18 Nov-18 Dec-18	Jan-19 Feb-19 Mar-19 Apr-19 May-19 Jun-19 Jul-19 Aug-19 Sep-19 Oct-19 Nov-19 Dec-19	Jan-20 Feb-20 Mar-20 Apr-20 May-20 Jun-20 Jul-20 Aug-20 Sep-20 Oct-20 Nov-20 Dec-20	Jan-21 Feb-21 Mar-21 Apr-21 May-21 Jun-21 Jul-21 Aug-21 Sep-21 Oct-21 Nov-21 Dec-21	Jan-22 Feb-22 Mar-22 Apr-22 May-22 Jun-22

COMPONENT 1 - Community Level Actions

Outputs	Activity
1.1 In addition to existing community action plans developed as part of the HURCAP process, complete community climate action plans for White River and Tuvaruhu informal settlements	1.1.1 Identification of key issues and prioritisation of actions for two additional hotspot case studies (Nggosi and Panatina wards)
1.2. In-depth community profiling for the hotspot communities	1.2.1 In-depth profiling of all hotspot communities - establish local survey teams - train local survey teams - conduct household and community-level surveys to establish baselines
1.3. Scoping and feasibility studies of prioritized local actions for each hotspot community	1.3.1 Carry out scoping and feasibility study. Assess the cost, feasibility and partnerships that will be needed to implement the actions suggested by the community.
1.4. Implementation of screened / agreed resilience actions in each hotspot community.	1.4.1 Implement screened/agreed pilot-studies in each hotspot community.
	1.4.2 Provide technical support where necessary.

COMPONENT 2 - Community level capacity strengthening

Outputs	Activity
2.1. Training on conducting community profile self-assessment and monitoring	2.1.1 Training on surveys, data recording, and data management.
2.2 Awareness and capacity development support, including workshops relating to key issues (CCA/Community Early Warning/DRR/Health)	2.2.1 Awareness and capacity building activity relating to key community issues.

COMPONENT 3 - Ward level actions

Outputs	Activity
3.1. To develop a women-focused climate risk communications programme	3.1.1 Development of theatre performances, radio broadcasts, and community newsletters
	3.1.2 Work with women's groups in Honiara to determine the most effective means of communicating about climate risk strategies, and which actions are likely to be most successful given the local context.
3.2. To integrate climate change into educational programs for youth and children	3.2.1 Development of teaching modules relevant to the urban context, conducting lessons in schools and youth community settings, and contributing to the development of environmental curricula for schools.
	3.2.2 Translate/apply the Climate Change Child-Centred Adaptation approach to schools and youth programmes in Honiara
3.3 Ecosystem-based adaptation options, in particular for food security, sustainable livelihoods, flood mgt. etc. implemented	3.3.1 Conducting training and piloting of closed-loop organic waste and urban food production activities, and reducing climate vulnerability through ecosystem services (enhancing food security, reducing storm water run-off, and reduced sensitivity to climate extremes due to reduced waste and rubbish accumulation in the local area).
3.4. Climate resilient community spaces developed, including productive open spaces and community evacuation centres (NATURE-BASED SOLUTIONS)	3.4.1 Engage with Honiara City Council to identify and promote climate resilient public space e.g. using floodplains as sports areas, planting trees to increase shading in community spaces to combat heat stress, and the rehabilitation of community centres for use as safe places for evacuation.

COMPONENT 4 - Ward level capacity strengthening

Outputs	Activity
4.1. Provide 'Planning for Climate Change' training for nominated 'resilience officers' in each of Honiara's wards, and integrate training with DRR	4.1.1 Training of resilience officers in both climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction, and provide a platform for whole of city regular meetings and capacity building.
4.2. Pilot best practice participatory approach to city government, NGO, and community collaboration in climate planning and enhance the understanding of	4.2.1 Pilot best practice participatory approach in climate planning and enhance the understanding of adaptation pathways
4.3. Assess locally appropriate land administration options for peri-urban settlements, and households, around Ngossi and Panatina wards	4.3.1 Assess appropriate land administration system options that seek to account for both Western and Customary laws when dealing with urban growth, secure and safeguard legitimate tenure rights, and inform decisions on resettlement.

COMPONENT 5 - City-wide governance and capacity strengening

Outputs	Activity
5.1. Capacity development needs assessment to be conducted in Honiara with focal Ministries and HCC	5.1.1 Capacity development needs assessment in Honiara (planning, GIS risk mapping, land administration, engineering, data management, climate change adaptation, media and communications).
5.2. Develop and run capacity development workshops for planners and other urban and related professionals in support of urban resilience: planning, land administration and GIS risk mapping.	5.2.1 Initiate new MoU's between Government departments, Solomon Islands National University (SINU), and RMIT University/UN-Habitat to provide training at capacity development workshops, and to establish new avenues for teaching and learning opportunities.
	5.2.2 Development of tailored capacity building workshops for professional staff to build knowledge and required skill sets (HCC and focal Ministries) at RMIT University.
	5.2.3 Two-week course of workshops designed to cater for planning, land administration, and GIS risk mapping for HCC and SI Ministry
5.3. Employ a climate adaptation and resilience officer, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group and provide support for regular meetings	5.3.1 Employ a Climate Adaptation and Resilience Officer (CARO) for Honiara City Council, and constitute a multi-stakeholder steering group for implementation of the project.
5.4. Develop and support more effective partnership networks, including for cross-border issues, and provide support for increased participation	5.4.1 Develop a formal mechanism for managing cross-boundary urban resilience issues between Guadalcanal Province and HCC, particularly taking into account cross-boundary flows of resources, people and the long-term urban expansion of the city.
5.5. Policy and stakeholder mapping, and a whole-of-govt. review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy (including land use plans and building codes)	5.5.1 Map and assess linkages between relevant stakeholders and initiatives for improved governance and institutional response to climate change impacts and natural disasters.
	5.5.2 Conduct a whole-of-government policy review to identify areas for mainstreaming of climate change considerations across urban policy (including a review of land use plans and the introduction of possible building codes).

Knowledge management and advocacy

Outputs	Activity
6.1 Climate change training and knowledge exchange	6.1.1 Develop climate change adaptation training and knowledge exchange programmes between HCC staff and ward councilors.
6.2. Advocacy materials	*training youths for pictures/videos…*
6.3. Knowledge sharing platform	6.3.1 Develop and maintain a knowledge sharing mechanism at the city-wide scale, in close collaboration with HCC and the two key ministries.
6.4. Project learning mechanism	6.4.1 Conduct and record a participatory joint learning event based on annual review of activites and make available project findings and recommendations.

ANNEX D – LIST OF INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS

Honiara City Council Ward location	Hotspot name	Number of households (per project document, 2009)	Total population (per project document, 2009)	Number of households (2019, ESTIMATED)	Total population (2019, ESTIMATED)*	Average HH size (estimate)	Number of households (2021, based on HHS)	Total population (2021, ESTIMATED) (surveyed plus estimations)	Status
01 Mataniko	Ontong Java	77	610	88	697	7,9	HHS to be conducted in 2021 (if possible)	Yet to be calculated	Draft Climate Resilience Community Profile completed
02 Vura	Kukum Fishing Village	60	453	55	415	7,6	HHS to be conducted in 2021 (if possible)	Yet to be calculated	Draft Climate Resilience Community Profile completed
03 Kola'a	Aekafo Planning Area	822 (401 accoridng to CRDP)	5183	1154	7270	6,3	HHS to be conducted in 2021 (if possible)	Yet to be calculated	Draft Climate Resilience Community Profile completed
04 Nggossi	White River/ Wind Valley	113	789	220	1496	6,8	HHS to be conducted in 2021 (if possible)	Yet to be calculated	Draft Climate Resilience Community Profile completed
05 Panatina	Gilbert Camp/ Jabros (originally Tuvahu)	260	2339	296	1924	6,5	HHS to be conducted in 2021 (if possible)	Yet to be calculated	Draft Climate Resilience Community Profile completed
	TOTAL		9374	1813	11802				

ANNEX E – STAKEHOLDER MAPPING

Name	Institution	Position	Contact	Data collection method
Mr. Bernhard Barth	UN-Habitat	Programme Manager	bernhard.barth@un.org	Questionnaire answered by email
Ms. Inga Korte	UN-Habitat	Project Team Leader	inga.korte@un.org	In-person interview
Mr. Steve Likaveke	UN-Habitat	Project Coordinator	slikaveke@mlhs.gov.sb	Questionnaire answered by email
Ms. Cindrella Mede Vunagi	City Council Honiara	Chief Physical Planner	cvunagi@hcc.gov.sb	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Buddley Ronney	Ministry of Lands, Housing and Survey (MLHS)	Deputy Secretary Technical	bronnie@mlhs.gov.sb	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. John Clemo	Based in Honiara City Council (volunteer role with Volunteer Service Abroad)	Climate Change and Resilience Advisor	john.clemo@gmail.com	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Chanel Iroi	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management & Meteorology (MECDM)	Deputy Secretary	clroi@mecdm.gov.sb	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Darryn McEvoy	Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT)	Project Lead Coordinator	darryn.mcevoy@rmit.edu.au	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Alexei Trundle	University of Melbourne	Technical Advisor and sub-contracted Climate Change Adaptation and Community Consultation Specialist	alexei.trundle@unimelb.edu.au	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Philemon Kaola	Ontog Java Community	Community Secretary	---	Questionnaire answered by email and sent to the project coordinator based in Honiara
Mr. Steven Taniamae Bunabo	Aekafo Planning Area	Chairman of Jericho 2 Community	---	Questionnaire answered by email and sent to the project coordinator based in Honiara
Mr. Teiba Manu	Wind Valley	Community Secretary	---	Questionnaire answered by email and sent to the project coordinator based in Honiara

ANNEX F – CONTACTS

CLIENT
United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat)
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific - Fukuoka 1-1-1 Tenjin, Chuo-ku, Fukuoka 810-0001 JAPAN

habitat.fukuoka@un.org
www.fukuoka.unhabitat.org

AUTHORS
Katherine Drakeford | kdrakeford08@gmail.com
Sara Vargues | smvargues@gmail.com

DATE
October 2020

STATUS
Finalised