MID-TERM EVALUATION

INCREASING THE RESILIENCE OF INFORMAL URBAN SETTLEMENTS IN FIJI THAT ARE HIGHLY VULNERABLE TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISKS

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, Kamsin Raju (2020)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The *Fiji Resilient Informal Settlements (FRIS)* project financed by the Adaptation Fund provides support to addressing climate change and disaster risk issues, with a strong focus on informal settlements. This is a four-year project implemented by UN-Habitat and executed by the Ministry of Housing and Community Development (MHCD) and the Ministry of Local Government (MLG). The overall objective of the project is to increase the resilience of informal urban settlements in Fiji that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks.

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide the Adaptation Fund and implementing partners with an assessment of the performance of the FRIS project to date, identify lessons learnt and develop recommendations that can be taken forward to the next stages of the project. The evaluation focuses on examining the project's four components: Institutional strengthening to enhance local climate response actions, Local (community/informal settlements) resilience strengthening, enhancing resilience of community level physical, natural and social assets and ecosystems, and Awareness raising, knowledge management and communications. The components are evaluated against the results criteria laid out in the mid-term evaluation TOR: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

Methodology

The mid-term evaluation utilized a desk review of project documents, questionnaires and structured interviews with key information 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 mid-term evaluation identified challenges regarding prioritization of activities and overall ownership by the project's executing partners due to a lack of resources. However, a high level of support for the project at the community level is present, which is likely due to the successful use of a participatory approach throughout the participatory vulnerability assessment and action planning (VAAP) process.

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 the lack of human resources, limited technical knowledge, low stakeholder engagement and long/ complicated bureaucratic procedures of executing partners. As a result, UN-Habitat has provided significant additional support to the executing partners with its limited resources. Despite the challenges that are present, the project has had some great successes. The major achievements to date include the inclusiveness of activities, in regards to vulnerable groups, the establishment of resilience officers (ROs) in four town councils and the completion of the VAAPs, both of which pave the way for greater implementation effectiveness of the remaining outputs.

Efficiency The project's overall performance is considered average. The completed activities have been implemented 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 numerous existing factors that impact the sustainability of the project results. Along with the issues described earlier regarding ownership and effectiveness, appropriate design of physical works, budget management at Ministry level and integration of project outputs to MHCD work plans are also factors that are likely to influence sustainability.

However, there are also factors present which can promote the longevity of results. The work of the ROs within the Town Councils and at the community level enables consistent engagement and capacity building with these stakeholders. Furthermore, the participatory approach used by the project when engaging with communities has been crucial for building trust and thus promoting the sustainability of results.

Recommendations

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

2. UN-Habitat and MHCD to co-develop work plans and monitoring framework for the next stages of the project to increase accountability and ownership of executing partners.

3. Continue regular meetings to check progress of work plans against monitoring framework.

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AF	Adaptation Fund
AoC	Agreement of Cooperation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DTCP	Department Town and Country Planning
ESGY	Environmental, Social, Gender and Youth
ESS	Environmental and Social Safeguards
FRIS	Fiji Resilient Informal Settlements
HHS	Household Survey
KI	Key Informant
MHCD	Ministry of Housing and Community Development
MLG	Ministry of Local Government
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
RO	Resilience officer
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
USP	University of South Pacific
VAAP	Vulnerability Assessment and Action Planning

1   INTRODUCTION

1.1   PROJECT BACKGOUND AND CONTEXT

The *Fiji Resilient Informal Settlements (FRIS)* project financed by the Adaptation Fund provides support in addressing climate change and disaster risk issues, with a strong focus on informal settlements. This is a four-year project implemented by UN-Habitat and executed by the Ministry of Housing and Community Development (MHCD) and the Ministry of Local Government (MLG).

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

1. Institutional strengthening for enhanced local climate response
2. Local (community/informal settlement) resilience strengthening
3. Enhancing resilience of community level physical, natural and socio-economic assets and ecosystems
4. Awareness raising, knowledge management and Communication

The project has a total budget of US$4,235,995 million and focuses on 16 informal settlements in four urban areas: Lami, Sigatoka, Lautoka and Nadi.

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 informal urban settlements in Fiji that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks. This will be achieved by:

I. Institutional strengthening for enhanced local climate response;
II. Local (community/informal settlement) resilience strengthening;
III. Enhancing resilience of community level physical, natural and socio-economic assets and ecosystems;
IV. Awareness raising, knowledge management and Communication.

1.3   PURPOSE AND FOCUS OF THE EVALUATION

The mid-term evaluation of the Fiji Resilient Informal Settlements (FRIS) project is in accordance with the requirements laid out by the Adaptation Fund. The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide the Adaptation Fund and implementing partners with an assessment of the performance of the FRIS project to date, based on the agreement, logical framework, activities and budget. It is expecting to assess the overall performance of the project with regards to its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Furthermore, the assessment will identify lessons learned and recommendations for the remainder of the project implementation.

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 FRIS project adopts a comprehensive framework built upon 4 main components.

Component 1, *Institutional strengthening to enhance local climate response actions* is aligned with both the Adaptation Fund's outcome 1[1] and Fiji priorities[2] and focuses on reducing vulnerability to climate-related hazards and threats both at the city/town and community level by:

o Conducting city-wide risk and vulnerability assessment;
o Producing hazard maps;
o Developing city-wide climate change action plans;
o Establishing Urban Planner / ROs in 4 towns/cities.

---

[1] See annex A

[2] Government of the Republic of Fiji, (2018). *Republic of Fiji. National Adaptation Plan. A pathway towards climate resilience.* Retrieved from: https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/National%20Adaptation%20Plan_Fiji.pdf

Component 2, *Local (community/informal settlements) resilience strengthening*, is aligned with both the Adaptation Fund's outcome 3[3] and Fiji priorities[4] and focuses on strengthening awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes and capacity by:

- o Developing an assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning;
- o Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments, including hazard maps, conducted, in informal settlements in Lami, Sigatoka, Nadi and Lautoka;
- o Developing community-level resilience, recovery and upgrading plans in identified informal settlements (community action plans (CAPs)) supported by a 'gender and inclusion assessment' of the resulting actions to take forward into component 3;
- o Involving targeted population groups in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities;
- o Targeting household and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability.

Component 3, *Enhancing resilience of community level physical, natural and social assets and ecosystems*, is in line with the Adaptation Fund's outcomes 4 and 5[5] and aligned with Fiji priorities[6]. It focuses on increasing the adaptive capacity of relevant development and natural resources sectors and increasing ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress by:

- o Physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems developed or strengthened in response to climate change impacts, with a consideration of the following sectors and options: urban development and housing; communications and DRR; food security and sustainable agriculture sector; human health and welfare; marine and fisheries; waste and waste infrastructure; and water resources and infrastructure.

Component 4, *Awareness raising, knowledge management and communications*, is in line with Adaptation Fund's guidelines[7] and is also aligned with the Fiji priorities[8]. 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:

---

[3] See annex A

[4] Government of the Republic of Fiji, (2018). *Republic of Fiji. National Adaptation Plan. A pathway towards climate resilience.* Retrieved from: https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/National%20Adaptation%20Plan_Fiji.pdf

[5] See annex A

[6] Government of the Republic of Fiji, (2018). *Republic of Fiji. National Adaptation Plan. A pathway towards climate resilience.* Retrieved from: https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/National%20Adaptation%20Plan_Fiji.pdf

[7] 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

[8] Government of the Republic of Fiji, (2018). *Republic of Fiji. National Adaptation Plan. A pathway towards climate resilience.* Retrieved from: https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/National%20Adaptation%20Plan_Fiji.pdf

- Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/ housing are generated, captured and distributed to other communities, civil society, and policy-makers in government appropriate mechanisms;
- Regional advocacy and replication.

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 (see annex F) was facilitated by UN-Habitat team members and the selection of key informants was based on their 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. The results of the mid-term evaluation are summarised in the Evaluation Matrix (annex C). Each component is scored between numbers one to five, one being very poor and five being excellent. The components are scored against the evaluation questions listed in the ToR and the numbers correspond with the results in section 4. It is important to note the scoring is purely qualitative and illustrates outcomes of the evaluation. Along with annex C, the scorings are also summarised according to the ToR result categories of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability in section 4.

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 to gain an understanding of workplans, 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
- Climate Resilience Fiji ESGY Scoping and Interim Management Report – July 2019
- Knowledge Management Strategy Fiji – August 2018
- FRIS Project Performance Report (PPR) – July 2019
- 16 informal settlements' Vulnerability Assessment and Action Planning Reports

3.2.2   Key informant interviews and consultations

In addition to documentation review, the information gathering techniques included:
- Interviews with FRIS team members:
  - Mr. Bernhard Barth, Programme Manager, Human Settlements Officer, UN-Habitat
  - Ms. Inga Korte, Project Team Leader Urban Climate Resilience, UN-Habitat
  - Ms. Begonya Peiró, Resilience and Informal Settlements Advisor, Ministry of Housing and Community Development
  - Ms. Mere Rayawa, Project Assistant, UN-Habitat
  - Ms. Kamsin Raju, Resilience Officer for Nadi town, Nadi Town Council
- Interviews with key stakeholders/government officials involved in the project
  - Mr. Sanjeeva Perera, Permanent Secretary of Ministry of Housing and Community Development
  - Mr. Keith Hornby, Policy Advisor, Ministry of Housing and Community Development
  - Ms. Selaima Maitoga, Health Inspector from Lami Town Council
  - Mr. Craig Powell, Chief Executive Officer Nadi / Sigatoka Town Councils
  - Mr. Meli Koroitamana, General Manager Operations of Nadi Town Council
  - Mr. Mohammed Anees Khan, Chief Executive Officer of Lautoka City Council
  - Mr. Nilesh Prakash, Chair of the Project Management Committee, former Director of the Climate Change Unit

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 3 of the 16 informal settlements that are part of the FRIS project. Bilo and Vuniivi informal settlements are both located in Lami, outside the town boundaries. Korociri informal settlement is located in Nadi, outside the town boundaries. Interviews have been carried out with the community leaders of those three settlements:
- Mr. Kevueli Vunibaka, Community Leader of Bilo Informal Settlement
- Mr. Isereimi Vakosokoso, Community Leader of Vuniivi Informal Settlement

- Mr. Rahemat Ali, Community Focal Point of Korociri Informal Settlement

3.3   MID-TERM EVALUATION LIMITATIONS AND MITIGATION

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 an in-person/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 community and MHCD responses.

The evaluation team attempted to mitigate these limitations by selecting several key informants who have similar or the same roles regarding the project. Triangulating data from multiple sources allowed the team to verify the information provided by the key informants.

4   RESULTS

4.1   RELEVANCE

4.1.1   Rationale of the results and its objectives

The overall objective of the project is to increase the resilience of the informal urban settlements in Fiji that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks by responding to varies gaps that were identified. Based on the review of project documents and data collected from the key informants (KIs) **it is possible to state that the project's objectives have not changed and that the project's rationale is still valid and very relevant**. According to the information gathered during the KIs, the FRIS project is currently even more relevant as challenges and vulnerabilities faced by community residents have been increasing in the last 6 months. As a result of the economic impact of COVID-19, employment and food security represent now top concerns for Fijian communities. As community members rely more on natural resources for subsistence, they become increasingly vulnerable to climate-related hazards which frequently affect their crops and livestock. Furthermore, many people in the informal settlements have reported loss of employment or reduced hours, which further limits their ability to response to emergencies and allocate resources to strengthen their adaptive capacity.

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

Climate change is seen as one of the main barriers to reducing inequalities and a major threat to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This view is reflected `in the Fijian Government's National Climate Change Policy, which states that building climate resilience is critical to the implementation of the SDGs[9]. Existing development deficits exacerbate communities' vulnerability to climate change. Consequently, enhancing climate resilience within the context of informal settlements at the community-level will enable improved adaptive capacity and progress of many of the SDGs. The desk review showed that all 17 SDGs are integrated into the action identification and prioritization process, following a holistic approach. Furthermore, **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**.

4.1.3   Changes in result context during implementation

In terms of changes in result context during implementation, one of the main challenges reported by the majority of the KIs was the outbreak of the global COVID-19 pandemic. With regards to the project implementation, the major impacts were perceived at the community level. VAAP household surveys

---

[9] Ministry of Economy, Republic of Fiji, (2019). *National Climate Change Policy 2018-2030.*

were halted in one of the informal settlements which reduced the size of the sample analysed. VAAP workshops were delayed but ended up being carried out with some adjustments to the original work plan (e.g. the number of community representatives targeted to attend the workshop was reduced to 20 people which hindered the level of community engagement in some settlements).

At the community level, the current economic crisis (due to COVID-19) has changed communities' perception on vulnerabilities. The primary concern of communities is currently food security, and thus an improved understanding of how climate-related hazards impact their ability to grow crops is even more pressing. **Hence, the rationale of the project at the local level is also of even greater relevance due to COVID-19**.

4.1.4   Institutional and partner priorities

At the national level, although the project is aligned with the government's plan and strategies, it has not been considered as a top priority by government counterparts; mainly due to the lack of human resources and technical capacity to perform on the ongoing projects. At the local level, the project is also not perceived as a priority, essentially due to jurisdiction factors as informal settlements do not fall under Councils' mandate. City/town councils' focus is on urban and peri-urban communities located inside the city/town boundary and to whom the council is responsible for providing services and regulation. Additionally, according to the information obtained during consultations, **the lack of resources available to support the planning and implementation has been raised as one of the major challenges to prioritizing the project faced by the councils**.

4.1.5   Ownership by national and local stakeholders

As outlined in section 2, the desk review revealed that the project is fully aligned to the Fijian Government's National Adaptation Plan (NAP). The NAP was conceived in response to international commitments and national needs as the main overarching process to comprehensively address climate change[10]. It contains 160 adaptation measures that are to be prioritized over the five-year period of the NAP, organized across a total of 10 components (five systems components and five sectoral components). The objectives of the project are in line and respond to the aforementioned focus areas and with the governments' objectives of informal settlements' upgrading strategies. Furthermore, it is important to note the high level of engagement and support of Fiji Prime Minister who considers informal settlements upgrading as well as climate change action as government

---

[10] Government of the Republic of Fiji, (2018). *Republic of Fiji. National Adaptation Plan. A pathway towards climate resilience.* Retrieved from: https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/National%20Adaptation%20Plan_Fiji.pdf

priorities. However, as discussed in section 4.1.4, **the project has not been seen as a top priority for national stakeholders and thus the level of ownership has been compromised**.

Furthermore, the lack of capacity of the Ministry of Housing and Community Development (MHCD), to a large extent caused by change in personnel and long vacancies, following the restructuring in 2018 has been reported by the KIs as one of the major challenges throughout the first half of the project implementation. Additionally, the lack of ownership by new personnel of the MHCD has also been highlighted as hindering the level of commitment of MHCD to the FRIS project. More communication between the MCHD staff and the FRIS project team has been identified as a potential way forward in order to better align the project with MHCD's strategic work plan and priorities. Furthermore, more human resources with technical knowledge are to be considered for the next phases of the implementation to ensure the success of the varies activities and the achievement of project's outcomes.

At a local level, the municipal councils reveal a certain level of engagement with the work that is being developed by the ROs both within the councils and with the communities. However, this differs from council to council. According to the information gathered during the interviews, the level of involvement and support of the councils would be higher in the city/town-wide vulnerability assessment as councils' focus on providing services and regulation within city/town boundaries. The city-wide component would highly benefit the councils and hence increase their ownership/involvement in the project.

There is an overall high level of support for the project at the local community level. The review of project documents and KIs showed that the participatory approach used in the planning and validation workshops, whereby participants identify climate vulnerabilities and prioritize potential solutions, has helped create a sense of ownership over the project. Ownership is also reflected in the undertaking of small tasks by some communities to address the challenges discussed in the workshops. For example, in Vuniivi settlement, following the workshops, one household built a new septic tank so waste no longer pollutes the environment. Furthermore, in Bilo settlement, the community has been building a new drainage system, stating that they are doing what they can now to address the actions identified during the workshop. While community attendance at the planning and validation workshops and the amount of engagement during this process varied, generally communities were well involved in this stage, further illustrating that **the participatory approach of the VAAPs has been successful**.

Figure 1 Validation workshops in the informal settlements under component 2

When looking to the next stages of the project, the KIs reveal certain challenges that will need to be addressed by the project. Interviews with both communities and project staff highlighted the issue of having no contact with communities in the months following the workshops, particularly in regards to the potential impact on future participation and cooperation. One KII explained that as communities are not being frequently engaged they are unaware that the project has been continuing to work towards implementation. The lack of consistent engagement in the communities also falls on the Town Councils as the KIs note the difficulty in gaining support from the Council staff to carry out activities that could be used to keep communities engaged in time between workshops and implementation. The interviews suggested that a simple solution to local communities' involvement and continued cooperation with the project is provide quarterly updates, as well as, increase involvement of the Town Councils who are well placed to make field visits to the communities more frequently.

4.2   EFFECTIVENESS

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

EFFECTIVENESS:
score **3.0** 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 Timeframe and Implementation Schedule Progress):

1. Component 1 is fairly deviant from the planning due to frequent delays of government sub-contracts to executing partners. The remaining outputs (1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 – city-wide VAAPs) are expected to get started shortly as the contracts between MHCD and the University of the South Pacific (USP) has already been approved. According to the revised work plan, those outputs are to be completed by January, March and May 2021, respectively.

     Output 1.1.4 – Urban planner/resilience officer established in three towns and one city.

2. Component 2 (outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3) has been completed up to the date. Awareness raising activities have not yet been implemented, although the assessment process has also provided some awareness raising. Community Capacity Development Plan's implementation (outputs 2.1.4 and 2.1.5) is expected get started in the last quarter of the year.

     Output 2.1.1 – Assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning developed.

Output 2.1.2 – Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments, including hazard maps, conducted, in informal settlements in participating towns.

Output 2.1.3 – Assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning developed.

3. Component 3 is yet to start.

Outputs under Component 3 have not yet been completed.

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

Output 4.1.1 – Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/housing are generated, captured and distributed to other communities, civil society, and policy-makers in government appropriate mechanisms

Output 4.1.2 – Regional Advocacy and replication.

4.2.2 Factors and processes affecting the achievement of results

According to the information gathered during consultations, **there are numerous factors that have hindered the achievement of the abovementioned goals. These include: the lack of human resources, limited technical knowledge of executing partners, low stakeholder engagement and long/ complicated bureaucratic procedures.** With regards to human resources, MHCD does currently not have enough staff to support the project to the extent that is required. Additionally, human resources with greater technical expertise and well versed with the government machinery, processes and procedures would be required to advise the project management and meet the project's objectives. Being a critical partner of the project (particularly in the coming implantation phases), it would be crucial to consider more technical expertise not only on the overall management of upgrading processes but also with focus on the implementation of the physical works. Additionally, MHCD's staff turnover has been reported by KIs as a major challenge affecting the project's effectiveness. Senior technical staff who were involved with the project were reported to have resigned at crucial stages, taking with them the knowledge of the project, which resulted in UN-Habitat having to invest more time in building relationships, as well as an understanding of the project within the MHCD. It is also important to note the impact the replacement of UN-Habitat's Project Manager in Fiji had on implementation progress. The former Project Manager had to leave the country on a short notice due to personal reasons which translated into limited in-country oversight from August to November 2019 until the replacement arrived.

Regarding stakeholder engagement, the main lessons learned from engaging with other external executing partners are linked with the need of developing a proper guidance and close monitoring of activities and outputs. During the consultations, KIs highlighted the importance of having a clear understanding of the capacities of executing partners and whether these are adequate in relation to the expectations. For any future engagements of external partners, clear directions, guidelines and tools as well as main results/outputs expected have to be agreed from the beginning and implementation need to be very closely monitored.

Complicated and long bureaucratic procedures have been heavily impacting timely project implementation. Frequent delays in contracts between MHCD and other executing partners have been negatively impacting the project implementation. For example, the process of subcontracting of component 1 to an external partner was initiated early 2019 and is still not finalized. Moreover, limited specialized expertise of the external partner (Live and Learn – LLEE) who was initially subcontracted to implement the component 2 led to the hiring of two MHCD consultants to take over and finalize LLEE's deliverables. This lengthy recruitment process was further hindered by long bureaucratic

government procedures (e.g. approval of cabinet papers, advertisement requirements, etc.) required for the recruitment of international staff. The abovementioned factors translated in delays of approximately 1,5 years for Component 1 and Component 2 has been delayed by close to 6 months. Consequently, Component 3 will also be delayed by approximately 6 months. Since the city-wide assessments and strategies have not been done before the community assessments, the approach had to be adjusted. The city-level assessments would have provided a more in-depth analysis that would have been useful when selecting and informing the specific actions. Additionally, given that the hazards maps have not yet been produced, the VAAPs are predominantly based on perceptions and field observations. Nonetheless, other project activities have been adjusted to adapt to the situation and try to minimize delays.

A further factor that is likely to impact the achievement of results is the mobility restrictions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. International expertise is required to implement component 3; however, Fiji's border remains closed to non-essential travel thus hindering the potential of finding the appropriate candidate for the project's next stages. As previously emphasizes, the lack of technical expertise has been a consistent challenge for the project and therefore COVID-19 restrictions may result in further delays.

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

As previously described, the project involves partnerships between stakeholders at the community, local and national level. Feedback gained from one KI describes "*the framework established by the project to enable vertical integration [as] among the most positive and powerful aspects*" of the project. However, the KIs also show that there are many barriers to ensuring these partnerships are effective. One contributing factor that emerged from the KIs is communication and coordination can be highly challenging which contributes to a lack of clearly defined responsibilities and thus impede a sense of ownership among government partners. One example provided in the KIs is regarding output 1.1.2 (hazard maps). Although extremely relevant for increasing awareness of hazard exposure and climate risks at the city level, the Department of Town and Country Planning does not see the full alignment with its work plan anymore (having requested support to the hazard mapping during project planning) thus the hazard maps have been delayed.

The KIs describe that the attempts by the project to rectify ineffective partnerships resulted in UN-Habitat taking on many of the coordination responsibilities assigned to the MHCD. **However, the**

team's limited resources cannot sustainably perform this role without mores human resources support by the Ministry.

4.2.4 Outcomes to date on the project partners

The establishment of the ROs in the councils has presented many opportunities, as it facilitates communication and engagement with the councils and communities, which highly contributes for the strengthening of capacity at the local level, effectiveness and sustainability of the project. More engagement from other staff members from the council would be beneficial; however, limitations on personnel availability were identified as a major barrier to this. One good example where the project and the role of the ROs have already proven to be successful for some communities is the clean-up campaigns organized by the councils in the informal settlements after the lack of solid waste management has been raised by the communities during site visits and training sessions.

Under Component 2, the assessment and planning tool has been completed, and has guided the assessment and action planning process. VAAPs have been successfully completed, including quantitative and qualitative information that establish a good baseline. Despite COVID-19, targeted population groups have participated in the assessment activities (following the restrictions in terms of number of participants). Awareness raising activities have not yet been implemented, although the assessment process has also provided some awareness to the communities.

Outcomes under Component 3 have not yet been achieved. The delays under outcome 2 have influenced this. Under Component 4 (awareness raising, knowledge management and communications), the project implementation revealed a high level of transparency and all documents that have been produced are accessible to various groups of audiences. There have been some activities related to this outcome (e.g., Facebook page, brochures, etc.). Also, the methodology employed that was adapted to the Fijian context has been included in a regional guide as case study which contributes to the achievement of the main outputs.

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

According to the KIs, the project has been considerably impacting the stakeholders involved in implementation. At municipal level, the trainings organized with the councils have contributed to improving their knowledge on planning for climate change and strengthening partnerships. The upcoming city-wide assessments (under component 1) was highlighted as a great opportunity to further engage officers from the councils through a practical and hands on approach. However, a

greater engagement from MHCD and the Town Councils would be needed to maximize knowledge exchanges and practices of local stakeholders. **The ROs have been playing a crucial role both in the community and city-level work**. This year, they have been closely involved in the community-level work (e.g. coordinating the household surveys on the ground, supporting the community workshops, process the data with GIS, etc.), which has been contributing to improve their knowledge and skills and could also be very beneficial for the tasks that they have to carry out for the 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 collected through desk review and KIs illustrate that **inclusiveness is at the core of the project**. **Each activity is designed to address the specific needs of vulnerable groups and cross cutting issues through the collection of detailed disaggregated data and integrating these findings into the action planning process**. The VAAP has supported data collection in a disaggregated manner to get a better understanding of the different vulnerable groups in the settlement (e.g., household survey, participatory mapping identifying households that are vulnerable because of their exposure, or because of their socio-economic condition, etc., identifying risk spots for vulnerable groups such as children, etc.). Focus group discussions have been carried out following participatory approaches, ensuring that all groups were involved and the interventions identified have included guidelines on how to adopt a gender-based approach. Ensuring that community representatives keep being involved during the next phases, through participatory design activities and during the implementation will be crucial.

4.3 EFFICIENCY

EFFICIENCY:
score **2.9** out of 5

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, particularly that of the executing agency. However, under UN-Habitat guidance, the project has been able to move forward with component 2 and 4 and thus the **project's overall performance is considered average**. As a result of delays, project activities are currently underbudget while the project is over budget on staffing due to taking on responsibilities originally assigned to MHCD.

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.** Household surveys have integrated gender and age disaggregated data such as number of people with disabilities in the settlements, households with female heads of the household, etc. This provides a valuable baseline for the next phases of the project and can support the monitoring and evaluation process. For the VAAPs, a bottom-up participatory approach that allows community members to engage with the identification of vulnerabilities and prioritization of actions. Prior to the organization of the workshops, guidelines were provided on how to ensure that the ESS were applied (e.g., guidelines for selecting workshop participants).

Furthermore, the KIs explained that the ESS have informed the design of the capacity building framework for trainings and awareness that will be implemented alongside hard actions. All capacity building activities will be 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).

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

Overall, the activities and outputs have been delivered in a cost-efficient and timely manner with some exceptions depending on the activity. The establishment of the resilience offices has been one successful activity implemented in terms of cost-effectiveness and it has been strengthening involvement and engagement of both municipal and community levels. As mentioned in the previous sections, agreements with executing partners – particularly under component 2 – could have been more cost-efficient had there been more oversight and quality control during the activities' implementation. Having the project being executed through the government system could reduce costs such as inflated staffing and logistics costs. However, this could also be translated into lower quality of the deliverables as engaging technical expertise may be challenging.

4.3.4 Implementation efficiency

In terms of efficiency, challenges and opportunities have been reported during consultations. UN-Habitat team has been fully involved throughout all stages of the project and has been contributing to the success of the project implementation. Furthermore, the relevance of project activities to the

communities has greatly contributed to increasing their interest, involvement and sense of ownership and thus the overall implementation efficiency. As mentioned, the establishment of the ROs within the councils has been a major factor in the success of the project. Additionally, female beneficiaries have been encouraged to participate and empowered due to the number of female team members directly involved in community engagement. Challenges with regards to the project's efficiency include factors listed in previous sections, such as, lack of ownership and involvement of the MHCD as well as the PMC; long bureaucratic procedures and various actors involved in the approvals; difficult leadership of MHCD and lack of clear responsibilities; high and frequent staff turnover in counterparts (MHCD and municipal councils).

4.4 SUSTAINABILITY

4.4.1 Factors affecting or likely to affect sustainability of the results

SUSTAINABILITY:
score **2.6** out of 5

A crucial factor to secure the sustainability of the project's implementation is the involvement of the various stakeholders from national to local partners. Limited technical capacity to design, implement and monitor the physical infrastructures being proposed could also be a barrier for the sustainability of the project. The identification of suitable solutions to be implemented in the selected settlements that could be easily maintained and monitored with a minimum of resources and technical knowledge is likely to contribute to the sustainability of the project. Furthermore, integration of FRIS outputs such as APs within the MHCD work plan would be highly beneficial for future upgrading programmes. One positive factor that may contribute to the project's sustainability is the ongoing government reforms such as the review of the National Housing Policy. Among other aspects, this revision would be looking at how incremental works of projects such as FRIS could fit into the strategic approach to informal settlements' upgrading and formalisation process. A clear definition of partners' responsibilities is highly recommended in order to the project to be sustainable (e.g. Who is going to be responsible for the maintenance and monitoring of the actions implemented under the project?).

Budget management at the Ministry level has been identified by KIs as one of the major issues impacting the sustainability of the project. Consistent delays in grant agreements between MHCD and Town Councils have had negative consequences for the relationships between stakeholders, particularly in regard to ROs' payments and potential resources to be allocated to other areas for municipal operations. Additionally, according to the AoC and project budget, the ROs are only funded by the project until year 3. Initial discussions with the Project Management Committee included the expectations that councils will provide funding for the ROs in year 4 to ensure the sustainability of the project.

4.4.2 Established networks among institutions

While some networks have been established by the project, the KIs noted that these will be expanded upon as component 3 is implemented. The variety of actions proposed under component 3 will require strong working relationships with various stakeholders, such as the Ministry of Lands, i Taukei Land Trust Board, Water Authority of Fiji and the Fiji Roads Authority. However, a key issue observed by the KIs is a perceived hesitation by the MHCD to involve certain implementing partners. This challenge would need to be resolved prior to the start of component 3 as it is likely to impede establishing further networks and partnerships.

At the local level, steering committees have been formed in the four towns/cities in order to support the project implementation. The local steering committees are potentially an effective way to create networks among communities and Town Councils as well as other stakeholders. However, it has been reported by KIs that little involvement by the steering committees has been identified and thus more active participation should be promoted by the project.

4.4.3 From "built capacities to building capacity"

Different levels of knowledge transfer have been reported during consultations. The ROs have been engaged in several trainings carried out by the project consultants and USP. The trainings were focused on ESS, VAAPs and household surveys. Project consultants have been guiding the ROs in the execution of their tasks (e.g. household survey, data collection, mapping, and GIS mapping). Furthermore, the ROs have been involved in activities by the Town Councils, such as organizing waste collection campaigns or creating maps to support the COVID-19 emergency response. The degree to which ROs have built capacity within the councils varies from one case to another. One example that emerged from the KIs is how ROs have trained council staff on mapping tools such as QGIS and the advantages of open source data management. To further promote the opportunity the ROs have to build capacity within the town councils, the KIs suggested additional GIS training, along with providing the appropriate software, and a focus on training junior staff. Finally, the KIs also emphasized the need to facilitate knowledge sharing between council staff and project staff as a way to increase the teams' capacity.

At the community level, in some settlements, community representatives who have attended the validation workshop have transferred knowledge to other community members by engaging them in some activities, including urban farming/small grater gardens techniques, regular clean-up activities to stop vector and water borne diseases, improved waste management through community waste disposal areas, etc.

4.4.4 Using new knowledge to build up confidence

According to the KIs, **the participatory approach has been critical, not only for the assessments, but also to build trust with community members.** Through the workshops, community representatives gained a better understanding of the FRIS project and could clarify what benefits the project will bring to their community. Community members could also engage with representatives from UN-Habitat, the consultants, and the ROs. Furthermore, the workshops have raised discussions on subjects, such as: hazard exposure and the impacts of climate change through exercises. These activities introduced and explained many key concepts, including: climate hazards, trends and projections, highlighting some of the potential future impacts. In this way, workshops have not only helped the consultants to collect data, but also to raise awareness among community members. Furthermore, the involvement of the ROs as representatives from the local councils in the household survey, the workshops, and on site data collection has brought many benefits. Community leaders have now a clear focal point at the council they can reach out to. Additionally, the ROs became familiar with the issues in the settlements and are also aware of key vulnerable groups. KIs reveal that communities are grateful for being included in the planning process, however, the level of expectations is very high and community members are expecting to see prioritized actions to be implemented shortly. Hence, a participatory approach should continue to be applied during the project design phase.

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

As mentioned in previous sections, current capacities within executing partners are very limited and existing staff are already overloaded with MHCD work. Hence, it is unlikely that the existing structure would be able to support taking the project activities forward, particularly the implementation of component 3. According to KIs, hiring at least two engineers (one international and one local) would be strongly recommended in order to sustainably implement component 3. Additionally, the recruitment of one international community capacity development consultant for the next 18 months, for the implementation of component 2 (output 2.4 – awareness raising activities for targeted population groups in various subjects and output 2.5 – training of target household and communities on various topics) has also been highlighted as crucial to ensure the success of next phases' implementation. Furthermore, according to the information collected, time extension will most likely be needed in order to finalize the completion of all 4 components. Finally, the above-mentioned recruitments should be done concurrently to prevent further delays of the programme.

5   LESSONS LEARNED

Implementation

Detailed and concrete work plans, extensive monitoring as well as frequent follow-ups with the executing agencies and partners are required in order to achieve a successful project implementation. It has been proven that having staff embedded within the MHCD/municipalities – reporting directly to the UN-Habitat team leader – is much more beneficial than outsourcing tasks to local partners.

Physical proximity is an important factor for timely implementation: the FRIS team is situated within the MHCD and can thus interact closely with relevant counterparts. Moving out of the joint building with MLG/ MHCD has weakened the working relationship with MLG and requires more efforts to maintain interaction and MLG's sense of ownership.

Resources and capacities of executing agencies are limited and require extensive guidance and oversight from the team leader/ project assistant.

Community/National Impact

- **Community Governance:** Community organization has drastically improved, leading to increased social coherence;
- **Linkages:** Connecting target communities with municipalities as well as national government has been important for the target communities. In several cases, issues are now being addressed more easily and faster (for example trash collection, water pollution, local disputes) with the help of Resilience Officers;
- **Climate Resilient Assets:** Building community assets that are urgently needed;
- **Advocacy:** The project highlights the importance of 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 extensively from awareness raising activities on a range of topics, including COVID-19 and health related issues, impacts of climate, and DRR.

Ensuring sustainability

- Strong focus on capacity building/ knowledge transfer to communities;
- Strong focus on improving community organization to improve governance structures;
- Strong alignment with national policies and NAP;

- Implementation modality that ensures strong involvement of MHCD: instead of outsourcing various tasks to local executing agencies (such as Live and Learn, or engineering subcontractors), a team within MHCD will take lead in engineering as well as capacity building activities. This approach will allow for more technical and managerial oversight as well as more timely implementation, and will directly impact sustainability.

6 RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluators rate the project performance as average, with high potential for improvement if some corrective measures are taken. Project implementation is ongoing and has already been contributing to increased resilience of informal urban settlements in Fiji 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 lack of involvement of the MHCD and the limited staff dedicating time to support the project have been highlighted as major factors impacting in the overall project's performance. Although there have been efforts to increase their involvement, often there are other more urgent projects that take up most of their time. Some limited additional resources have been allocated to the project by MHCD to address the issue which has been beneficial and has led to some improvements, but more dedication will be required to meet the project's objectives. Also, staff with specific expertise and fully dedicated to the project implementation would be required.

Integration of project work within MHCD, definition of responsibilities and establishment of monitoring framework of project staff to follow through on responsibilities

FRIS project needs to be better integrated within MHCD day to day activities and individual work plans. A monitoring framework could serve as an efficient tool to track deliverables and activities of project staff against project outputs and should be developed quarterly by UN-Habitat and MHCD to promote greater accountability and ownership. Furthermore, structured work plans, including clearly defined responsibilities and milestones, need to guide the implementation in order to achieve objectives more promptly and efficiently.

Improving communication among all stakeholders involved in the project is to be prioritized in the implementation of next phases. More frequent meetings with project team and the MHCD are to be included in the revised work plan. Additionally, regular check-ins with the councils to update them on the project progress and suggestions on how they can further support the project are highly recommended. 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:

- A minimum of quarterly but ideally monthly meetings with UN-Habitat regional team, Permanent Secretary of MHCD and/or ministry's staff;
- A minimum of monthly but ideally bi-weekly meetings of MHCD with the Fiji project team;
- Quarterly PMC meetings with core group, 6 monthly with expanded group (key government partners), and yearly with all stakeholders.

Finally, a more structured stakeholders' engagement would enable the project to stay informed of any development that may influence future results (e.g. potential changes in settlements' context and social structure).

Executing partners

The involvement of one or two more non-governmental executing partners (depending on further agreements) besides MHCD to move the implementation forward (e.g. engage a specialized organisation to implement improved sanitation facilities in selected communities) is strongly recommended.

6.2   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. This is especially the case of the MHCD, as component 3 activities could directly inform the formalization of the informal settlements the ministry is responsible for.

ANNEX A – ADAPTATION FUND'S OUTCOMES

Project Outcome	Project Outcome Indicator	Fund Outcome	Fund Outcome Indicator
Outcome 1.1: Reduced vulnerability at the city-level to climate-related hazards and threats	Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis – number of assessments, maps and plans available online	**Outcome 1:** Reduced exposure at national level to climate-related hazards and threats	1. Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis
Outcome 2.1: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes and capacity at the community level with particular emphasis on women, youth, older people and other people in vulnerable situations	Percentage of targeted population aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses	**Outcome 3:** Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level	3.1. Percentage of targeted population aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses
Outcome 3.1: Increased adaptive capacity with relevant development and natural resource sectors	Physical infrastructure improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress	**Outcome 4:** Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development and natural resource sectors	4.2. Physical infrastructure improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress
	Ecosystem services and natural assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress	**Outcome 5:** Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress	5. Ecosystem services and natural assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress

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, including Memorandum of Understanding (MoUs) and other agreements?	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
	3,9					**3,0**						**2,9**				**2,6**				
1 — Outcome 1.1: Reduced vulnerability at the city-level to climate-related hazards and threats; Output 1.1.1 City-wide risk vulnerability assessment conducted for participating towns; 1.1.2 Hazard maps produced; 1.1.3 City-wide climate change action plans developed for participating towns; 1.1.4 Urban planner/resilience officer established in three towns	5	5	5	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	4	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2
2 — Outcome 2.1: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes and capacity at the community level; Output 2.1.1 Assessment and planning tool for community vulnerability assessment and action planning developed.; 2.1.2 Community-based climate vulnerability and informal settlements assessments, including hazard maps, conducted, in informal settlements in participating towns.; 2.1.3 Community-level resilience, recovery and upgrading plans developed in identified informal settlements.; 2.1.4 Awareness raising activities for targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction assessment and awareness activities focused on (at least) (1) early warning systems needs, (2) housing assessments and resilience, and (3) environmental and eco-system management.; 2.1.5 Training of targeted household and communities on livelihood strategies in relation to climate change impacts, including variability, through (1) training for resiliency skills (including for carpenters and other artisans), (2) training in coastal zone/ecosystem management, and (3) strategy development for food security and sustainable agriculture.	5	5	4	2	2	4	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	2
3 — Outcome 3.1: Increased adaptive capacity with relevant development and natural resource sectors and increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress; Output 3.1.1 Physical, natural, and social assets and ecosystems developed or strengthened in response to climate change impacts, with a consideration of the following sectors and options: urban development and housing; communications and DRR; food security and sustainable agriculture sector; human health and welfare; marine and fisheries; waste and waste infrastructure; and water resources and infrastructure.	5	5	5	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
4 — Outcome 4.1: Project implementation is fully transparent. All stakeholders are informed of products and results and have access to these for replication; Output 4.1.1 Lessons learned and best practices regarding resilient urban community development/housing are generated, captured and distributed to other communities, civil society, and policy-makers in government appropriate mechanisms.; 4.1.2 Regional Advocacy and replication.	5	5	5	3	3	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2

STATUS
- Not started
- In progress
- Complete

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

Fiji Informal Settlements Programme (FRIS) – Indicative work plan

	Original Schedule
	Schedule delays

Component/ Activity:	2018			2019												2020												2021												2022							
	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J
Component 1 – Institutional Strengthening to enhance local climate response actions – CITY LEVEL																																														
Conduct city-wide risk and vulnerability assessment for participating towns.																	X								X		X																			
Produce hazard maps with particular emphasis on the selected informal settlements taking wider ecosystems into consideration																			X											X																
Develop city-wide climate change action plans for participating towns.																							X			X																				
Establish an urban planner/resilience officer in each participating town.																																														
Component 2 – Local Resilience Strengthening – COMMUNITY LEVEL																																														
Support the Finalization of an assessment and planning tool.																X																														
Complete the community vulnerability assessments																						X																								
Complete the community action plans																						X																								
Support the development of capacity development strategies for household and community livelihood strategies in relation to climate change impacts in targeted communities																	X					X																								
Implementation of Community Capacity Development Plan (trainings, workshops, etc.)																																														
Component 3 – Infrastructure (COMMUNITY LEVEL)																																														
PILOT - Selection of Subprojects based on community action plans in 2 settlements																			X					X																						
Selection of Subprojects based on community action plans																									X		X																			
PILOT – preparation of subproject proposals in pilot settlements																						X				X																				
Preparation of Subproject proposals for each settlement (project design)																														X					X										
PILOT - Implementation of infrastructure projects																									X																					
Implementation of infrastructure projects																																						X							X	
Component 4 – Lessons Learned/ Best Practices/ Knowledge Management																																														
Establish an advocacy and knowledge management strategy in compliance with AF, UN-Habitat and GoF policies																																														
Systemize knowledge management capture																																														
Implement communications and advocacy strategy targeting all identified stakeholders using appropriate media																																														
PROJECT GOVERNANCE																																														
Support Management Committee Meetings	X				X					X										X		X			X		X		X		X															
Support the Project Management Team																																														
Facilitate Inception Workshop																																														
Ensure compliance with national and local laws, policies, strategies and plans																																														
Support the implementation of the Environmental and social Management Plan																																														

Note (Implementation of infrastructure projects row): **Need for extension**

ANNEX D – LIST OF INFORMAL SETTLEMENTS

	Town / city	Settlement	Old number of households (considered in the project document)	Total number of households (after household surveys)	HHS coverage (percentage of households surveyed)	Number of households covered by HHS	Total population (ESTIMATE) (surveyed plus estimations)	Population SURVEYED (based on HHS coverage)	Status
01	Lami	Bilo	82	16	94%	15	114	105	VAAPs completed
02	Lautoka	California	24	20	90%	18	113	103	VAAPs completed
03	Lami	Kalekana	145	194	82%	150	959	782	VAAPs completed
04	Nadi	Korociri	80	64	98%	63	405	399	VAAPs completed
05	Sigatoka	Kulukulu	16	43	84%	36	182	152	VAAPs completed
06	Lami	Quaia	364	329	90%	296	1749	1573	VAAPs completed
07	Lautoka	Naquiroso	16	14	93%	13	98	91	VAAPs completed
08	Lautoka	Nasoata	8	83	82%	68	433	355	VAAPs completed
09	Nadi	Nawajikuma	277	500	29%*	145	Yet to be calculated	Yet to be calculated	VAAPs completed*
10	Lautoka	Taiperia	22	30	83%	25	168	144	VAAPs completed
11	Lautoka	Veidogo	33	33	85%	28	207	175	VAAPs completed
12	Lautoka	Vunato	86	101	88%	89	531	476	VAAPs completed
13	Sigatoka	Vunikavika	50	61	95%	58	293	278	VAAPs completed
14	Lami	Vuniivi	15	11	100%	11	72	72	VAAPs completed
15	Lami	Wailekutu	15	17	82%	14	103	85	VAAPs completed
16	Lami	Wainivokai	16	24	83%	20	99	82	VAAPs completed
		TOTAL	1249	1540	89%	1049	5526	4872	

*HH survey on hold
due to COVID-19.

*results were obtained through several technical field assessments and were validated by community representatives during the FGDs.

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
Ms. Begonya Peiró	Ministry of housing and Community Development (MHCD)	Resilience and Informal Settlements Advisor	begonya.peiro@un.org	Questionnaire answered by email
Ms. Mere Rayawa	UN-Habitat	Project Assistant	mere.rayawa@un.org	In-person interview
Ms. Kamsin Raju	Nadi Town Council	Resilience Officer	kamsinraju@gmail.com	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Sanjeeva Perera	Ministry of housing and Community Development (MHCD)	Permanent Secretary	sanjeeva.perera@govnet.gov.fj	In-person interview
Mr. Keith Hornby	Ministry of housing and Community Development (MHCD)	Policy Advisor	keith.hornby@govnet.gov.fj	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Mohamed Ziar	Ministry of Local Government (MLG)	Director	mohammed.ziar@govnet.gov.fj	Questionnaire sent by email but no reply received
Ms. Bindula Devi	Department of Town and Country Planning (DTCP)	Director	bindula.devi@govnet.gov.fj	Questionnaire sent by email but no reply received
Ms. Selaima Maitoga	Lami Town Council	Health Inspector	hinspectorltc@unwired.com.fj	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Craig Powell	Nadi / Sigatoka Town Councils	Chief Executive Officer	ceo@naditowncouncil.com.fj	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Meli Koroitamana	Nadi Town Council	General Manager Operations	works@connect.com.fj	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Mohammed Anees Khan	Lautoka City Council	Chief Executive Officer	ceo@lcc.com.fj	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Nilesh Prakash	Climate Change Unit	Chair of the Project Implementation Committee, former Director of the Climate Change Unit	nilesh.prakash@giz.de	Questionnaire answered by email
Mr. Kevueli Vunibaka	Bilo Informal Settlement	Community Leader	---	In-person interview
Mr. Isereimi Vakosokoso	Vuniivi Informal Settlement	Community Leader	---	In-person interview
Mr. Rahemat Ali	Korociri Informal Settlement	Community Focal Point	---	In-person interview

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