

Fiji REDD+ Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism

DELIVERABLE 1

October 2017

Inception Report, Work Plan,
and Consultation Plan



Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Background.....	3
1.2. Purpose	4
1.3. “Feedback” and Grievance Redress Mechanisms.....	4
1.4. Objectives	5
2. Approach.....	6
2.1. Personnel.....	6
2.2. Methodology	7
2.2.1 <i>Risk Assessment for Conflicts and Grievances</i>	7
2.2.1.1. Task (i) Assessment of Risks for Potential Grievances and Disputes ..	7
2.2.1.2. Task (ii) Institutional Capacity Assessment	7
2.2.2 <i>Design of the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism</i>	8
2.2.2.1. Task (iii)Development of the FGRM	8
2.2.2.2. Task (iv)Local iTaukei Authority Strengthening	9
2.2.2.3. Task (v)Plan for improvement of FGRM	10
2.2.3 <i>Communication and Finalization of FGRM</i>	10
3. Deliverables	11
3.1. Deliverable 1: Inception Report, including Work Plan and Consultation Plan	11
3.2. Deliverable 2: Assessment Report on Risks and Institutional Capacity for Conflict Redress.....	11
3.3. Deliverable 3: Drafted design of the FGRM and Reporting Forms for iTaukei Village Headmen and Government Officers	12
3.4. Deliverable 4: Communications Plan and Training Report	12
3.5. Conclusion	12
Attachments.....	13
Attachment 1: Acronym List.....	14
Attachment 2: Revised Work Plan and Site Selection	15
Attachment 3: List of Attendees and Invitees to Inception Workshop	19
Attachment 4: Final Agenda and Discussion Notes from Inception workshop	21
Attachment 5: Consultation Plan	24

Tables and Figures

Table 1. Revised Work Plan	15
Table 2. Site Section Criteria.....	18
Table 3. Inception Meeting Attendance List	19
Table 4. Fiji FGRM Stakeholders and Institutions for Possible Consultation	24
Figure 1. Inception Meeting – Working Session	20

1. Introduction

The Government of Fiji's (GoF) effort to reduce emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+) requires a mechanism for responding to complaints, disputes, and grievances arising from the readiness and implementation phases of the *Fiji National REDD+ Program*. The Ministry of Fisheries and Forests (MFF), GoF awarded Integra, LLC (Integra) a contract to provide consulting services to develop a feedback and grievance redress mechanism (FGRM) for all stakeholders in the national REDD+ program. The consultancy began on 18 September 2017.

This **Inception Report** details the outcome of the inception workshop hosted on 6 October 2017 at the University of the South Pacific (USP) and attended by representatives from the REDD+ Steering Committee, relevant government ministries and boards, key donors and experts involved in REDD+ programming, civil society organizations (CSO), nongovernmental organizations (NGO), and universities. This report also includes the **FGRM Work Plan**, which describes all activities, personnel, schedule, and deliverables for each of the tasks under the consultancy; and the **Consultation Plan**, which outlines who and how the FGRM team will engage with key stakeholders.

1.1. BACKGROUND

Forests represent the majority of land in Fiji, and consequently are important for the livelihoods of communities and the national economy. Over 90% of forestland in Fiji is under customary ownership and consequently the national REDD+ Program requires extensive consultation, partnership, and safeguards for communities and traditional customs relating to forestland ownership and management. On issues of benefit-sharing, conflict resolution, institutional arrangements, and forest monitoring systems, customary land owners and communities are critical to the readiness and implementation of REDD+ in Fiji. The national REDD+ program must allow for concerns and feedback from stakeholders to be addressed and for potential conflicts or disputes to be resolved informally (when possible) and/or formally (if necessary) in an unbiased and satisfactory manner.

Currently, the GoF through the MFF (with co-funding support from the German Agency for International Cooperation GIZ)) is undertaking multiple assessments to implement the national REDD+ readiness phase, which include:

- Fiji REDD+ **Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment** (SESA), where the principal outcome will be a social and environmental management framework that will advise Fiji on how to address social and environmental issues for site-specific investments during the REDD+ readiness phase (USP). *November 2016 – November 2017¹*
- Establishment of a **Forest Reference Level** (FRL) for forestland and development of a System for **Monitoring, Reporting and Verifying** (MRV) carbon emission reductions from forests in Fiji (Universität Hamburg, Germany). *April 2017 – April 2018*

¹ Typically, the SESA would have been completed after the FGRM, DoDD, and MRV building on the information collection during these assessments. As the SESA was started first, the FGRM group will be building on the information they have collected during the review and informational interview stage – including the situational analysis.

- Analysis of **Drivers of Deforestation and Degradation (DoDD)** and identification of response strategies (Conservational International, Winrock International, Indufor). *August – December 2017.*
- Development of a **Feedback and Grievances Redress Mechanism (FGRM)** a system that will compliment formal legal channels for managing grievances for REDD+ project activities and process (Integra). *September – January 2017.*

1.2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this FGRM consultancy is to advise the Fiji REDD+ program on the design of a consistent, legitimate process to receive feedback and address conflicts that arise from the REDD+ readiness process and subsequent implementation of REDD+ activities. Integra's team will provide expertise in REDD+ national capacity building, grievance redress and dispute resolution, indigenous and customary land rights, and innovations for communication solutions for communities to design and implement the FGRM for Fiji REDD+. The design of FGRM will follow key principles and guidance, including the United Nations' "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework², World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework (ESF)/Safeguard Policies (10+1), the Fijian Constitution (2013) and the nation's written laws and regulations regarding indigenous rights³, and use appropriate and accessible methods that are suited to local and national needs.

1.3. "FEEDBACK" AND GRIEVANCE REDRESS MECHANISMS

GRMs are increasingly recognized as a critical tool for promoting transparency and accountability. They are organizational systems that serve as resources to receive and address concerns about the impact of national (formal and informal) government policies, programs, and operations on external stakeholders. GRMs are recourse for situations in which, despite proactive stakeholder engagement, some stakeholders have a concern about a project or program's potential impacts on them. Stakeholder inputs handled through these systems and procedures are termed "grievances", "complaints", or in this assessment for the GoF, "feedback".

Integra will design a FGRM that is relevant for REDD+ programming in consultation with the REDD+ Steering Committee and MFF that builds on existing GRM whilst addressing critical gaps, incorporating community feedback and respect for existing systems, and providing recommendations for actions to strengthen institutions. Integra's approach to the development of the FGRM will embody the following core principles⁴:

- **Fairness.** Grievances will be treated confidentially, assessed impartially, and handled transparently.
- **Objectiveness and independence.** The FGRM should operate independently of all interested parties in order to guarantee fair, objective, and impartial treatment to each case.

² http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesBusinessHR_EN.pdf

³ The 2013 Constitution is consistent with the United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Rights (UNDRIP), where the iTaukei enjoy full rights to land, culture, institutions and religion, with all these rights firmly protected within.

⁴ These principles are in direct alignment with the World Bank's (2012). *Feedback Matters: Designing Effective Grievance Redress Mechanisms for Bank-Financed Projects, Part 1: The Theory of Grievance Redress.*

- **Simplicity and accessibility.** Procedures to file grievances and seek action should be simple enough that project beneficiaries can easily understand them. The FGRM should be accessible to all stakeholders, irrespective of the remoteness of the area they live in, language, or level of education or income. The FGRM should not use complex processes that create confusion or anxiety (such as only accepting grievances on official-looking standard forms or through grievance boxes in government offices).
- **Responsiveness and efficiency.** The FGRM will be designed to be responsive to the needs of all complainants. Accordingly, officials handling grievances should be trained to take effective action upon, and respond quickly to, grievances and suggestions.
- **Speed and proportionality.** All grievances, simple or complex, should be addressed and resolved as quickly as possible. The action taken on the grievance or suggestion is swift, decisive, and constructive.
- **Participatory and social inclusion.** A wide range of project-affected people should be encouraged to bring grievances and comments to the attention of project authorities. Special attention is given to ensure that women, impoverished people and marginalized groups, including those with special needs, are able to access the FGRM.

1.4. OBJECTIVES

The overall objective for this consultancy is to develop a FGRM framework for the Fiji National REDD+ Program that actively engages concerned stakeholder groups and supporting institutions. This will be accomplished by effectively and efficiently receiving and responding to concerns, complaints, and grievances (“feedback”) that REDD+ stakeholders and other parties may have during the readiness and implementation phases of REDD+.

2. Approach

Integra's approach is holistic, transparent, and will compliment and build upon the current work being done under the SESA, DoDD, and MRV assessments. The FGRM is characterized by the following tasks:

- **Identify potential for conflicts and existing processes for redress:** Comprehensive rapid assessment of existing dispute and conflict resolution through coordination with the ongoing Fiji REDD+ assessments and coordination with national and regional bodies.
- **Develop strategy and actions to support implementation of Fiji REDD+ FGRM:** Institutional assessment of strengths, weaknesses and capacity needs of REDD+ institutions in supporting FGRM.
- **Develop feedback and grievance redress mechanism:** Design of FGRM using key principles and guidance from the UN, World Bank, and national policies and procedures with inputs from local communities, using appropriate and accessible methods that are suited to local and national needs.
- **Strengthen the local iTaukei FGRM structures:** Development of a standard feedback and grievance form for iTaukei and field officers to record and report grievances. Conduct training for iTaukei leaders on FGRM and garner feedback.
- **Develop FGRM management and improvement plan:** Development of an effective tool /procedure to systematically document and record frequency patterns, and causes of grievances and their resolution.
- **Communicate and finalize FGRM:** Plan for consultation workshops on FGRM for stakeholders, garnering feedback.

2.1. PERSONNEL

Individual	Role	Description
Corey Nelson	Team Leader and Communications Expert	Leads the team on all tasks related to FGRM assessment and design. Provides direction, oversight, and quality control for all deliverables. Serves as primary technical writer with inputs from team and develops communications strategy for FGRM in compliance with national and international best practices guidance. Leads consultation with stakeholders and designs and delivers training.
Ulai Baya	Deputy Team Leader	Serves as “on-the-ground” POC for the FGRM Team to the government. Provides expertise on legal frameworks and institutional governance of forestland.
Mereseini Seniloli	Social Development Expert	Provides expertise on gender and vulnerable populations, iTaukei social structures, conflict resolution mechanisms, and REDD+ social safeguards processes for all tasks. Leads consultations and supports training with stakeholders. Conducts analysis and report writing with team.
TBD	Legal Expert	Provides expertise on legal, policy, and institutional frameworks for conflict and dispute resolution. Provides international standards for FGRM and relevant human rights policy for the Fiji REDD+ Program. Supports consultations with stakeholders and conducts analysis and report writing with team.

2.2. METHODOLOGY

2.2.1 Risk Assessment for Conflicts and Grievances

The Integra team will conduct the assessment of risks for conflicts in REDD+ readiness activities as well as REDD+ projects and national REDD+ through in-depth consultations, research, and field assessments at chosen REDD+ activity sites. The team will travel to sites selected in consultation with the REDD+ Secretariat and REDD+ CSO organizations.

2.2.1.1. *Task (i) Assessment of Risks for Potential Grievances and Disputes*

Integra will begin with a rapid assessment of existing conflicts and issues arising from the REDD+ readiness and early REDD+ projects developed in Fiji, as well as the current procedures for resolving conflicts relating to land tenure, resource use and benefit-sharing. Integra will use a combination of document and literature review from the Fiji REDD+ readiness activities, including current work being undertaken the REDD+ SESA process. The team will build off of conduct surveys and consultations undertaken by the SESA team following up with more in-depth interviews with relevant GoF ministries and boards, legal institutions, REDD+ Steering Committee, REDD+ project developers, REDD+ CSO member organizations, NGOs specializing in customary land and resource rights and coalitions of community-based organizations, as needed. Integra will develop a questionnaire to gather information from a breadth of organizations and conduct in-depth interviews with key stakeholder institutions. Integra will consult with experts and academic institutions that have studied conflicts and grievance redress processes for NRM and customary land tenure systems in the Pacific Islands to gather information and case studies on potential conflicts for REDD+ Fiji.

The assessment will describe the breadth of current and potential issues that are likely to be at the core of conflicts and disputes over REDD+ activities, and map out how key stakeholders influence the issues, and the nature of the debate over each issue. The team will assess social, cultural, environmental, and legal norms in resolving conflict in different REDD+ activity regions of Fiji, especially focusing on customary norms in resolving conflict. The past record of key stakeholders in resolving conflict will be used to assess the likely risks presented by different potential issues. The assessment will also look at the role of women and minorities in potential conflicts and assess the risks to these special groups in the REDD+ process.

2.2.1.2. *Task (ii) Institutional Capacity Assessment*

Parallel to the risk assessment, Integra will also conduct an assessment of the capacity of existing REDD+ institutions and management structures in resolving conflicts arising out of the REDD+ readiness and project activities. The assessment will look at key characteristics of these institutions, such as the accessibility, credibility, compatibility with various REDD-related and donor standards for conflict and human rights, legal mechanisms and institutional performance to develop a complete profile of existing pathways for resolving conflicts relating to REDD+ in Fiji. The institutional capacity assessment will follow World Bank guidelines on Grievance Redress for Projects, and will assess institutional capacity across the following criteria:

- **Legitimacy:** Is the institution widely perceived as being independent of parties and vested interests in the dispute or conflict?
- **Accessibility:** Is there sufficient assistance for individuals or groups with barriers (literacy, cost, language, awareness, fear of reprisal)?

- **Predictability:** Is there a clear procedure and time frame for providing response and resolution? Is there a pathway for recourse if parties are not satisfied?
- **Fairness:** Are the procedures perceived as being fair to all parties to the conflict? Is there fair representation of all parties?
- **Rights compatibility:** Are the outcomes of conflict resolution consistent with national and international rights laws and standards?
- **Transparency:** Are the procedures for resolving conflict and the outcomes transparent to meet public interest concerns?
- **Capability:** Do the institutions have human, technical, and financial or other resources needed to deal with the conflicts at present (and future)?

Integra will assess both formal and informal institutions at national-, provincial-, divisional- and local-levels to assess how different actors – individuals, specific social groups, communities, and private and public institutions – currently use these institutions to resolve conflict, and the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches and past precedent.

The combination of the two assessment components described above will be combined to compose a risk analysis profile for REDD+ readiness and project activities. This analysis will assign categorical risk ratings by combining the risk of conflicts with the institutional capacity to address them, and where high risks of conflict meet low institutional capacity, the risk to the REDD+ activity or project will be rated as high, and consequently prioritized for the FGRM development.

2.2.2 Design of the Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism

After completing the both assessments, the Integra team will design the FGRM, using information from the consultations with institutions, communities and the breadth of stakeholders in the REDD+ process. Part of the design of the FGRM will include working closely with indigenous customary landowners (iTaukei) to develop a model system for feedback and grievance redress processes. In addition to designing the FGRM, Integra will develop a plan for ongoing review and improvement of the FGRM mechanism, so that the mechanism will increase in effectiveness over time, through experiential learning.

2.2.2.1. Task (iii) Development of the FGRM

The FGRM will be designed to complement existing institutions and mechanisms for addressing conflict, and will specifically address areas identified as key risks for conflict that are not addressed by existing institutions or processes. The process/flow for the FGRM will consist of the following:

- **Receipt and Registration of Feedback/Grievance:** The FGRM will have multiple options for the reporting of feedback, concerns and grievances of several kinds, that will include written, electronic or telephone inputs from individuals or groups, public forums such as meetings or proactive solicitation of feedback. There will be a clear designation of local agency staff, customary authorities or the appropriate authority should receive and register feedback or grievances.
- **Acknowledgement and Assignment:** There will be a centralized system for receipt and logging of grievances, with complainants receiving a timely acknowledgement. The staff or local customary authorities require clear guidelines and training on procedures to

determine eligibility of complaints for the FGRM, and the other options for complaints to receive redress if the REDD+ FGRM is not the appropriate mechanism. The eligibility of the complaint will be determined on the basis of type of harm claimed, whether the complainant is the party that is impacted (or may be impacted), and the availability of sufficient information and evidence to evaluate the claim.

- **Develop a Proposed Response:** The staff or local authorities must determine the type of response to the grievance. Responses range from relatively simple direct actions to further assessment and engagement with complainant and stakeholders to develop a consensus solution. If the complaint cannot be addressed by the FGRM, a determination must be made for what the appropriate institution or mechanism is to refer it to.
- **Implementation of Redress:** Once the response is determined, the staff responsible has to inform the complainant of the proposed response, and secure approval and agreement to the response from the complainant. If the complainant is not satisfied with the proposed response, the staff must determine whether another response can be proposed, or whether the complaint must be referred to another institution or mechanism.
- **Review:** If the complaint is complex and cannot be resolved by simple action or collaborative efforts to resolve the conflict, there should be a review on whether a new solution should be proposed, or the complaint should be referred to an alternative mechanism, such as the judicial system.
- **Closeout:** The staff should document the resolution of the complaint, whether redress was implemented successfully, referred to another mechanism, or unresolved. The overall process should be time-bound, depending on the nature of the complaint.

Aside from these general guidelines for the design of the FGRM, Integra will use the results of the assessments to design the REDD+ FGRM to account for existing cultural and customary norms in resolving conflict for communities and other stakeholders. The Integra team will account for social relationships, allow for special considerations to protect minority group rights, and the FGRM should adhere to the overarching principles of the institutional GRMs described above. Integra will design the FGRM to allow for these cultural considerations, and develop a mechanism that can respond to a wide range of concerns, and establish the capacity needs of the staff and the institution that will host the FGRM. The mechanism will protect the identity of complainants in sensitive cases, to protect individuals or minorities from threats of recrimination.

2.2.2.2. Task (iv) Local iTaukei Authority Strengthening

As part of the design of the FGRM, Integra will work on establishing a mechanism for the iTaukei indigenous communities to use their existing conflict resolution systems and establish a standard form for conducting feedback and grievance redress for REDD+ activities. This is important in the context of Fiji, as the majority of land falls under customary authority, and this is part of Fijian law and government institutions. Consequently, iTaukei village headmen are key figures in resolving conflicts, and the overall FGRM for REDD+ must work in concert with these customary authorities.

Integra will design appropriate tool(s) and a documentation method for the iTaukei village headmen to use in recording and reporting grievances for REDD+ readiness and project implementation. Integra will work closely with the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, MFF, and other relevant ministries to also develop forms that can be used by field officers for similarly recording grievances and consolidating them within the proposed FGRM. Integra will design the forms and

gather feedback from the iTaukei village leaders and ministries and finalize the design of the form. Integra will conduct a training of trainers on how the iTaukei customary authorities and officers from ministries can use them to record grievances and enter them into the FGRM. Integra will design protocols for centralized storage of the complaints, procedures on the disposition of complaints under the FGRM.

2.2.2.3. Task (v) Plan for improvement of FGRM

Integra will design a centralized reporting system for the FGRM to record complaints and disputes, the forms used to record them, the assignment and eligibility assessments, the proposed responses and disposition of cases. Integra will use a quantitative and categorical data gathering framework for the monitoring and evaluation of the FGRM that will be used to identify performance characteristics like time to respond to complainants, satisfaction with resolution of complaints, number of complaints referred to other mechanisms and repeat rates of certain categories of complaints. This will facilitate the REDD+ Secretariat, REDD+ CSO and other REDD+ bodies to evaluate whether the FGRM is resolving and potentially reducing conflict, and whether the system can be improved through further improvements of components of the FGRM.

2.2.3 Communication and Finalization of FGRM

Once the first two components of the FGRM consultancy are completed, the Integra team will conduct a stakeholder consultation validation workshop in Suva to present the results of the assessments, FGRM design, and plan to monitor and improve the mechanism over time. Integra will conduct facilitated discussions with a broad group of stakeholders, including the REDD+ Secretariat, Ministries of the Government, CSO, representatives of iTaukei communities, and other stakeholders in the REDD+ process. The feedback will be incorporated into a final report for the consultancy, with additional improvements for the FGRM that was designed. Integra will also prepare a communications strategy to raise awareness about the FGRM that will inform capacity-building activities for REDD+ and the SESA process, so that stakeholders are widely aware of the FGRM for future conflicts or grievances.

3. Deliverables

At the end of the consultancy, the following products will be delivered:

1. A comprehensive report on the current grievance redress structures, processes, and frameworks in including structures and processes relevant for REDD+ concerns.
2. A proposed FGRM for the Fiji National REDD+ Program, including a plan on the ongoing review and improvement of the mechanism.
3. Training report on a reporting process for the iTaukei village headman and government field officers including reporting forms for the iTaukei village headman and government field officers to record and provide feedback on issues, complaints and grievances.

3.1. DELIVERABLE 1: INCEPTION REPORT, INCLUDING WORK PLAN AND CONSULTATION PLAN

Integra commenced work on the FGRM by drafting an inception report and work plan, which included an overall schedule for completing the technical tasks described in the methodology described above and outlined in the terms of reference (TOR). Integra hosted an inception workshop in partnership with the REDD+ Secretariat to present the FGRM design and consultation process to the Secretariat and key stakeholders such as relevant government ministries, key donors in the REDD+ process, REDD+ CSO, technical experts, and NGOs. Integra submitted the draft inception report and work plan on 9 October 2017. The inception workshop was delayed because of attendance constraints from key stakeholders, resulting from holiday and Pre-COP23 events. As such Integra hosted the inception workshop on 16 October 2017 and is submitting the final Inception Report, with Work Plan and Consultation Plan (Deliverable 1) within two working days of the workshop conclusion. The timeline for the remaining deliverables has been adjusted accordingly in our work plan (Attachment 2).

The FGRM is simultaneously working on Deliverable 2, whilst the REDD+ Secretariat is reviewing the revised report.

3.2. DELIVERABLE 2: ASSESSMENT REPORT ON RISKS AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR CONFLICT REDRESS

The FGRM team is currently conducting the assessments of potential for conflicts and grievances in the REDD+ program in Fiji through a risk the institutional capacity assessment. The team will conduct a desk review of the legal, policy, and institutional context for land management and tenure, and conduct interviews with key stakeholders identified during the inception workshop in consultation with the REDD+ Steering Committee. The assessments will build on consultations with communities conducted during the ongoing SESA and DoDD analysis to provide information on the risk for conflict and existing pathways to address grievances at the community-level. Neither the SESA nor DoDD focused on grievances issues so the information will be used to supplement the FGRM sessions.

3.3. DELIVERABLE 3: DESIGN OF THE FGRM AND REPORTING FORMS FOR ITAUKEI VILLAGE HEADMEN AND GOVERNMENT OFFICERS

Once the draft assessment report is submitted, the FGRM team will begin working on the FGRM design and the reporting forms for the iTaukei village headmen and government officers. This design activity and the work with iTaukei villages will be conducted over 2 weeks, in locations that will be decided in consultation with the REDD+ Secretariat – we have proposed two site selections in *Attachment 2* and outlined our criteria for selection. The Integra team will conduct the training of trainers on the use of the reporting forms and the FGRM, and the designed FGRM and reporting forms will be submitted to the REDD+ Secretariat for approval.

3.4. DELIVERABLE 4: TRAINING REPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY

Once the REDD+ Secretariat has approved the training approach and grievance forms, the FGRM team will conduct a training for the TOR-targeted groups on the use of a reporting and recording form(s) (carried out in collaboration with the REDD+ Secretariat). Feedback on the form and the reporting and recording process will be collected after the training from all participants in order to improve the process. The final forms and results of the training will then be shared in a “Training Report” with the REDD+ Steering Committee.

In addition to the grievance mechanism itself, the team will develop a “Communications Strategy” to inform all stakeholders about the existence of the FGRM and instructions of operation. The communication plan will include aspects of stakeholder-targeted communication channels, facilitators, multipliers and possible timelines.

3.5. CONCLUSION

In the final weeks of the contract, a validation workshop will be held to review the proposed design of the FGRM and protocols and procedures developed for improvement of the FGRM in the future. It is anticipated that because of the December holidays and the COP23 this will be delayed until January and has been noted in the revised work plan (see *Attachment 2*). Consultation with stakeholders and final report will mark the conclusion of consultancy.

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1: ACRONYM LIST

ATTACHMENT 2: REVISED WORK PLAN AND SITE SELECTION

**ATTACHMENT 3: LIST OF ATTENDEES AND INVITEES TO INCEPTION
WORKSHOP**

**ATTACHMENT 4: FINAL AGENDA AND DISCUSSION NOTES FROM
INCEPTION WORKSHOP**

ATTACHMENT 5: CONSULTATION PLAN

ATTACHMENT 1: ACRONYM LIST

CSO	Civil Society Organization
DoDD	Drivers of Deforestation and Degradation
FGRM	Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanisms
FRL	Forest Reference Level
GoF	Government of Fiji
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
MFF	Ministry of Fisheries and Forests
MRV	Measuring, Reporting and Verification
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SESA	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment
TOR	Terms of Reference
USP	University of the South Pacific

ATTACHMENT 2: REVISED WORK PLAN AND SITE SELECTION

Table 1. Revised Work Plan

No.	Deliverables	September		October					November				December			
		18	25	2	9	16	23	30	6	13	20	27	4	11	18	25
D-1	Work Plan & Inception Workshop Report															
	1) Draft inception report, work plan, and consultation plan															
	2) Draft inception meeting agenda															
	3) Hold inception meeting and submit revised inception report, work plan, and consultation report (<i>*report submitted within 2 days of meeting</i>)															
D-2	Assessment of Risk and Institutional Capacity for REDD+ Conflict Redress															
	1) Desk study and review of SESA documents and relevant literature															
	2) Conduct stakeholders and institution interviews															
	3) Synthesis and report preparation															
	4) Submit for review and revision of report															

No.	Deliverables	September		October					November				December			
		18	25	2	9	16	23	30	6	13	20	27	4	11	18	25
	5) Deliver final assessment report															
D-3	Design of REDD+ FGRM and reporting forms															
	1) Design of reporting forms, processes for collecting grievances															
	2) Field visit to iTaukei communities and meetings with village headmen															
	3) Training of iTaukei headmen and officers on use of forms															
	4) Draft FGRM design and reporting forms															
	5) Draft reviewed															
D-4	Final design and validation of FGRM (because of the December holidays we anticipate that D-4 tasks will shift to the month of January)															
	1) Conduct validation workshop															
	2) Design communication strategy for FGRM															
	3) Finalize design of FGRM and submit final report															

Revised Work Plan

With the challenges of coordinating schedules for multiple key stakeholders that were required for the Inception Meeting the timeline for the FGRM has shifted (see *Table 1*). The entire consultancy will be completed within the 17 week proposed timeline from the GoF, but now takes into account holidays and the Pre-COP and COP23 activities.

Site Selection

The FGRM proposes two main locations for the community consultations and training of trainers with iTaukei and forestry officials: *Drawa (Nabavatu, Nabiti)* and *Serua 1 (Wainiyabia, Nabukelevu, Naboutini, Qarasarau)*. These sites will be covered over a duration of two weeks and will include community consultations that will enhance our assessments under Deliverable 2⁵ and inform the development of the FGRM and reporting forms. The FGRM team will spend one week in each site location.

The criteria that the FGRM team formed for selection was proposed at the Inception Meeting and refined with the working groups feedback. The FGRM team considered 10 sites identified through the SESA, DoDD, and where there is current conflict around land management and used the following criteria to down-select for consultations and trainings (see also *Table 2*):

- **REDD+ active or potential sites:** There are currently two active REDD+ sites in Fiji: Emalu and Drawa. The FGRM will select an active REDD+ site to get the perspective of community members and stakeholders already actively engaged and more readily informed on REDD+ policy in order to understand current conflicts and grievances that have stemmed from REDD+ readiness and implementation. Equally important for the FGRM is to visit a potential REDD+ site where community members are very likely not informed, or else have very little understanding of, the implications of REDD+ activities. This will help inform planning and readiness that can be used as a guide for other potential REDD+ site implementation.
- **Potential / On-going categories of conflict:** There are five broad categories of conflict that stem from land leasing issues that will have bearing on all REDD+ activities regarding boundary disputes, quality and clarity of contracts, land trust management, and benefit sharing mechanisms: (i) landowner and landowner, (ii) landowners and government, (iii) government and trustee (TLTB), (iv) landowners and investors, and (v) investors and government. The FGRM assessments and consultations must include sites that collectively exhibit the above types of conflict. There are levels of disputes present at each of the sites considered in our selection.
- **Forest types:** REDD+ activities will be implemented in two forestland types: indigenous and plantation (pine and mahogany) and each comes with a different set of challenges regarding ownership and property (bundled element) rights. There is also a lack of clarity around the perceived value of the different forestland types and how carbon for emissions is calculated. Both sites selected have native and plantation forestland.
- **Environmental/biodiversity hotspots:** Biodiversity, deforestation, and protected areas will also create a set of potential risks for REDD+ to include land use, encroachment, and land ownership issues. Pulling from the work already completed with the SESA and the

⁵ We will include any supplemental information from the community consultations in the revised version of Deliverable 2.

DoDD, the FGRM team has selected sites where there is potential for these grievances to be exacerbated (*Serua 1*) and where there are mechanisms in practice that are already attempting to address these complaints (*Drawa*) with local communities.

- **Accessibility** is also a consideration for the FGRM assessment. For example, Emalu is logistically challenging to visit and with the short timeframe allotted for the consultations was removed from consideration. The FGRM team made site selections based on the ability to travel to, conduct community consultations, and host a training of trainers of each site with a one-week timeline.

Table 2. Site Section Criteria

Possible Site	REDD+ or Potential	Biodiversity Hotspot / Protected Area	Forestland Type	Present Conflict Rating*	Logistic Challenge Rating*
Emalu	REDD+	Protected area	natural	2	3
Drawa	REDD+	Protected area	natural and plantation	3	2
Nakauvadra	potential	Protected area and biodiversity hotspot	natural and plantation	3	1
Dreketi/Drawa	potential	Protected area	natural and plantation	1	2
Kadavu-Nabukelevu	potential	Protected area	natural	1	3
Yawe	potential	Protected area	natural and plantation	3	3
Ra Tomanivi	potential	Protected area and biodiversity hotspot	natural	3	1
Serua 1 (highlands)	potential	Protected area and biodiversity hotspot	natural and plantation	3	1
Serua 2 (coastal)	potential	Protected area	natural (mangroves)	2	1

*rating from 1-3, with 1 limited, 2 being moderate, and 3 difficult

ATTACHMENT 3: LIST OF ATTENDEES AND INVITEES TO INCEPTION WORKSHOP

Table 3. Inception Meeting Attendance List

	Name	Title	Organization	Phone	Email
1	Diana Ralulu	STA	Land Use, Ministry of Agriculture	8355631	diana.ralulu@govnet.gov.fj
2	Sunia Baikirewa	PEPD	Ministry of Economy	8324462	sunia.baikirewa@govnet.gov.fj
3	Jone Tubui	Team Leader - WRMU	Water Authority of Fiji	9104270	jtubui@waf.com.fj
4	Ulai Baya	Deputy Team Leader	Integra	9352591	ulai@tribewanted.com
5	Ken Chambers	Former Team Leader	Integra	9323350	chambers_k@usp.ac.fj
6	Salanieta Koro	Research Assistant	Integra	9745484	salanietakoro93@gmail.com
7	Corey Nelson	Team Leader and Communications Expert	Integra	9370949	cnelson@integrallc.com
8	Mereseini Senioli	Social Development Expert	Integra	8072394 /7879143	mereseini.seniloli@gmail.com
9	Siteri Tikoca	Conservation Officer	NFMV	8304822	stikoca@naturefiji.org
10	Marama Tuivuna	Project Officer	Forestry	9980096	marama.tuivuna@gmail.com
11	Sele Tagivuni	Co- Director	Grace Trifam	7344800	sele.tagivuni@gmail.com
12	Nelly Snow	Tech- GIS	TLTB	9251678	nsnow@tltb.com.fj
13	Ravi Singh	Tech- GIS	TLTB	9749473	rsingh@tltb.com.fj
14	Akosita Lewai	PFO	Forestry / REDD+	9966781	akositalewai@gmail.com
15	Maika Tabukovu	Lecturer	FNU	9182695	maika.tabukovu@fnu.ac.fj
16	Rusila Savou	CCO	WWF	8001467	rsavou@wwfpacific.org
17	Daniel Pluyle	SPC/GIZ Tech	SPC/GIZ		daniel.pluyle@giz.de
18	Narendra Chand	Technical Advisor	REDD+	7172608	narendrachand@gmail.com
19	Prem Neopane	Research Associate	Universtät Hamburg		Prem.raj.neupane@uni-hamburg.de
20	Archana Gauli	Researcher	MRV		anagauli@gmail.com

	Name	Title	Organization	Phone	Email
21	Chethna Ben	Adjunct	USP	8614982	chethnaben@usp.ac.fj
22	Tek Maraseni	Associate Professor	USQ	0418564916	maraseni@usq.edu.au
23	Eroni Batikawai	Adjunct	USP	8626550	ebatikawai@gmail.com
24	Marilyn Korovusere	DDS	ITaukei Affairs	8991040	marilyn.korovusere@govnet.gov.fj
25	Sarah Pene	Research Fellow	USP	3231316	sarah.pene@usp.ac.fj

Over 50 invitations went out and 25 people attended (see *Table 3*), representing all key stakeholders for FGRM (see *Figure 1*).

Figure 1. Inception Meeting – Working Session



ATTACHMENT 4: FINAL AGENDA AND DISCUSSION NOTES FROM INCEPTION WORKSHOP

**notes from the discussions are included within the agenda itself.*

Fiji REDD+ Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism

INCEPTION MEETING AGENDA

Fiji 16 October 2017 from 3-5pm in the USP/FBE conference room, Laucala Campus

Welcome, introductions and overview (3:00 – 3:30)

- Prayer – Pastor Eroni Batikawai
- Introduction of Integra and Fiji REDD+ FGRM Team – Ken Chambers
- Introduction of REDD+ Steering Committee, REDD+ Unit, Ministry of Fisheries and Forests, Ministry of iTaukei Affairs (Akosita Lewai – REDD+ SC)
- Recognition of USP, NGOs and CSO attendees
- Overview of objectives: To develop a feedback and grievance redress mechanism for the Fiji National REDD+ Program. Integra's approach to designing the Fiji REDD+ FGRM will be characterized by the following approach - Ken Chambers
 - Identify potential for conflicts and existing processes for redress.
 - Develop strategy and actions to support implementation of Fiji REDD+ FGRM.
 - Develop feedback and grievance redress mechanism.
 - Conduct training for iTaukei leaders on FGRM.
 - Develop FGRM management and improvement plan.
 - Communicate and finalize FGRM.

Background on Fiji National REDD+ Program (3:15 – 4:00)

- Overview of activities under FCPF Readiness Grant – Akosita Lewai
 - See PPT Slides
 - REDD+ Readiness runs from 2015 – 2019 and has four Components:
 1. **REDD+ Readiness Fund:** Structure
 2. **Institutional Strengthening:** “Centralized” FGRM fits under this. Two divisional units – REDD+ Unit and REDD+ Steering Committee (Head of Departments/NGOs/LO Reps/Private Sectors/CSOs)
 3. **Development of a REDD+ Strategy:** DoDD
 4. **Establishment of a Monitoring System:** Capacity Building and national MRV

- Overview of SESA – Dr. Sarah Pene
 - See PPT slides
 - SESA is being conducted out of order from the other assessments and should have been completed after the MRV, FGRM, and DoDD
 - 12-month process, now requesting a 3-month extension
 - Focused on policies, laws, and regulations around social and environmental safeguards
 - Stakeholder stocktaking from the private sector, NGOs, and CSOs involved in REDD+ activities
 - Situational analysis is complete and includes on the following:
 1. Five broad thematic areas (technical) with two matrices on policy and strategic activities
 2. Results of case studies from key informational interviews and community consultations in 4 sites, which expanded the key thematic areas to 78
 3. Prioritized and filtered under four options for approach
- Overview of MRV – Dr. Prem Neopane
 - See PPT slides
 - FRL for forestland and development of system for MRV carbon emissions reduction
 - Looking forward to the inputs from the SESA, DoDD, and FGRM to link to MRV database
 - Need for a knowledge sharing session across all assessment/consultancy teams
 - Central database system being designed for the MFF (server), links to a field collection system
 - Challenges because of the short timeline and over burdening of local counterparts (12 hour days).
- Overview of Drivers of Deforestation – Mereseini Seniloli
 - See PPT slides
 - Currently in progress with the completion of Deliverable 1
 - Site selection and community consultation completed
 - Divisional workshops completed

Overview of REDD+ FGRM Activity and Presentation of Work Plan (4:00 – 4:30)

- Schedule of activities and current status (Corey Nelson)
- Presentation of activities and Deliverables (Corey Nelson)
 - Assessment (D2): Assessment Report on Risks and Institutional Capacity for Conflict Redress
 - Design of FGRM (D3): Drafted design of the FGRM and Reporting Forms
 - Community consultation and finalization of FGRM (D4): Workshops with iTaukei village communities on reporting forms, refinement of FGRM and communication plan

Discussion of FGRM Design and Activity (4:30 – 5:00)

Moderated discussion led by Ulai Baya.

Discussion notes, comments and considerations raised during the working session:

- Need to define how the FGRM integrates into the REDD+ Program. Follow up with new REDD+ Technical Advisor.
- Why conserve the forest vs. cutting it down? (iTaukei Ministry rep) Need to better understand the benefit sharing mechanism and communication to land owners.
- The perceived value of carbon – Indigenous forest over plantation (iTaukei Ministry rep).
- Who owns the carbon? Carbon is not a property with rights currently in Fiji, so how does this translate for REDD+ FGRM?
- There is need to align the information from all of the assessments and key areas (Uni. Hamburg).
- Thin/nonexistent FGRM in TLTB contracts.
- Mapping and documentation of “land bundles” under the FAO Global Land Tool (USP).
- What measures can lead to less conflict? Better evaluation of property rights itself (NGO).
- Legal, cultural, institutional considerations in the FGRM, but don’t forget environmental (NGO).
- Help landowners understand the implications of activities and the consequences (CSO).
- How will FGRM attribute grievances to specific REDD+ activities? There are 5 activities undertaken at the moment, but how will you know which grievance is the result of which activity? (Uni Hamburg).
- Capitalize on work already done (e.g., interviews with SESA Team) and follow standards (DoDD).
- Include hotspots/priority areas from the SESA as criteria for site selection (MoE).

ATTACHMENT 5: CONSULTATION PLAN

The FGRM team has identified several potential stakeholders for consultation, representative of the government, NGOs, CSOs, universities, subject matter experts, and private sector (see *Table 4*) that may be involved with REDD+ readiness and implementation. The FGRM team will build off of consultations and interviews conducted by the SESA, MRV, DoDD teams - recognize that this information will only supplement our own consultations.

The FGRM Team hosted an Inception Working Group where key stakeholders and relevant ministries had representation; facilitating a working group session on potential risks for conflict from REDD+ activities (notes are included in the Agenda in *Attachment 4*). The outcome of the working session identified a need for more in-depth consultations that will take place in Suva, before heading out to the communities.

Each interview will contribute to data on current GRMs challenges, processes, strengths, weakness, and opportunities for improvement. Data collected will be used to inform the FGRM design and reporting templates.

- **REDD+ Secretariat⁶**
- **Native Lands and Fisheries Commission (NLFC)**
- **iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB)**
- **Ministry of iTaukei Affairs**
- **Legal Aid Commission**

Table 4. Fiji FGRM Stakeholders and Institutions for Possible Consultation

Indigenous Communities	
Drawa (Nabavatu, Nabiti)	Serua 1 (Wainiyabia, Nabukelevu, Naboutini, Qarasarau)
Private Sector	
Scientific Forestry Fiji (SFSFiji)	Fiji Hardwood Trust
Sustainable Forest Industries Limited	Fiji Pine Trust
Future Forests (Fiji) Ltd	Fiji Hardwood Corporation Limited
Government Agencies	
Ministry of Forests	Fiji National REDD+ Steering Committee
Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Environment
Ministry of Economy	Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources
Ministry of iTaukei Affairs	
Non-Government Organizations / Civil Society	
Conservation International	Partners in Community Development Fiji (PCDF)
Live and Learn Environmental Education	CSO Platform (Nunia)

⁶ The REDD+ Technical Advisor has just been appointed and attended the Inception Meeting.

Academic and Research Institutions	
University of the South Pacific (USP)	University of Hamburg (MRV assessment)
International and Regional Agencies	
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)	The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ)	UNDP Pacific Program
Faith-based Organizations	
Religious organizations such as Methodist, Catholic and Hindu have special interest in environment and climate change issues	
Indigenous Groups	
REDD+ Resource Owner Committee	National iTaukei Resource Owners Council (NTROC)
Statutory Bodies	
iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB)	Native Lands and Fisheries Commission
Legal Aid Commission	

The FGRM team has communicated with the REDD+ Steering Committee regarding a recommendation to have the Secretariat host “sharing sessions” between each of the on-going assessments (SESA, FGRM, MRV, and DoDD). These sessions will be designed to share knowledge and create an alignment of information between all on-going work to better inform outcomes for REDD+ readiness and implementation. The FGRM Validation Meeting (hosted in January) will also provide an opportunity to reconvene all members of the Inception Workshop for continuity, transparency, and knowledge sharing.