

**New Zealand Agency for International Development
(NZAID)**

Nga Hoe Tuputupu-mai-tawhiti

**A Review of: “Voices & Choices: Gardening
Good Governance and Democracy in the
Pacific”**

November-December 2004

REPORT

Team Members

Dr Jeffrey Buchanan (Team Leader)

Dr Vanessa Griffen

Mr Cedric Schuster

The names of contributors who were not from MFAT or the partner organisation have been withheld in accordance with standard MFAT Activity Evaluation policy criteria and OECD DAC Criteria where anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants is protected when requested or as needed.

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction and Report Summary.....	1
1.1	Recommendations.....	4
1.2	Methodology.....	8
2.0	Objective One.....	11
2.1	Task one: Achievements of the project.....	11
2.2	Task Two.....	19
2.3	Task Three.....	24
2.4	Task Four.....	28
2.5	Task Five.....	30
2.6	Task Six.....	32
3.0	Objective Two.....	34
3.1	Task One: The contextual information that guided the project at the outset.....	34
3.2	Task Two: Stakeholders' interests and opinions in the project.....	35
3.3	Task Three: Analysis of key project documents.....	36
3.4	Task Four: 1. Analysis of relevant community/national/regional plans (4.2).....	36
3.5	Task Five: Analysis of NZAID Policy document, Pacific strategy and country strategies.....	39
4.0	Objective Three.....	40
4.1	Task One: Goal and purpose of the project.....	40
5.0	Objective Five: Monitoring and Evaluation.....	49
5.1	Adequacy of current monitoring.....	49
6.0	Objective Six: Programme expansion and future focus.....	52
6.1	Task One: Expansion to other countries.....	52
6.2	Task Two: Civics education.....	52
6.3	Task Three: Focus on working in communities versus working at governmental level.....	56
	Annex One: Terms of Reference.....	62
	Annex Two: Literature reviewed.....	68
	Annex Three: Case Study: Kiribati.....	69
	Annex Four: Case Study: Solomon Islands.....	74
	Annex Five: Case Study: Fiji.....	81
	Annex Six: Case Study: Vanuatu.....	85
	Annex Seven: List of People Met.....	90
	Annex 8: V&C Annual Report 2003-04 (Prepared by FSPI).....	93

Acronyms

ARHP	Adolescent and Reproductive Health Programme
AusAID	Australian Assistance for International Development
CDU	Curriculum Development Unit
CGW	Community Governance Workers
ECANSI	Environmental Concerns Action Network of Solomon Islands
JWP	Just World Programme
KCRU	Kiribati Curriculum Resources Unit
MYOB	Mind Your Own Business
MLC	Marau Local Council
NZAID	New Zealand Assistance for International Development
NZHC	New Zealand High Commission
PCD	Partners in Community Development
RRRT	Regional Rights Resources Training
SIDT	Solomon Islands Development Trust
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
V&C	Voices and Choices

Annexes

Annex	Name
Annex One	Terms of Reference/NZAID Briefing Questions
Annex Two	Literature Reviewed
Annex Three	Case Study: Kiribati
Annex Four	Case Study: Solomon Islands
Annex Five	Case Study: Fiji
Annex Six	Case Study: Vanuatu
Annex Seven	List of people interviewed
Annex Eight	FSPI V&C Annual Report

1.0 Introduction and Report Summary

The Foundation for the People of the South Pacific International (FSPI) is a regional agency based in Suva. FSPI's project V&C: Gardening Good Governance and Democracy in the Pacific (V&C) is the subject of this review. The main objective of V&C is to address threats to peace and sustainable development by fostering or 'gardening' civil society, democracy, and good governance in Fiji, Kiribati, the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. V&C is completing its three-year pilot phase and the review assesses the strengths and weaknesses of that process and makes recommendations for the future.

V&C operates at the community, national and regional level. At community level it aims to assist communities in promoting a more Pacific oriented consensual form of good governance that is both responsive and accountable. At the national level, it aims to build capacity through formal and non-formal education in the areas of civil rights and civil society in order to increase civil representation, engagement, and social justice. At the regional level, it seeks to establish a regional network to strengthen good governance procedures, promote greater accountability and transparency, and promote increased participation by civil society.

The project is jointly funded by DFID, NZAID and ADB. The project has been running since 2001 with participating countries entering at different times. In the proposed next phase, FSPI affiliates in Tonga, Tuvalu and Samoa have requested to join the project.

The review process found that, where the project was known of, there is widespread appreciation for the goal, objectives and activities within the project. There was, however, little understanding of or knowledge about the project amongst government officials, New Zealand High Commission staff, and other official sectors which was due, in part, to the low profile the project has in each country. The most success and greatest appreciation was recorded at community level where twenty communities have been involved in project implementation. Having said that communities appreciated the project, there was also a degree of frustration expressed that the expected delivery of goods and services had not been achieved at community level. The focus during the pilot phase of the project has been at community level which accounts for the relatively higher profile of achievements and exposure in this project tier.

The community mapping exercise, which engaged community members in surveying their historical, geographic, political, social and economic activities resulted in the ADB funded report "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific". Community members were also generally satisfied that this exercise was valuable in determining their 'needs' for the communities' development and that they, the communities involved, now looked forward to some material satisfaction as a result of their participation in the data collection. At 'higher levels' where the report has been disseminated, it has been acclaimed as a valuable asset for development agencies, and diplomatic and academic purposes and provides a base for further engagement for V&C in an expanded project.

The major finding of the review centres on refining its future direction – specifically at community level, and the report's recommendations reflect this concern. Increasingly throughout the pilot phase there was a move to implement development projects at community level rather than to promote knowledge in communities about civics and systems

of governance. The incorporation of small development projects in communities emerged from the Community Action Plans each community had been involved in as part of their Participatory Learning Activities. Such development needs – or to be specific – the urgent basic needs of the communities for water, rubbish disposal, better health and education facilities, were a major preoccupation of all the communities visited during the review. The review team was made aware, in all the countries, of the community needs that were not being addressed by local authorities or government ministries. However, the V&C project has inadvertently developed as a community needs identification exercise. There are now considerable expectations by the communities - ones supported by FSPI and its affiliates - that these development needs must be responded to by FSPI to maintain its credibility. FSPI's rationale is genuine but altruistic – let alone sustainable- in assessing its role as being that of project implementer in order to not leave communities without some successful project developments. This outcome has left the project in something of a conundrum and one which was considered at great length by the review team.

The urgent development needs of the communities for assistance with meeting basic needs was an unexpected outcome of organizing for community governance but it is not one for V&C to address *per se*. The implementation of small projects such as rubbish disposal, health centres and water tank delivery should not be a focus for the project. It is highly recommended, therefore, that FSPI return to a more finely tuned definition of 'gardening governance and democracy' through the more efficacious incorporation of its civics education activities into non-formal education programmes at community level and through assisting, primarily through advocacy, national education systems with civics curricula in the formal education system.

What is recommended is that the project be implemented at community level by well trained, well focused community governance workers who come from within those communities. These community workers would disseminate civics education and other relevant issues pertinent to the alleviation of poverty. The Solomon Islands (See: Case Study Five) model run by the FSPI affiliate SIDT offers an excellent template, especially in its Village Quality Life Index approach to community participation. Vanuatu (See Case Study: Vanuatu: Annex Six) also offers excellent examples of good practice for the next phase, especially in the affiliate's excellent management and holistic approaches to what it means by 'governance' and its application at community level.

The review team felt that, to a large extent, the issue of why the project became a de facto small project implementer, was due to a lack of direction and focus at both FSPI and affiliate levels on what 'governance' means in relation to the project. FSPI is recommended to deliberate on what is meant by 'governance' as considerable direction was lost by not having a clear mandate on its definition and how to apply it through the very clear Log Frame activities which offer a path for governance activities, specifically through civics education. How civics education should proceed in the next phase is discussed at length in sections 6.2 and 6.3 in the report.

What the review team also found was clear evidence that the project is not sufficiently progressive in its understanding and application for the inclusion of marginalized voices. For example, in all countries reviewed there was little understanding of how to move forward the inclusion of youth and females in governance. There was little evidence of a meaningful and directive approach to increase knowledge or participation in or about the ideology that lies behind the social and political conditions that maintain marginalization. The report discusses

at length the need to incorporate human rights issues into the fabric of the project. In the Solomon Islands the 'new' community leadership structure simply mirrored traditional structures that marginalized the participation of females and youths. The individual Country Case Studies in this report detail such observations. For a project named 'Voice and Choices', there was insufficient attention paid to critical analysis of social and political decisions that would clarify, let alone ameliorate, the conditions that continue to provide the structures for poverty. The main goal of 'V&C' is to aid in the elimination of poverty. FSPI is therefore recommended to look more closely at the structural arrangements that contribute to poverty and how they link to existing levels of under development and what 'governance' means in the light of such social and political divisions. The recommendation is for the inclusion of information in civics programmes that question influences that maintain the structures of a status quo that perpetuates poverty. A critical pedagogy would more suitably address civics education than a mere descriptive one.

The review found that some direction may have been lost due to the FSPI management wishing to provide affiliates with a high degree of autonomy. This situation, while avoiding micro management, may have assisted with the loss of direction that occurred, especially in the Solomon Islands and in Fiji. To a lesser extent project direction meandered in Kiribati. In Vanuatu the project was most on track as a governance project that promoted community awareness and issues pertinent to the real goals and aspirations of the Log Frame. The review team assessed that the FSPI management was fully engaged in activities to simply maintain the running of the project and they should be commended for the intensive work they did in securing funding, setting up systems, and other project related activities. With an administrative template now more fully in place, the FSPI management will be able to concentrate on project goals and direction. The review recommendations reflect this for they promote the idea that FSPI management should now be divided into management / financial administration and resource / training roles so that the work is separated and not carried out by the one position as at present. The Governance Programme co-ordinator's roles and responsibilities in the next phase of the project should be primarily to act as a resource person and trainer for affiliates in order to provide conceptual clarity in community and national implementation. The new role would aid the co-ordinator to act as a policy analyst and advocacy strategist for FSPI's implementation of the objectives of the project at regional and international level. The review team feels that a separation of duties along these lines would provide the FSPI management with a greater degree of capacity to work on what is a complex and time consuming set of activities which will include seven countries in the next phase.

The role of the affiliates in the project was a major issue in the review process. What the review found was a varying degree of affiliate response to the project. While each affiliate was participating, some were able to more fully implement the project with all of the activities being optimised. Vanuatu is the most successful in its project implementation and is to be commended for its approach and energy. The report has included a case study on each country. The report does not seek to criticise any individual affiliate. Numerous situations were at play in each country that both aided successful project implementation or mitigated against optimal results. However, with a refocused and restructured FSPI management more able to work closely with affiliates, the review team feels certain issues that arose in the first phase will be more easily avoided in the second. Again, the review recommendations specifically address the situation pertinent to management strategies and affiliates.

The fact that the Voices and Choices project is complex cannot be overlooked. The review team found that given the relative lack of training and experience of all affiliates in working

simultaneously at community, provincial, national and regional levels in areas they were not experienced in (i.e. education), there is a great need to provide training for all project staff. Similarly, a project that works across so many levels must be clear on where its limitations lie. How much energy, and to what extent its resources are placed at each level, was a concern for the review team. The first phase of the project concentrated on community level activities. However, in attempting to set up activities at national and regional levels FSPI should not stretch its capacity. In the second phase, FSPI must make sure that the budget is sufficient to include all of its activities at the regional level. Activities at the community level should not be cut back to provide for those at regional level. This assessment is based on the feed back from stakeholders, including those at regional levels, who felt that FSPI has a niche at community level activities. The review team was not opposed to activities at the regional level such as the Virtual Governance Centre for they are valid contributions to the promotion of good governance. However, given the inevitable constraints of budget and capacity, stakeholders and commentators felt that the niche created by the project at community level should not be diluted. The review team was not privy to the budget proposals for stage two but it advises FSPI to maintain its concentration and consolidation at community level while carefully exploring its entry into regional activities. Similarly, a recommendation that the Regional Advisory Group be refocused reflects the concern that the review team had on regional activities and the efficaciousness of the current composition of that group. While not advocating that the group be disbanded, it is recommended that the group be seriously assessed for its current contribution. This recommendation is a reflection of stakeholder opinion, one that was concerned with expense, rationale and group commitment.

Governance is an amorphous concept. Promoting its concepts and application across multiple cultures and countries in a region as geographically, politically, socially and culturally diverse as those the project is involved with creates a number of inevitable issues and problems. The review team was very much aware of this situation and, being cognizant of it, framed its response to the V&C accordingly. The review team assessed the Log Frame and the project's achievements primarily against that document for it was the one central to the project design and its implementation. Given the issues faced by FSPI and the affiliates in the pilot phase of the project, the review team feels that the achievements recorded should be commended. With greater focus on civics education, as opposed to project development / services delivery at community level, and with increased attention to direction at all levels by a re-structured FSPI management, the review team feels that the project will continue to contribute to the promotion and application of good governance in selected Pacific countries.

1.1 Recommendations

In light of the report findings, specifically to the overall direction in the next phase of the project, the two major recommendations are:

Recommendation: That the rationale and mandate of V&C be very clearly focused on good governance and what good governance means in relation to civics and the associated political and social processes that govern people's lives.

Recommendation: That FSPI and the affiliates critically analyse the implications for the project of providing assistance to communities to help meet their development needs before implementing the next phase of the governance project.

Further recommendations are grouped thematically around issues arising from the report:

1. Log Frame

Recommendation: That the re-drafted Log Frame include a detailed Risks and Risks Management section.

Recommendation: That FSPI ensure that all affiliate staff have sufficient training and capacity development to cover all of the expectations in the Log Frame.

2. PLA Methodology

Recommendation: That PLA tools leading to Action Plans do not raise community expectations for unrealistic provision of goods and services within V&C

Recommendation: That Action Plans centre on the utilization of the Village Quality Life Index as implemented through SIDT community and governance programmes.

Recommendation : That all PLA tools and Action Plan methodology be critically assessed for V&C and donor objectives that promotes sustainable inclusion and participation of women and youth.

3. Project Management

Recommendation: That FSPI play a greater role in guiding the direction of the project to enable it achieves its maximum impact and outcomes. Accordingly, that:

- (1) The co-ordination of the project be divided into management / financial administration and resource / training roles and the work be separated and not carried out by the one position as at present;
- (2) The Governance Programme co-ordinator's roles and responsibilities in the next phase of the project be primarily to act as a resource person and trainer for affiliates and to provide conceptual clarity in community and national implementation; and to act as a policy analyst and advocacy strategist for FSPI's implementation of the objectives of the project at regional and international level.

Recommendation: That FSPI use the skills of the Governance Programme co-ordinator to provide conceptual direction, capacity building, policy analysis and advocacy for the project overall and for affiliates, and that additional staff be employed to assist the Governance Programme with administration and management communications with affiliates.

Recommendation: That FSPI prioritise its own analysis and dissemination of the project findings as an important part of implementing the project including the allocation of funds to cover the costs for the dissemination of the project findings at regional and international meetings.

Recommendation: That FSPI should not start any more projects without having all the necessary agreements and initial funding disbursed to its accounts.

Recommendation: That FSPI should utilise the remaining months of the project to compile lessons learnt and produce guidelines/best practises on community governances from the experiences during the pilot project. Such guidelines should include: a resource tool kit on conducting PLA for community governance; a simplified handbook at the national level on the roles and responsibilities of the varying government agencies, NGO's, private sector and donors which could assist communities; Lessons learnt.

4. Civics Education

Recommendation: That civics education is promoted at the non-formal and formal levels in each affiliate country.

Recommendation: That at the formal level, FSPI and affiliates should concentrate on advocacy at national level to ensure implementation of civics education and that they do this in partnership with other interested parties such as UN agencies, and that FSPI not become directly involved in curriculum development nor teacher training.

Recommendation: That affiliate staff receive substantial training in civics education and its application processes in both the non-formal and formal sectors.

Recommendation: That national level structures, the role and responsibilities of decision makers and politicians, accountability and transparency, democratic processes, constitutional issues of national importance, how inequalities occur and are maintained, should be amongst the content of future awareness raising on governance in civics education at all levels.

Recommendation: That at the national formal civics education level, FSPI should play an advocacy role to promote teacher training and curriculum reform but should not attempt to fund training or the preparation of extensive curricula on civics education.

Recommendation: That FSPI initiate a meeting amongst the following organisations and individuals in Suva in order to discuss a common approach and strategy towards formal and non-formal civics education in the Pacific: UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, Fiji Curriculum Development Unit, Mr Len Flier.

Recommendation: That FSPI recognise the considerable difficulties and expense of curriculum reform and teacher training at national level in the formal civics education sector and re-write their Log Frame accordingly and that the Len Flier report be fully considered for the implications it details in the area of formal civics education.

Recommendation: That community based non-formal civics education follows a well organised, highly structured and systematic model incorporating community based trainers highly proficient in civics education that includes Life Skills, economic

activity training, health promotion and human rights and that SIDT, UNICEF and UNFPA models be utilised for this purpose.

Recommendation: That given the complexity of the situation of incorporating non-formal and formal education into the FSPI programme across seven countries, it is imperative to hire a recognised educationalist on a period contract basis to facilitate this process.

5. Gender and Human Rights

Recommendation: That the promotion of meaningful gender and youth policies and systems for their application into the goals and objectives of the V&C be included in the project Log Frame.

Recommendation: That Human Rights be presented as critical discourse and be integrated into V&C as an integral aspect of 'good governance'.

Recommendation: That FSPI and the affiliates consider the need for more social analysis in the V&C project, to inform their work with communities and raise awareness in communities on equality and equity principles as part of gardening good governance.

Recommendation: That FSPI needs to clarify its promotion of the principles of equality and equity in the V&C project, including in its proposal, research, analysis and advocacy.

Recommendation: That the project begin by raising gender awareness amongst project staff and in the communities, as part of the gardening good governance campaign.

Recommendation: That FSPI consider measures to increase participation of marginalized groups, particularly women and youth, in participation in all project meetings and activities.

6. Linkages

Recommendation: That FSPI should make substantial links with UN and other agencies that already run relevant social, governance, health and human rights programmes in affiliate countries in order to avoid duplication, and promote education in areas that combine to provide both direction to the alleviation of poverty and an increased understanding of governance

Recommendation: That V&C and affiliates involve greater networking and linkages between NGOs and government agencies.

7. Regional Governance Advisory Group

Recommendation: That RGAG be reconstituted to include people more in tune with the actual focus and application of V&C.

8. Affiliates

Recommendation: That affiliate staff, who work mainly at community level, be brought more into the broad scope of the project in order to promote a greater response to project objectives.

Recommendation: That FSPI assesses the management needs of affiliates against the implementation activities expected in order to identify areas requiring FSPI support, capacity building or assistance;

Recommendation: That there be discussion between FSPI and the affiliates at the beginning, mid-term and end of the project on the respective roles in project implementation.

Recommendation: That FSPI and affiliates assess capacity building needs for management of the project by affiliates and discuss how to address these, at the beginning of the project.

Recommendation: That FSPI initiate, co-ordinate and assist in more information sharing between affiliates on all aspects of the project.

Recommendation: That more consultation is needed with the national affiliates in preparing the budget for the project to ensure the appropriate budgetary costs for national activities are provided in the proposal including contingencies to accommodate for interest rates and currency fluctuations

9. Donors / Funding

Recommendation: That donors harmonise the reporting and disbursement requirements, so that project officers can more effectively implement the projects

10. Monitoring and Evaluation

Recommendation: That a mid-term review of the project be funded in order to address issues that arise during implementation – ones that could have been avoided had there been greater monitoring by outside agencies during the current V&C cycle.

1.2 Methodology

The review team visited project sites and interviewed stakeholders in the centres of the four participating countries between November 9 and December 4, 2004.

The NZAID Review Terms of Reference (ToR) and the associated Briefing Guidelines (See: Annex One) guided the review mission and the structure of the report. The report follows the format of the ToR and Guidelines through each Objective and Task.

The team reviewed documents related to the project per se and issues related to governance in the Pacific. The project design document provided details of the initiative while the literature related to V&C established the context. The documents reviewed are listed in Annex Two.

At all times the team was aware of the need to assess both FSPI's and the affiliates' position on project events and general issues pertinent to the project and the review process. Hearing the 'voice' of these stakeholders and representing it in the review report was felt by the team to be crucial. To this end, therefore, the team attempted to record the respective positions of each group. Where appropriate the team then triangulated findings in order to process all comments and devise an appropriate response for report purposes. Only after intensive discussions and analysis amongst team members did recommendations emerge. In final discussions with FSPI, the major findings of the report were fed back and analysed with order to ascertain the legitimacy of responses to field visits and other related aspects of the review process.

The most critical source of information took the form of interviews scheduled in each country. Focus groups were held at each project site. Discussions with individuals were also conducted in-field to both add to and verify data collected. The team attempted to triangulate their findings. In order to do this successfully, special attention was taken to speak to the same people in groups and, where appropriate, individually in order to assess perceptions. Through such interviewing processes and visiting sites, the team assessed FSPI's achievements as reported in the FSPI V&C reports. In particular, the team assessed achievements as reported in the V&C report for 2003-04 (See Annex 9). This report was crucial for it was written by FSPI and lists in detail all achievements that occurred to date against Log Frame objectives.

One to one and group discussions were held with representatives of government officers, NGOs, church groups, women's groups, and other interested parties in each country. Interview schedules were guided by the ToR. For example, team members visited UN and other development agencies in order to assess perceptions of the project on issues directly related to specific activities. In addition, interviews were also conducted with representatives of other funded projects that have objectives or activities that overlap or are otherwise similar to those of this project.

In some cases, interviews with stakeholders and other people important to assessing the project were unable to be contacted and or were unable to schedule an interview. The two delay in Kiribati due to aircraft problems meant a shortened time in Fiji which in turn met interviews could not be met. This occurred with DFID, UNDP and ADB personnel in Suva who were unable to re-schedule due to their travel timetable or who were unable to meet with team members despite requests to do so. Some meetings were unable to be made in other participating countries. This was especially so with the Fiji affiliate who were unable to schedule appointments or arrange visits to more than one site due to reasons which are still unclear to the review team. The Fiji affiliate was the least able to make suitable arrangements for the team. The three other affiliates were all impressive with their willingness and ability to provide the team with meetings and field visits. Although extra time was negotiated by the team with NZAID for review purposes, that time was spent primarily in team meetings in Suva with FSPI and amongst team members discussing the review before members returned to their respective countries.

It is important to note here that there is a certain amount of frustration if not cynicism amongst some quarters towards interview teams. So many review teams make visits to the various players in development in the Pacific that now there is a somewhat negative reaction to such teams in some areas.

To guide the interviews, the team developed general questionnaires for the various categories of respondents. The interviews themselves were open in structure and the guides were used to ensure key question areas were not omitted.

Detailed notes were kept during the interviews, which were later reviewed to identify key concerns and other highlights and seek patterns or symptoms of deeper problems that could affect the outcomes of the project. The following section describes these findings. At all times the team was cognizant of the need to follow participatory approaches while conducting their research for the purposes of the report. To meet this objective special attention was made to include women and girls where appropriate. In several instances women were excluded from the groups that had been assembled for discussions. Team members then sought information as to why there were no women and what this might mean for the project. Team members also sought to have women included in subsequent or additional meetings. This situation also applied to youth and youth participation. Such instances are recorded in this report (See annexes for individual country case studies).

The team was composed of three contracted individuals. Dr Jeffrey Buchanan was the team leader and is based in Suva. Dr Vanessa Griffen is also based in Suva. Mr Cedric Schuster is based in Apia.

The work plan was developed in conjunction with FSPI staff and NZAID personnel notably Ms Rebecca Spratt. The itinerary was developed around airline schedules which were often difficult to piece together in order for the four countries to be visited within the timeframe. All team members visited Kiribati. Due to airline cancellations out of Kiribati, only Dr Griffen and Mr Schuster were able to visit Vanuatu and Fiji while Dr Buchanan visited the Solomon Islands alone.

Specifically, the team were keen to visit project sites in remote areas in order to ascertain project achievements in such locations. To do this it was necessary to take dingy boats to outer islands which added considerably to the time in each country but also to building a profile of how the project operates within the exigencies of transport and communication issues.

The report structure follows the ToR format (See: Annex 1). The "Specific Areas of Interest for NZAID" (See Annex 1), which are an addition to the ToR, are included as objectives and / or integrated into the body of the report.

2.0 Objective One

Introduction

This section addresses the issues arising from Objective One of the ToR: "*Assess the achievements of the project, including but not exclusive to progress towards achieving the project objectives as set out in the project log frame.*" An assessment of project achievements is therefore based against activities in the V&C Log Frame, the Log Frame being the guiding document for the project. This assessment also takes into consideration achievements 'outside' of the Log Frame that the review team noted as being achievements worthy of mention. This includes intangible achievements exogenous to the Log Frame proscription. The Log Frame, which is from the 2003-04 Project Report, is found in Annex Eight. There were 45 different activities covered in the Log Frame assessment. This is a considerable number for such a relatively small project and a further demonstration of the implementing agencies' abilities given the generally high achievement rating. Not all of the activities were tabled to be accomplished in this phase of the project. In the FSPI Report, levels of achievement for each activity were rated between 1 and 6 with 1 equating to 'Likely to completely achieved' and 6 'Too early to judge.' The review team analysed each of the 45 activities against FSPI's assessment and in light of review findings in the field.

The review team investigated the project activities with the FSPI assessments in mind. As noted in the Methodology Section, the review team utilised a thorough methodology to assess all project activities. For example, through interviews with stake holders, outside agencies and individuals, scrutiny of documentation, materials produced by FSPI and affiliates, and field observation, the team was able to triangulate on the FSPI assessments as recorded in the 2003-04 Report. In most respects the review team was in accord with the FSPI assessment. On the few occasions where the team was not in accord with FSPI, team distinctions in interpretations and assessments have been noted in this report in the appropriate places.

The team spent considerable time discussing all aspects of this assessment process. The team has a combination of professional experience including education, project development, monitoring and evaluation, gender analysis and other areas of speciality relevant to the project assessment. The combination of these experiences contributed to the analysis of the project.

2.1 Task one: Achievements of the project

The V&C project has demonstrated considerable success across each of the objectives in the ToR. Achievements and lessons learned from the project are addressed under this task. The following points are the most notable amongst the project achievements.

1. **Project profile:** V&C is highly regarded in each participating country. Most individuals interviewed in the review process noted that the project rationale and objectives are, for the most part, valid. While the project is not highly visible in comparison to the much larger governance projects which concentrate almost exclusively on government national structures and processes, V&C is seen as a niche project that, while aiming at regional, national and community levels, is best suited

and most successful in community based activities. Overall, the project is seen as fulfilling a need in the area of governance and one that has a unique and valuable set of objectives. Principally, V&C is highly regarded for operating at grassroots level. In addition, that the pilot phase has progressed so well to date is a clear indication of the overall success of V&C and points to the efficacy and validity of continuing into the second phase.

2. **Project vision:** The values and rationale associated with the project were conceptualised and initiated through FSPI, primarily under the guidance of the [REDACTED], in response to the deterioration of good governance in several areas of the Pacific. FSPI staff have worked well within difficult challenging conditions across four countries to promote what is perceived regionally to be a valuable project addressing real and substantial issues. FSPI is highly regarded and the V&C has added to that acclaim, especially for its contribution at community levels. Many of the activities designed for implementation at the provincial, national and regional levels were not implemented during this pilot stage which accounts for much of the appreciation by stakeholders and observers for the work done at community level. The vision for project activities outside of community levels is therefore subject to how well it can be implemented given budget and capacity considerations in Phase Two. FSPI must be cognisant that it not stretch itself too wide with this project and that activities match its abilities. This issue is discussed at length in this report and is reflected in various recommendations. Essentially, the project so far has been successful at community level and is recognised for that contribution.
3. **Community participation:** A significant achievement has been the involvement of twenty regional grassroots communities in the pilot project. The willingness of the communities to be involved so actively is commendable. Community members are busy and have multiple commitments. The ability of FSPI and its affiliates to galvanise communities to work on the project demonstrates a high level of commitment by all parties and assured the success of project objectives.
4. **Regional governance mapping and research:** The success of community participation is evidenced in the highly acclaimed production of the ADB funded report on community mapping: "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific". This excellent and utilitarian report fulfils the requirements of objective two. Each of the twenty communities responded to the research initiatives that culminated in the report. FSPI affiliates contributed to the production of the report through analysis and collation of data.

The ADB Report was successful because of the methodology it followed. Capacity in research methodology amongst all stakeholders was developed in this process. The report intricately maps a multiplicity of issues as they relate to governance within the region. The usefulness of the report for development, academic, government, NGO and community purposes is possibly the most obvious achievement of the project to date. The author / editor, Dr Diana Guild, has compiled a valuable compendium of anthropological, political and social importance. The FSPI 2004 V&C Annual Report notes the significance of this ADB funded initiative: "The report analysed the community governance mapping information, considered relationships between traditional and modern governance structures and identified ways to integrate

community and modern governance systems.... At community level [the data] were used to facilitate the construction of community action plans." (p.4).

The findings have been presented in various formats including at regional conventions. The report has been widely distributed and should act as the catalyst for further V&C and other regional development / governance projects. Further distribution of the findings would be advantageous as would the commissioning of academic articles.

5. **Civics education:** Some encouraging signs were forthcoming within objective three of the Log Frame (See Annex Eight), which deals with civics education. Foremost amongst this was the Report of Civics Education in Fiji commissioned by FSPI. The report shows the harsh realities of promoting curriculum change within government institutions. Instituting civics education into formal curricula is difficult and requires specialist knowledge in such processes. There has been some progress in this area and more will be forthcoming as the project progresses into the next stage where action on this objective is more appropriate. Discussions on this issue are integrated into the report. A full discussion can be found in 6.2 and 6.3. Overall, in the next phase FSPI must be aware that curriculum is a specialist area and requires appropriate responses for implementation at formal and non-formal tiers (See: Recommendations).
6. **Vanuatu:** The management and application of the V&C through FSPV is a model of good practice. The consultants were consistently impressed with all aspects of the project in Vanuatu and commend all parties concerned. The Vanuatu Case Study details this model.
7. **Governance programme:** A number of activities under objective one of the Log Frame have been achieved or partially achieved (See Annex Eight: Annual report in which the Log Frame is located). Whereas the level of impact of each activity is yet to be assessed, the pilot phase of the project has shown that such activities can be of greater significance in the next phase. Further discussions on aspects of each activity are included in following sections and "Lessons Learned". What has seen some progress to date are:
 - The establishment of the Regional Governance Advisory group (RGAG). RGAG is comprised of eminent persons from the region.
 - The development of a website and Internet conferencing network which is an on-going activity.
 - Regional inventory of organisations involved in governance with Forum Island countries. This is a valuable source of information on organisations involved in governance and successfully meets objective 1.4.

Summary: overall achievements: In assessing the achievements of the project, the review team followed closely the FSPI V&C 2003-2004 Annual Report that summarised and assessed the outcomes of the project to date. FSPI and its affiliates compiled an assessment of their outcomes against the Log Frame. There were 45 different activities covered in this assessment. This is a considerable number for such a relatively small project and a further demonstration of the implementing agencies' abilities given the generally high achievement rating. Not all of the activities were tabled to be accomplished in this phase of the project. Levels of achievement for each activity was rated between 1 and 6 with 1 equating to 'Likely

to completely achieved' and 6 'Too early to judge.'" The review team analysed each of the 45 activities against FSPI's assessment and in light of review findings in the field. The review team agreed with the assessment of each activity as proposed by FSPI with only one or two questions about the level of achievement. The first two points in Lessons Learned discuss issues arising from this point about measuring achievement.

Overall, the review team has very high regard for the implementing agencies' demonstrated abilities to work so effectively within a challenging environment as that which encompasses V&C. The challenges are discussed below in light of lessons learned and the inevitable realities that emerge during the pilot phase of a region wide project.

Lessons Learned

There are a number of lessons learned and issues for consideration that arise from the review process. Other issues pertinent to various aspects of the project are incorporated into the report:

1. **Project goal:** The goal of V&C is: "To build a sustainable future and alleviate poverty for the Pacific region by promoting good governance and democracy". The FSPI assessment is: "Likely to be largely achieved/Likely to be partially achieved". The review team considered the FSPI assessment of the success against this goal in the 2004 Annual Report and considers it unnecessary that FSPI assess the project goal against such formidable odds. As the V&C Annual Report states: "This is a relatively small scale project." How measurements can be conducted is difficult, a sentiment with which commentators in the Annual Report concur in their own Lessons Learned Section: "It is difficult to measure the impact of V&C directly." The review team suggests that an assessment of the project goal against such enormous odds is unrealistic. Assessment and measurement should be required only against activities. The goal, as an overarching vision, remains valid.
2. **Development project / governance project:** Also difficult to achieve was activity 3.1.4 in the Log Frame (See Annex Eight) that reads: "Nurture good governance in each community in facilitating development projects particularly involving livelihood and management of cash income." The FSPI assessment for each country on this activity is "Achieved". The review team does not concur with this assessment. There was little evidence in any location to demonstrate that this activity was satisfactorily achieved or, under the circumstances of budget limitations, that it could be achieved.

The main lesson to be learned through this point is not so much about making unrealistic claims against activities, but that V&C should not move in the direction of a 'development project' where service implementation plays a significant role. Rather, the maintenance of V&C as a governance project should be the primary focus for the future. Whereas there is an argument that engagement of communities in economic activity promotes good governance, the review team suggest that the sheer scope of such activity across the region would, given budget constraints, pre-empt any realistic fulfilment of such activities. The main handicap to fulfilling activity 3.1.4 was that there was no allocated budget for 'facilitating development projects'. Altogether, the activity is somewhat misconceived and unrealistic.

Evidence during the review showed that some communities associated material and or service outcomes with V&C rather than awareness or advocacy. The review team suggests that a service promoting focus would be unsustainable and should not substantially reflect the goal and purpose of the project. The question for V&C therefore is: "What is the main contribution of the project going to be in terms of governance?" The review team nominates a focus on awareness and advocacy as a primary focus for the project. This recommendation does not dismiss community involvement in promoting services and economic activity within the project, but it should not be an automatic objective or expectation as has become the case in many of the pilot communities.

The ADB Report collates and analyses opinions from the 20 participating communities. Prevalent in community opinions about what their communities need is increased knowledge and awareness about governance per se. Additional skills such as those associated with Lifeskills that would be beneficial for youths are also common. Increased awareness of governance for traditional leaders was also prevalent. These findings were articulated in communities during the review process.

An overarching rationale for the next phase of V&C should therefore be one that strengthens the educative approach to governance in communities – just as it is the goal and focus at national and regional levels. At community level activities would reflect a broader and strengthened awareness of what constitutes good governance and how this is achieved. (See 6.2 and 6.3 for a full discussion on Civics Education)

It is therefore advised that FSPI critically consider the Log Frame activity 3.1.4 that states: "Nurture good governance in each community in facilitating development projects particularly involving livelihood and management of cash income". The 2004 V&C Annual Report notes that this activity had been achieved in each affiliate country. This claim is contested by the review team. In addition, Activity 3.1.4 is the catalyst to the problems FSPI encountered over direction and, ultimately, the sustainability of the project. Noted in the annual report under activity 3.1.4 is the comment: "All communities see good governance and development being inextricably linked. This is reflected in the Community action Plans." This statement is contentious and begs the question of how it was instigated. The review team feels that the issues surrounding this need to be more critically and fully addressed as detailed in this section and throughout this report.

- 3. PLA and action plans:** The PLA process leading to action plans may have contributed to the expectation for project development at community level. Future PLA processes should focus on awareness and advocacy and guide participants to those outcomes as opposed to the 'wish list' that occurred in many communities in the pilot phase.

A further recommendation is for FSPI to consult with SIDT over their PLA process in the Solomon Islands. This process leads communities towards the Village Quality Life Index (VQLI), which then promotes good governance through sustainable village based, community focussed, economic and awareness activities. Such an approach would go a long way to implementing a governance project that encourages links between traditional and modern aspects of economic and social activities and other relevant areas of governance discussed in the ADB funded report. These objectives and associated activities would relate appropriately to the current V&C goal and purpose and Log Frame objectives.

4. Inclusion of Women and Youth: Women and youth were represented in the PLA process but there are indications that their participation is not on equal terms with men, based on traditional exclusion practices and their role and status in society. The ADB RETA assessment of the V&C country studies highlighted this throughout and made significant reference to the exclusion of women and youth in the overall assessment of the project. Evidence from the review team visit suggests that in the outer islands of Kiribati this situation occurs (See Annexes for Case Studies). In the team visit to the community in Bonriki, in Tarawa, women were members of the development committee and seemed very vocal in the discussions but this is not necessarily indicative of how women would be in community decision making; the V&C project staff in FSPI Kiribati, in a discussion by the team member on gender participation, pointed to the difficulties of sole woman representatives participating fully in village meetings in the maneaba (meeting house) where traditionally, women are excluded..

There are indications that post- PLA processes and new community organisations arising from the V&C project, continue to under represent women and youth. In the case of women, this is particularly so when the V&C project does not raise issues of gender and other forms of marginalisation that occurs in traditional governance structures and processes. In new community development committees arising from the V&C project, women continue to be excluded if men are plan the new community structure or representatives are chosen from existing village committees. A positive outcome of the project has been the development of action plans which the communities wish to implement. However, the new community organisations have not addressed marginalisation of women or youth as an issue of better governance at community level. The FSPI project has not yet significantly focused on leading in issues of promoting equality of representation or inclusion of marginalised community members, particularly women and youth.

-----EXAMPLE FROM THE FIELD-----

In Vanuatu, a model for some of the best achievements of the V&C project, the community in Middle Bush selected the heads of their existing committees to be members of the new committee to implement the community action plan. None of the community committees – for education, health, community organising, youth – were headed by women, so the proposed new committee excluded women entirely. Even though there is a women’s committee with an articulate woman chairing it, women did not know about the structure proposed or the intention to implement the community action plans. This was discovered when the review team member asked the women about the new development committee which was to implement the community action plan. In discussions with the women (See: Annex: Women’s participation in the V&C project) – they indicated their view that they should be involved because “we are better at organising: the men just talk!” In a discussion with the male chairperson of the new committee, the team member remarked as lightly as possible that she had noticed there were no women on the new committee; the women’s group later said the chairperson had told them about the committee being formed and their chairperson could be on it! This about change indicated that even a noting of the absence of women can produce an (astute perhaps) about turn for their inclusion: a recommendation of the review is that a much more proactive role can be taken by V&C personnel and participants to break gender-based and youth exclusions.

The FSPI 2004 V&C Annual Report noted in its ‘Lessons Learned’ that youth and women are being excluded from governance processes within the communities. The data collected in the governance mapping exercise and collated as a guide for organisations throughout the

region reported that communities felt strongly about the under representation of youth and women. It is recommended that FSPI utilise this finding and seeks ways for promoting the inclusion of women and youth in the V&C project through critically examining its own approaches to increasing the representation and inclusion of women and youth as a governance issue throughout the project.

Overall, the V&C achieves poor results in the inclusion of human rights as a priority issue in its goal of alleviating poverty and in promoting good governance. How politics is structured, what constitutes power relations and related issues around exclusion, marginalization and prejudice have not been adequately accounted for in the conceptualisation of the project. A governance awareness and advocacy is not primarily about explaining how structures work as is but about how structures should work to achieve equity and inclusion. The review team strongly suggests that FSPI reconfigure and re-conceptualise its project so that it is not merely promoting awareness about how to work within existing unequal structures. There was considerable evidence that the project does not address change (See Objective Three).

- 5. Networking:** One of the main observations about the V&C is the potential for greater networking and linking of the project amongst government agencies, NGOs and other interested and relevant parties. There was much evidence to show that greater links with such agencies would: increase the profile of the project; provide valuable contacts for V&C to operate within such as providing services to other, larger governance operatives as the UNDP in Kiribati; reduce duplication of project activities in the same areas. The Case Studies provide examples of these situations. Linking with UN agencies such as UNICEF's Lifeskills Programme, UNDP's Civics Education Programme, UNFPA's Adolescent and Reproductive Health Programme would further V&C objectives to provide appropriate education in communities (See: 6.2, 6.3). Such linking would avoid duplication, costs and would allow affiliates to work closely with UN agencies. FSPI needs to remember that there are multiple projects in the Pacific, of which are closely allied to V&C objectives.
- 6. FSPI communication channels:** There was considerable evidence that FSPI needs to evaluate its communication channels with affiliates. There is also room for affiliates to do the same. With the exception of Vanuatu, issues about lack of communication due to various reasons surfaced throughout the consultancy. In discussions with FSPI it was clear that they readily acknowledge the need to improve communications with affiliates in order to optimise operations. Where affiliates have a more 'independent' notion of themselves, there is a particular requirement for FSPI to work actively to assess the exact affiliate relationship so that project implementation is not thwarted, as may have been the case with Fiji.

The start of the project is perhaps the most obvious example of poor communication. That there was no initial meeting was due in part to donor funds not being released in a timely manner, although why the project began without funds is also a considerable question. As the ADB Report states (p.22) "There was no official start up work shop held with team members from each country to determine the consistency in project development, information collection, and community action plan execution." Whereas the ADB Report notes that "It is evident that three countries progressed satisfactorily despite the initial ad hoc implementation [Fiji being the exception]" there is ample evidence that shows the ad hoc nature of the initial phase reduced the full impact that more communication and

cohesion of principles and application could have had. The points arising in the Lessons Learned demonstrate this. Crucial here is the feedback received from affiliates about what level of communication they require. Whereas FSPI may not seek to micro manage, there is evidence that a more guided approach to the project may be necessary, especially where problems are obvious. The Case Studies also detail such concerns. Evident from the above information is the paramount necessity for FSPI to: open and keep open lines of communication especially when there is a deterioration of personal and organisation ties; have in place a strategy agreed in advance for all affiliates to work through issues and areas of concern with FSPI; an increased schedule for visits to project countries and, importantly, project sites by both FSPI and affiliate personnel; a reflection by all staff on how they communicate personally with each other.

- 7. Funding:** A number of issues to do with match funding and how donor funds are released became evident. How they impact on the project is of concern. Objective Four in this report details these issues in detail. The lesson learned here is that the donors in liaison with FSPI need to work out a more systematic and appropriate method of releasing funds in order to avoid the bottlenecks that occurred in the pilot phase and which caused so much frustration. NZAID was commended for being efficient and pro-active in its requirements and acquittals process and for releasing funds in a timely manner. Affiliates stated that FSPI informs them when donor funds have not been received on time.

The following recommendations emerge from the lessons learned:

Recommendation 1: That the rationale and mandate of V&C be very clearly focused on good governance which is applied primarily through awareness raising in civics education programmes and through advocacy activities.

Recommendation 2: That PLA tools leading to Action Plans do not raise community expectations for unrealistic provision of goods and services within V&C.

Recommendation 3: That Action Plans centre on the utilization of the Village Quality Life Index as implemented through SIDT community and governance programmes in the Solomon Islands.

Recommendation 4: That the promotion of meaningful gender and youth policies and systems for their application into the goals and objectives of the V&C be included in the project Log Frame.

Recommendation 5: All PLA tools and Action Plan methodology be critically assessed for V&C and donor objectives that promotes sustainable inclusion and participation of women and youth.

Recommendation 6: FSPI and its affiliates actively encourage greater linking amongst relevant agencies in order to promote increased efficiency and opportunities for V&C to operate within.

Recommendation 7: That FSPI and donors determine a more efficacious method for releasing funds in a timely and efficient manner.

2.2 Task Two

Management Structures

The management structures of FSPI and its country affiliates are well established and have the capacity and capabilities to support the implementation of the V&C project at regional and national levels.

Differing capacities and capabilities in the affiliates in terms of project staff, experience, country situation and development focus, rather than management structures, may have determined the relative success in implementation of the V&C project in each country.

Although management structures in FSPI and the affiliates are capable and adequate, the review team has suggestions elsewhere in this report, on improving management of the project.

Recommendation 8: That FSPI assesses the management needs of affiliates against the implementation activities expected in order to identify areas requiring FSPI support, capacity building or assistance;

Roles and responsibilities between FSPI and the country affiliates

The respective roles and responsibilities of FSPI and the country affiliates in implementing the project were not clearly set out in the original project proposal.

The regional workshop FSPI convened to introduce the project to affiliates, also did not clarify roles and responsibilities for implementation, although it did cover concepts, tools and techniques, community work skills and proposed FSPI communications on the project. It would be useful for FSPI to clarify with affiliates at the beginning and during the project of the long-term management requirements of FSPI as co-ordinator of the project and the responsibilities and role of the affiliates in production of outputs over the whole project period.

The FSPI role and responsibilities to donors were not fully understood by affiliates. FSPI also may have assumed affiliates knew their roles and responsibilities in relation to reporting on project implementation in times set by the donor/s and had the capacity to produce reports as required. In this regard, the review team noted that the quarterly reports required by one donor (DFID), placed unnecessary stress on the country implementers and FSPI as coordinator of the project. Quarterly reports on activities seem particularly demanding for what was a new and innovative project requiring community-level organizing, awareness raising, research and data collection on a complex conceptual issue – governance – and its application in Pacific communities and countries. FSPI in turn, was also heavily burdened with the administrative need to receive and forward quarterly reports. Six monthly reports seem more appropriate.

Value would be added to the project if FSPI could do its own analysis and conclusions on the project outputs, the community governance reports and outline key information and lessons learned for advocacy at regional and national levels. The process would give affiliates a greater sense of what has been achieved, the lessons learned, and the use that FSPI and the affiliates can make of the project outputs. This would contribute to phase two of the project.

Recommendation 9: That there be discussion between FSPI and the affiliates at the beginning, mid-term and end of the project on the respective roles in project implementation.

Recommendation 10: That FSPI and affiliates assess capacity building needs for management of the project by affiliates and discuss how to address these, at the beginning of the project.

Communications structures/processes – FSPI and affiliates and with stakeholders

Communication structures and processes between FSPI and affiliates on project implementation in the period covered by the review include communications on research methodologies, community surveys, mapping and report writing, funding acquittals and project administration. Communications between FSPI and affiliates on the project is generally adequate and supportive.

From FSPI's point of view, a great deal of communications with affiliates during implementation of the V&C project centred on project administration and funding arrangements. Less emphasis was placed on the content of the governance project. The FSPI Governance Programme coordinator would prefer that FSPI spend more time on analysis, comment and discussion of the project content with the affiliates. FSPI would like to have more time for its staff to make substantive inputs into implementing the project rather than being merely the regional administrator and disbursing of funds. The review team agrees with this observation and has recommendations that address this issue.

Project staff in the affiliates made varied comments on communications processes: Two affiliates had no complaints on communications with FSPI but made suggestions for communications to enhance their understanding of the project and to reduce the isolation of project staff. Two affiliates expressed criticism of FSPI as being unavailable or not communicating when needed and failing to meet with an affiliate when in the country, despite requests for this. An affiliate also complained that FSPI communications on the project were inadequate, and instructions were not clearly given, including for the review team visit. Communications may have been sent by FSPI but, in some cases, not adequately picked up by affiliates. Inter-agency communications and responses can be improved. The review team does not see FSPI as being wholly responsible for apparent lapses in communications amongst affiliates. The suggestion is that all parties look closely at their weak links in communication processes including those prompted by personal differences.

Recommendation 11: That FSPI use the skills of the Governance Programme coordinator to provide conceptual direction, capacity building, policy analysis and advocacy for the project overall and for affiliates, and that additional staff be employed to assist the Governance Programme with administration and management communications with affiliates.

Communications support / processes - stakeholder engagement

FSPI has communicated the project findings on completion of the main outputs, namely the ADB funded "Assessing Community Governance Perspectives in the Pacific", to strategic stakeholders, including the Forum Secretariat, AusAID, and other regional, diplomatic and development agency representatives. FSPI is also engaged with Fiji-based and regional NGOs and networks in advocacy on good governance.

There is opportunity, especially in phase two of the project, for FSPI to play a much greater role in communications with stakeholders at all levels, but particularly at the regional level, to carry forward the project findings. The role of FSPI in communicating on good governance from a community perspective at a higher levels, for example, with UN agencies, national governments and regional intergovernmental and development organizations, should be a priority focus of the project in phase two.

Some affiliates have also communicated some information on the V&C project findings or processes to government and NGO stakeholders in their respective countries. In Vanuatu and Fiji, affiliates have visited key stakeholders and made presentations on the project. However, there was not sufficient evidence to state that the dissemination of information has been optimised. Increased contact with such organizations is recommended. One of the main objectives of the mapping exercise was to provide information and thus the imperative in phase two is to act on this.

The Regional Governance Advisory Group (RGAG) is identified in the project document as a source for communication with key stakeholders on the project based on the strategic positions held by its eminent persons members. Although RGAG has provided advice and support for the project in its initial stages, neither the FSPI staff nor affiliates had any strongly positive comments on its role or influence with other stakeholders, except for the support of ██████████ in the Forum Secretariat. One RGAG member suggested the RGAG had fulfilled its purpose and should be disbanded. That member said the RGAG had little direction that its members were thus not particularly interested in its function, and were too busy to deal with it. The review team also concluded that the RGAG has served a useful purpose in supporting the V&C project at its inception and that the group be replaced in the second phase with a Regional Good Governance Advocacy Group. The new group would have a different composition and role, including in advocacy and communications with other stakeholders.

Recommendation 12: That RGAG is reconstituted to include people more in tune with the actual focus and application of V&C.

Role of FSPI as support / resource for affiliates in undertaking the V&C project

FSPI has acted as a support for the project but mainly through its role in administering funding and managing the project at a regional level. FSPI has the role of being a resource for the affiliates in terms of content, clarification of terms and concepts, and as a trainer in building capacity of affiliate staff. FSPI provided support and acted as a resource at the beginning of the project and during project implementation. However, the role of the Governance Programme coordinator as a resource for affiliates was lessened by administrative and financial management responsibilities for the project. Therefore, FSPI must utilize its staff in more appropriate ways in the project. When FSPI expands the project to six countries, this problem will become pressing if funding is insufficient to cover capacity development, increased communications for affiliates and other arrangements that require optimising the V&C.

Recommendation 13: FSPI should play a greater role in guiding the direction of the project to enable it achieves its maximum impact and outcomes. Accordingly:

- (1) The co-ordination of the project should be divided into management / financial administration and resource / training roles and the work be separated and not carried out by the one position as at present;
- (2) The Governance Programme coordinator's roles and responsibilities in the next phase of the project be primarily to act as a resource person and trainer for affiliates and to provide conceptual clarity in community and national implementation; and to act as a policy analyst and advocacy strategist for FSPI's implementation of the objectives of the project at regional and international level.

Capacity of affiliates – in terms of skills, knowledge, relationships at community and government level and capacity to carry the project forward

Credit must go to the affiliates and their project staff for the initiative, resourcefulness and autonomy with which they implemented this innovative project. They were their own resource after the initial clarifications by FSPI on the project activities. The review team notes that the affiliates' executive directors also were supportive and resourceful in finding funding internally to meet the shortfalls in FSPI V&C project funding. The affiliates should be commended for their work on this project, which had few precedents in concepts or methodology (PLAs and KAP surveys applied to governance) and was burdened by difficult funding arrangements.

The affiliates have the capacity and capabilities for community level organizing and awareness raising. More capacity building by FSPI of project staff on research methods, PLA and KAP survey design and analysis could have helped project results. FSPI should assess and consult with affiliates on their capacity building needs for the next phase of the project. Project staff in the affiliates mentioned their need for training in governance concepts and analysis.

Capacity building requirements vary in each affiliate and FSPI needs to be aware of this. Project staff in one affiliate identified the need to have better understanding of the project; in another, project staffs are multi-skilled and have advanced public education and advocacy skills but would benefit from policy analysis for advocacy.

In the next phase FSPI should consider the following as areas for capacity building amongst affiliates:

- Clarification of the concepts of good governance at all levels.
- Policy analysis of community governance findings.
- In-depth understanding in affiliate organizations and project staff, of equitable development and human rights principles.
- Awareness raising on gender equality and equity issues and training in gender-awareness in project activities.
- Training in policy research and writing, including policy analysis.
- Economic and geopolitical analysis for project staff on global, regional and national development issues.
- Administration and management training.

FSPI's role in supporting the affiliates in future

FSPI's role in analysis of the project findings needs to be strengthened to enable it to play a stronger role in guiding the project's future development. FSPI expressed a wish to change its role for the second phase to be more involved in implementation with affiliates and the review team agrees with this assessment. However, FSPI management will have to make changes to the role and responsibilities of the present Governance Programme staff, including the employment of project staff for administrative roles, in order to enable a more proactive engagement by the FSPI Governance Programme in directing the V&C project.

There are also lessons learned from the affiliates in implementing the project that could be analysed by FSPI and shared with affiliates to assist them in their implementation of the project in its next phase. The examples from SIDT in the Solomon Islands including their Village Quality Life Index is an appropriate model for FSP affiliates to follow (See: Case Study: Solomon Islands). Vanuatu also provides ample evidence of best practice. FSPI is advised therefore to support affiliates in the next phase of the project through analysis of the project particularly in: outputs to date; policy implications; lessons learned; action strategies; advocacy messages.

Affiliates' support for carrying forward the project in the future

The affiliates have different levels of preparation and interest in carrying the project forward. In one country, the affiliate has already developed its own plans and built relationships for continuing the project, to strengthen community participation in governance and to develop better governance by political leaders at different levels. It is seeking funds to continue its governance work. In another, the affiliate is re-establishing community meetings and activities related to the V&C project. There is a strong view in the affiliates and in FSPI that the achievements of the V&C project in the communities need to be built upon. The redirection recommended by this report would shift focus from development project implementation to primarily education and SIDT Village Quality Life Index type functions. Links with agencies such as UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, RRRT would aid in that. Affiliates would benefit from such links in implementing the V&C as a truly governance project with a greater interest in reaching critical mass with advocacy and education programmes arising from the mapping exercises and a red-directed PLA. FSPI may wish to consider how much energy goes into its national and regional emphasis at the expense of its community work.

Information sharing on the V&C project, with other NGOs, regional agencies, government bodies

FSPI has shared the project findings through the media, regional organizations and donors. It has also disseminated the Regional Governance Inventory Compact Disc that contains the four country reports and the ADB funded Assessment Report by Diana Guild. FSPI is advised to make sure important parties such as New Zealand High Commissions and other diplomatic agencies, regional libraries and academic institutions are also sent copies of these documents.

Feedback from key regional organizations (Forum Secretariat) and donors (AusAID -Suva) to the review team on FSPI's project indicate that the sharing of information by the FSPI Governance Programme coordinator on the V&C project has been well received. FSPI has the capabilities to present the V&C project findings to other high-level officials and NGOs. Its Executive Director and Governance Programme staff and should use these resources for information dissemination and advocacy more significantly in the future. There should be no

difficulty in FSPI continuing to present the project findings at international and regional fora. Increased awareness would provide greater access to funds and also to networking opportunities with such organizations as UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, all of which run projects that could provide mutual benefits for them and V&C. The necessity for greater networking and linking is discussed elsewhere in this report.

Recommendation 14: That FSPI prioritise its own analysis and dissemination of the project findings as an important part of implementing the project including the allocation of funds to cover the costs for the dissemination of the project findings at regional and international meetings.

Sharing of information by affiliates

Some affiliates have also worked hard at disseminating information from the project at community and national level. Positive responses were heard by the review team on presentations by the affiliate on the project in Vanuatu, where it was evident that the project was very well known and respected in relevant government Ministries and units, and amongst key donors (AusAID, ADB) and other NGOs engaged in similar work. In Fiji, presentations by the affiliate executive director to regional organizations and local NGOs have also been well received. In Kiribati, there is some hesitancy over wider dissemination of the V&C information, although media messages have been disseminated. In the Solomon Islands there seemed to be little dissemination about the project or its findings. Affiliates do not seem to have a strategy on information dissemination. FSPI could assist affiliates in being more proactive in disseminating the project findings or initiating discussions on governance issues. Log Frame activities in this area need explication.

Recommendation 15: That FSPI and affiliates devise information dissemination strategies and consider means and audiences for strategic sharing of information and dissemination on the Voices and Choice project findings.

Capacity building and information sharing between affiliates

There is a critical lack of regular mechanisms for information sharing, problem solving, or capacity building between affiliates. FSPI can play a role in identifying relative strengths of affiliate implementation strategies and methods and inviting affiliates to share information and experiences from the field. This would be a useful role for FSPI and help build good relations between it as coordinator of the project and the affiliates, and information sharing between the affiliates. This would also legitimise the time and expense of the virtual Good Governance initiative.

Recommendation 16: That FSPI initiate, co-ordinate and assist in more information sharing between affiliates on all aspects of the project.

2.3 Task Three

Assessment of financial management systems and appropriateness of the project budget expenditure

FSPI and its affiliates used Mind Your Own Business (MYOB) accounting system to record and account for the utilisation of funds for the V&C project.

National affiliates, upon signing on as partners to the project, were allocated a national budget as per the project document. The budgets and work plan were aligned to the project objectives as agreed with the donors and reviewed annually by the Project Coordinator and the national affiliates.

Based on the donor requirements, the participating affiliates were required to produce quarterly summaries of financial spending accompanied with narratives on activities conducted utilising the funds. FSPI as the main contractor with NZAID, JWP and ADB reviewed the affiliate reports before compiling overall quarterly and annual summaries, which were then submitted to the donors along with the request for the next funding instalment. Funds were disbursed from the donors upon satisfactory use of previous disbursements and if confirmation of the requested budget was within the overall project agreement. FSPI as the main contractor coordinated the auditing of the project on an annual basis

Issues raised

- The MYOB accounting system used for managing the project was an efficient system, which ensured effective monitoring of fund utilisation and compilation of reports to the donors. The system was assessed as being appropriate for the affiliates and the project officers to follow and use effectively. Some of the difficulties experienced by some affiliates were due to the lack of training on MYOB for the affiliate finance officers. This has since been addressed with the FSPI finance officers providing training for the relevant affiliates.
- The disbursement process from the donors, namely the DFID contribution, was very problematic in that the funds requested were mostly late in arrival - usually ranging between one week and two months. Late disbursement of funds from JWP caused delays in the implementation of the project especially for affiliates with limited funds such as in Kiribati and Solomon Islands. Vanuatu and Fiji affiliates utilised funds from other projects to keep V&C afloat, which in turn meant slowing down activities for other projects as their funds were redirected to V&C. For small NGO's with limited funding, the current approach by DFID will need to be revised so that funds can be transferred earlier since the current funding disbursement scheme ultimately puts the V&C and other projects and the organisations themselves into severe financial risk resulting in loss of staff and delayed project goals.
- The adjustment undertaken by NZAID to disburse full annual funds to the project enabled the smooth implementation of the project over the last two years as the activities with the communities and the governance mapping activities intensified. Still, several of the activities and salaries for the project staff, which were primarily funded by DFID, were delayed. The delays in staff salaries especially since the salaries are very low are a critical factor in retaining the qualified staff that the project has employed.
- The review found that the audit reports for the project have shown that, apart from minor reallocation of funds due to delays in release of DFID funds to implement the project,

most of the funds have been disbursed and utilised according to the requirements of the different contracts.

- The delays encountered by the affiliates in receiving funds to implement the project were primarily due to the late arrival of payments via JWP into the FSPI accounts. There was evidence to confirm that the funds were immediately disbursed once they arrived into FSPI accounts. The main cause of funding delays was due to not satisfying the reporting requirements for the project. Reporting delays were due to affiliate staff not being in the office but in the field and therefore unable to finish off reports. Other reasons advanced for reporting delays were: lack of capacity in report writing meant a certain reticence to submit reports that might not meet requirements. In such cases FSPI then aided the affiliate. Two affiliates stated that due to staff problems and there were delays in submission (Solomon Islands, Kiribati). Once the reports had been completed satisfactorily, funds were immediately disbursed. This proved to be an efficient way of managing the progress and implementation of the project from FSPI.

V&C: Budget

The ToR posed the following questions related to funding: Has funding been sufficient for the programme overall? At the national and regional level? Has the balance between funding for the national and regional level activities been appropriate?

- The total initial project budget was reduced from £1,308,522 to approximately £542,095. To make up the revised funding total DFID as the main donor contributed 45% of budget, ADB provided 30% while NZAID provided 25%.
- As shown in the table below, the currencies exchanges and fluctuations caused over ten percent of the total funding to be lost which ultimately created a major financial disadvantage for the project's needs.

Total funds received

Donors	FSPI	National Affiliates	Total
DFID (GBP£)	120 959	95720	216679
NZAID(GBP£)	93725	41066	134791
%	61%	39%	
ADB (USD\$)	84824	115174	199998
%	42%	58%	

- The funds from DFID were secured first, but were not received until late 2002, while NZAID funds were received around the same time. The ADB funds, which were approved for only a specific activity within the project, were received in 2003.
- The budget for the project was provided from three different donors all with different requirements on reporting and acquitting.
- The budget did not include safety nets such as contingencies or allowed for inflation fluctuations, which resulted in the loss of around 10% of the approved project budget.

- The approved budget did not adequately cover national costs for some of the activities especially for areas such as travel costs, and regional workshops for the participating partners at the inception of the project and consistently during the project

Issues raised

- Implementing a project that was under budgeted will always create problems with implementation as was seen in the V&C. Several of the activities included in the project document such as public awareness advocacy programmes and regular visits to the project communities were reduced due to limited funding.
- Having a multi-donor funded project with separate criterion and requirements, put unnecessary burden on the project implementers, which affected the performance of duties as per the project document. Examples include the project officers at the national affiliates and FSPI spending more than a third of their time in administration, writing reports and balancing accounts for the different donors rather than implementing the project.
- The allocation for the salaries of staff at the national level were just adequate to retain staff although the dedication and real interest for some of the best staff enabled them to stay on although they were receiving much less than allocated amounts.
- The project activities at the national level, especially on travel costs were very limited, hindered the possible advance progress of the project as project officers were only able to travel a few times to the project sites. This impacted severely in countries with remote project sites. JWP also expressed concerns about certain costs such as communications and travel which shows some misunderstanding of the realities of such costs in the Pacific.
- The allocated budgets for some of the project activities at the national level such as information campaign and training materials were insufficient especially for countries like Vanuatu which has a much higher cost of living compared to Kiribati and Fiji.
- The review assessed that based on the activities required at the different levels of the project, there was appropriate division in the budget allocations amongst the regional secretariat and affiliates for implementing the project. That is the national affiliates were mostly focussed on
- The review assessed that the budget significantly fell short in being able to undertake all the activities within the project Log Frame. It would important to have had a mid term review of the project to assess possibly reducing the expectation or increasing the budget.
- Multi-donor approach is proven to be effective in providing funding for bigger projects, but improved coordination and harmonisation amongst the donors is crucial for reporting requirements so as not to overburden the project implementer with redundant administrative reports which will then provide ample time to meet the project objectives.

Recommendation 17: That more consultation is needed with the national affiliates in preparing the budget for the project to ensure the appropriate budgetary costs for national

activities are provided in the proposal including contingencies to accommodate for interest rates and currency fluctuations

Recommendation 18: That a mid-term review of the project be funded in order to address issues that arise during implementation – ones that could have been avoided had there been greater monitoring by outside agencies during the current V&C cycle.

2.4 Task Four

Action Learning approach: An assessment of the effectiveness of the action-learning approach to implementation and of risk identification and management strategies.

At project implementation stage, relevant tools were identified and developed for achieving the outputs. These tools were to be tested and refined over the life of the project so that at the end of the pilot phase a set of guidelines and lessons learnt would be developed that can ensure good governance at the community level

The tools identified and developed for the project included participatory learning approach (PLA) which consisted of governance mapping, community-based surveying, advocacy and public awareness, and applied research. The PLA techniques, which have been used in most of the community-based projects by FSPI and other agencies in the regions, were slightly adjusted by the original project coordinator to provide more focus on community governance. The community action plans were to be the end result of the PLA and community awareness was anticipated to include actions to improve decision-making processes, improve equality, and improve the standard of living in the communities. In most instances, the tools used were developed by the project coordinator at the inception of the project, which were then sent to affiliates with working guidelines. The affiliates with experiences in PLA adapted them to local situations and collaborated with the Project Coordinator to ensure uniformity throughout the project sites and project countries

Issues raised

- The initial project document and associated budget did not provide an opportunity for the participating affiliates, project officers and possibly experts in the area of community governance to contribute in the developing of the methodology. The process, methodology and guidelines were developed by the regional secretariat with affiliates then being requested to implement them. Lack of overall endorsement, clear comprehension and contribution from affiliates clearly contributed to delays in the report production for donor agencies. Moreover, the inherent factors in the initial methodology also contributed to the community action plan appearing to focus more on development and lacking in actions to improve decision making processes and equality within the communities.
- Due to the absence of clear methodology and process for implementing the project, the national implementation was mostly dependent on the national affiliates and project officers' capabilities, knowledge of the project needs and the level of communications they established with the regional secretariat and overall project coordinator. These differences in interpretation of the project can be seen in the different emphasis in the outputs produced at the national level where the community governance outputs have

been excellent while the other components of the project such as advocacy, regional good governance, and civic education have produced varied success

- The tools used for the community governance mapping and community action plans were assessed as being appropriate for the work. Nevertheless, some critical areas of the process are felt to have gone amiss which resulted in the community action plans addressing mostly developmental concerns, but lacked actions on how to improve governance of resources and people within each community. Some expressed examples were: ensuring marginalised group's voices will be heard, focusing on equitable distribution of community resources, addressing peace and harmony within the community and bridging traditional and modern governance at the community levels. A more reliable and sustainable and appropriate tool would be the Village Quality Life Index used by SIDT in the Solomon Islands.

Recommendation 19: That FSPI should utilise the remaining months of the project to compile lessons learnt and produce guidelines/best practises on community governances from the experiences during the pilot project. Such guidelines should include: a resource tool kit on conducting PLA for community governance; a simplified handbook at the national level on the roles and responsibilities of the varying government agencies, NGO's, private sector and donors which could assist communities; Lessons learnt.

- **Risk management**

There appears to be an absence of stated risk management strategies in the original project design. Most notably the review team felt that the re-drafted Log Frame for the second Phase would benefit from a Risk Identification and a Risk Management section. This is a practical way for identifying and analysing where risks may occur. There is no such system in the current Log Frame. Conversations with affiliate staff disclosed the need for such a system. By including an identification of possible risks in the Log Frame, project staff would be able to ascertain where they were in relation to what was actually occurring: were there in fact the situations identified in the Log Frame actually happening in the field, and to what extent? (See: Annex Eight for the full Log Frame).

The review team was unable to discover why there was no risk management included into the original Log Frame. There are numerous Log Frames to be found for the V&C which caused some confusion for the team. Log Frames previous to the one used in the 2003-04 V&C Annual Report are different in scope and depth. None employ a risk management system. Kiribati did not have the Log Frame when team members asked to view it. The Solomon Island affiliate had the Log Frame in the Annual report presented in Annex eight but the V&C Project Officer had never read it. Vanuatu staff were fully aware of and familiar with the Log Frame presented in Annex eight. The one Fiji affiliate staff member interviewed was aware of the Log Frame (See Methodology section for an explanation as to why only one Fiji affiliate member was interviewed).

For the purposes of enhancing the monitoring and evaluation process, it is vital that a systematised risk identification and management system be included into the next Log Frame.

2.5 Task Five

Multi-donor funding

The following questions arise from the ToR:

1. Assess the multi-donor funding structure and effects of these on project implementation.
2. Multi-donor funding – opportunities for greater harmonisation in terms of reporting requirements, funding arrangements, extent of and need for greater engagement between donors in relation to the programme

The project overall was funded by three different donors-namely ADB, DFID, and NZAID which all had different requirements. DFID, which provided 45% of the funding for the project required, and their funds would only be released upon confirmation that the co-financing for the project had been secured. The additional co- financing was provided by NZAID and ADB.

The ADB provided the easiest funding requirements for reporting as the contract was handled more as a consultancy whereby the details of the work plans were not as important as meeting the requirement milestones and producing the overall output.

The requirements of DFID funding included the need for quarterly reporting and release of funds. The funds were released on an acquittal basis only on funds that had been utilised by the project

The NZAID contract although initially started on the DFID requirements were able to release annual budgets based on work plan presented by FSPI for 2004.

Issues raised

- The existing multi-donor structure enables FSPI to undertake the project as no one donor was prepared to fund the full cost of such a critically important project. The outcomes of the current project clearly show the importance of the information generated, which can be used by all donors in the Pacific, assist with government planning and service delivery to communities, and provide an important component that needs to be addressed for all community-based projects
- The approach by FSPI to start the project without having all funding secured is not a recommended practice for projects of this nature with several affiliates involved. In launching the project without all the funds secured, FSPI had to continually revise its project outputs with the funds available, thus the project activities and budget at the end of the project are somewhat different than the original proposal.
- The differing reporting and disbursement arrangements by the different donors put extra burden on the project staff. This includes having to write three different accounting and progressive reports on a quarterly basis, especially for affiliates that were required to produce specific outputs within tight timeframes

- The DFID financial disbursement arrangements of only releasing funds based on acquittals might be appropriate for big organisations with funds to cover such expenses, but FSPI, its affiliates, and all Pacific Island NGO's with very few financial resources which are all tied to project funding, will certainly limit the capacity of the organisation in implementing a project. The V&C project was only able to continue because of the NZAID and ADB funds, which were released in lump sum or on annual basis. If the project is to continue, new funding arrangements need to be agreed with DFID if the project is to operate efficiently.
- Need for other donor funds to be leveraged? Respective roles of NZAID, FSPI, and FSP-affiliates in seeking additional new funding partners, enhancing donor coordination, need to be addressed.
- The review team identified several opportunities at the national level within which the project could source additional funds for future activities including replicating it in several more village communities. In particular, several initiatives by UNDP, AusAID other donor, NGO's and some government initiatives will be able to integrate some components of the project. AusAID (Suva) noted they were prepared to look seriously at funding and that FSPI should return to their offices as soon as possible and follow up on initial contacts.
- The UNDP project in Kiribati is focussing on strengthening the capacity of its Island Development Officers to better develop Island Development Plans and support community needs. In this project, the trainings needed are similar to the skills current possessed by the FSPK staff of the V&C project. Therefore every effort must be made to link up the two projects rather than duplicating some of the redundant activities. The UNDP project will benefit greatly from using the lessons learnt and experience of V&C to implement its project
- The AusAID project in Vanuatu on Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI) could benefit from working closely and utilising some of the information and skills of the Vanuatu V&C project especially when it is reviewing the REDI plans for the island groups within Vanuatu. Similarly the National Council of Chiefs have expressed interest in collaborating with V&C or even hiring V&C staff to build the capacity of the chiefs so they are able to better support their communities
- The current Fiji Ministry of Fijian Affairs and Regional development initiative to develop community development plans is similar to the V&C community plans process. The collaboration between the MFA and V&C Fiji partner PCDF shows possibly good progress in improving the chances of hearing the voices of the communities in national decision-making. It further shows a possible avenue for mainstreaming the V&C project goals into government processes.

Recommendation 20: That FSPI should not start anymore projects without having all the necessary agreements and initial funding disbursed to its accounts.

Recommendation 21: That donors harmonise the reporting and disbursement requirements, so that project officers can more effectively implement the projects

2.6 Task Six

Effects of the project implementation on the implementing agencies

The Case Studies annexed in this report detail aspects on the issues of how well integrated the V&C is in each country and what the effects are of the project on its overall performance. Links amongst affiliate projects are also discussed. How well the project is integrated and managed in an affiliate is a reflection of how well managed the affiliate is in general. Funding anomalies due largely to DFID/JWP impacted affiliates in that they had to access funds from other projects and sources to continue V&C activities.

Positive impact on affiliates

V&C has had a positive impact on affiliates through: bringing funds into the organisation; raising affiliate profile through V&C; expanding both capacity in and knowledge about governance and its application at community, national and regional levels.

Generally, the goal and purpose of the V&C was consistent with those of affiliates' other projects. No affiliate expressed any concerns about the nature of the project itself. All agreed that the V&C was viable, credible and fitted well with their own objectives.

There was evidence that governance issues were strengthened in affiliate projects due to the influence of V&C. Also evident was some degree of interaction amongst projects in areas around governance. This linking could be increased. FSPI is advised to promote the potential links, or the need and efficacy for them with affiliate staff.

Each affiliate shows a different or varying degree of response to the V&C in terms of management, integration and, ultimately, success of the V&C. a brief affiliate description follows:

Vanuatu has the most well defined approach to the project in terms of how it is integrated and managed. Links between projects are optimised. Project success is clear. Generally, the affiliate is a highly organised and efficient enterprise. The V&C has complimented how the affiliate is run and management of the project into the affiliate appears seamless.

Kiribati displayed a satisfactory performance in that FSPK sought to integrate the project. Management problems in the final year of the pilot project undermined the process of integration and management generally. Funds were postponed due to on-going issues surrounding acquittals. V&C was affected due to general management problems, rather than V&C affecting FSPK.

ECANSI, the Solomon Islands contracting agency, benefited through having V&C. ECANSI is a small agency and not an FSPI affiliate. As such, it was able to improve its institutional and project profile with other agencies and donors. Using its experience with V&C ECANSI is now seeking funds to implement its own community governance project. V&C has provided ECANSI with a model upon which to work both in conceptual and management terms. SIDT the FSPI affiliate will manage the V&C in the second phase. V&C was generally well integrated in to the agency, although size mitigated against any significant claims of V&C benefiting other projects within ECANSI.

The Fiji affiliate appears to have posed the most difficulties in implementing all phases of the project. This may in part be due to the relationship it has with FSPI. The ADB Report notes many "Lessons Learned" related to implementation of the project by the Fiji affiliate. How well V&C is integrated into the affiliate is perhaps demonstrated by the on going systems anomalies that were apparent to the review team.

There were fewer negative aspects for affiliates from their involvement V&C. These issues have been largely addressed under the "Lessons Learned" section. Briefly, the following points are relevant to how affiliates were affected by the project:

- **Funding:** Each affiliate stated that there had been funding anomalies in that tranches had not arrived on time. FSPI states that this was due to funds not being released in a timely way by JWP. That each affiliate had to 'rob Peter to pay Paul' was a common remark. Also, the fact that DFID /JWP did not release funds for six months did not aid the project. Match funding is also an issue. Ultimately, the affiliates bare the burden of these situations.

More funds should also be made available in line budgets to accommodate 'hidden' costs associated with the project at affiliate level. Affiliates noted that these costs included: secretarial costs, core costs such as electricity; added transport costs for visiting communities that were not covered in project funds. FSPI is advised to liaise with affiliates over how best to ameliorate this situation.

- **Management burdens:** This was not a major issue for affiliates except where there were issues of management already inherent in the affiliate itself. Greater clarification of V&C directives may go some way to promoting understanding amongst some management about what the essentials of the project and therefore instil greater involvement through linking, networking and generally promoting the project.
 - **Staffing:** Issues with staffing were more concerned with quasi-personal issues rather than those arising directly from problems inherent in the V&C. For example: The Solomon Islands contract agency ECANSI has one full time Project Officer dealing with V&C. When the project moves to SIDT in the second phase this Officer will have no paid employment. SIDT and ECANSI do not have a good relationship. Because of this it was not really evident to the consultant that further ties with the two NGOs would continue. It seems that the loss of capacity is due to institutional and personal issues something, which is not always within the scope of the V&C to negotiate around. What was evident in the review was the high amount of friction and mutual suspicions amongst NGOs and government organisations. The result is a loss for all parties as is evidenced in the Solomon Islands. In Kiribati, issues with project Officers over points exogenous to the V&C meant two Officers left. Again, this was not within the control of V&C operatives itself.

There was no evidence from any affiliate that staff were lost when other projects with which they had been associated were cut or ended.

3.0 Objective Two

Determine the extent to which the approach for the project is still valid and the original project goal and objectives are still relevant, from the viewpoint of NZAID, FSPI, the FSP affiliates and communities involved. Specific aspects to be assessed include:

- **Location of the project,**
- **Beneficiaries targeted - i.e. rural communities, provincial/national government, NGOs and regional inter-governmental institutions**
- **Focus on civic education and relationship between traditional and western forms of governance.**
- **Methodologies used**

3.1 Task One: The contextual information that guided the project at the outset

The project was initiated by FSPI under the direction of [REDACTED] after personal and professional observation of increased political and social instability in the region. The documents from this period conceptualise the overall philosophy, scope and mission of the project in much the same way as a contemporary analysis would. The main objective was to garden good governance and this mission is spelled out with primary reference to the increased political instability in the region. PNG, Fiji, Solomon Islands, had all experience traumatic political upheaval. Vanuatu was experiencing political difficulties. This is the main rationale for introducing a regional governance project which sought to 'garden' or 'grow' a strengthened governance system of inter-linking community, national and regional ties and affiliates to support this goal. In current documents and through discussions with FSPI personnel, this rationale remains constant.

The documentation at the conceptualisation period points to the need to educate people at all levels of society in what governance is. In the literature there is reference to the lack of knowledge about political institutions and forms of governance, both modern and traditional. The foci of the strengthening would be achieved at all levels, with an emphasis at community level where there was confusion about the efficacy of modern governance systems and worries about the breakdown of traditional systems.

There are numerous documents from the initial stages of the project formulation and from subsequent periods. There appears to be no significant deviation from project objectives. The scope of the initial project proposal was curtailed by funding limitations, but this has not detracted from the emphasis on gardening good governance at various levels.

The rationale for, and the promotion of civics education, have remained constant throughout the project. The implementation of this objective should occur more fully in the next phase but its rationale does not need revisiting. (See 6.2, 6.3 for a full discussion on civics education)

In terms of project location, the project was downsized to four countries. This satisfied donor funding and is, according to the review team, a suitable number of countries to have progressed with at pilot stage.

With reference to the western and modern forms of governance, the original project documents note that there is a need to address these obvious issues from community to government levels. How this is done is outlined in the Log Frame. The activities and rationale behind them have remained constant.

Overall, from discussions with relevant stakeholders and from such documents as the original proposals, the annual regional workshop reports, and implementation papers, there has been little significant change in direction for the project. Given the sound base on which the concepts were founded, this is a recognisable strength of the project and one supported by the stakeholders who are in general agreement that the goals and objectives are valid.

3.2 Task Two: Stakeholders' interests and opinions in the project

Stakeholders include: 20 participating communities, FSPI and affiliates, the RGAG, donors (DFID, NZAID, ADB). Other stakeholders were also canvassed for their opinions.

Overall, stakeholders have a very high regard for the rationale and application of the project. There was no dissenting voice on the efficacy of the project. The one exception was with communities who expressed various emotions about the lack of services generated by the project. This is a reflection of the way the project evolved from a governance project to one, in only some communities, where services were deemed to equate with governance.

In general, the communities were all supportive of the project. As stated throughout this report, the problems that arose emerged from the confusion about what was supposed to be the 'end product' for the project. The confusion led to frustration that goods and services had not been delivered to match the communities' Action Plan prescriptions in the PLA process. This issue is addressed with appropriate recommendations elsewhere in this report. Interest in and support for the project was high in communities that had a more educative approach where realistic Action Plans emerge.

From discussions with officials implementing the BLESS and GOAL governance projects in the Solomon Islands it became clear that the Village Quality Life Index Action Plans are more suitable for a project that purports to be one in which governance is signified by extensive educative objectives, such as is the case with V&C. The anomaly of 3.1.4 is therefore to be addressed so that it does not raise expectations unduly. One senior NZAID official noted that: "Where do the dozens of project proposals go to when they are written in communities for schools, health clinics, meeting houses...but on to the desks of three or four donors who can't possibly deal with this situation?"

██████████, member of the Regional Governance Advisory Group and Secretary General of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, stated that the project was valid and filled a niche in the governance arena. The project was within the stated policy direction of the Forum Secretariat, which promotes good governance.

Affiliates agreed that focussing on grassroots level was the best approach for the project. That links were established through provincial, national and regional networks was thought to be beneficial for improving governance. However, affiliates felt the main thrust of the project should be in grassroots communities. This premise came from the firm belief that there is

already a major impetus amongst the larger donors to implement governance projects at the 'higher' social tiers.

The affiliates working primarily at the community tier were not well informed of the V&C objectives at provincial, national and regional tiers. They had little in depth knowledge about the RGAG, the virtual governance centre or other higher tier aspects of the project. Their opinion that the project is best left at the grassroots level is a reflection of this lack of awareness. It is a recommendation that affiliates have a greater understanding of the project as a whole. This may enhance the self worth of the project in their eyes and promote a greater understanding and response to it.

Recommendation 23: That affiliate staff, who work mainly at community level, be brought more into the broad scope of the project in order to promote a greater response to project objectives.

The ADB and DFID were unable to meet for consultations in order to express their opinions about the project. NZAID and diplomatic officials were supportive of the rationale except for the NZHC in Kiribati who expressed some disquiet that governance could be defined as being applicable community level. The head of AusAID in Fiji was highly supportive of all aspects of the project. He stated that the ADB funded report was of an excellent standard and highly regarded and that there was potential to fund the project if FSPI were to again approach that organisation.

3.3 Task Three: Analysis of key project documents

The analysis of key project documents and issues relating to task three are integrated in various sections of this report (See: Objective One: Tasks One and Two; See: Case Studies).

3.4 Task Four: 1. Analysis of relevant community/national/regional plans (4.2)

Plans

The review assessed the relevance of the V&C project to the national plans for Kiribati, Vanuatu, Fiji and Solomon Islands. It also reviewed against the FSPI and its national affiliates Strategic Plans where one existed. The review further assessed the V&C against the regional and some international agreements and plans, as well as donor priorities

In all the participating countries development plans, there is emphasis on improving service delivery to the communities and improving standard of living for the rural or marginalised communities. Therefore the V&C project is directly addressing a need already identified by national governments. One interesting aspect is that most of these plans do not have a clear process of improving community governance. The rural development plans in the participating countries were described by the government officials in the relevant ministries as being developed more by the district officer equivalents with little input from the communities. The project review has shown that the work of V&C has assisted communities in increasing their understanding of their right, and V&C has actively engaged different government ministries to improve their service delivery. Additionally, all the participating countries have adopted a similar approach for the next phase of island/rural development

planning including a stronger emphasis on community involvement. Despite this, the broader role of the V&C in terms of being a stronger voice and advocate for issues when government agencies are undertaking work will need to continue and be reinforced. Furthermore, the need to mainstream good governance at the community level is only at its infancy therefore more resources and effort is needed to take this important work to the national and regional level.

The V&C project outputs and core roles of improving community governance are slowly being integrated into the different projects of FSPI and its affiliate's other projects. Examples include the PCDF where it has integrated community governance as part of its other community projects such as coastal management, disaster management, and coastal management. Other affiliates have not fully integrated the process and have varying degrees of integration mostly due to personal communications amongst the project officers. It is the view of the review team that more effort should be done at the affiliate and FSPI level to mainstream the process into all its community development based projects

FSPI and its project affiliates have all included good governance at the community and national level amongst its priorities on their respective Strategies and Plans. Additionally, several of the affiliates have been working with government and other NGO's on project relating to good governances. Examples of collaboration amongst the FSPI and national affiliates and governments include the PCDF working with the Ministry of Rural Development and Fijian Affairs on community development plans, the FSPV working with the Council of Chiefs, and Provincial Governments on good governance work in the communities, and FSPK working with the Kiribati Ministry of Island and Social Affairs on Island Rural Development and Capacity Building for Communities Programme.

FSPI's stated project objectives are not solely or exclusively concerned with project development but with gardening good governance. However, this term is often ambiguously interpreted. This is why the team has recommended that FSPI reconsider and closely examine the definition of 'good governance'. The team felt that there was an over emphasis on affiliates raising expectations on what would be materially delivered through project development. The PLA process, as discussed elsewhere in this report, is where this problem arises. However, the philosophy or direction of the project has led inadvertently to there being an emphasis on 'good governance' being equated with project proposals that raise expectations for goods and services delivery. This was especially so in the Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Fiji. Vanuatu most appreciably approached the 'good governance' objective through less emphasis on project development in terms of raising community expectations that proposal writing would lead to the delivery of aid. Affiliates have confused 'good governance' with project development, with the exception of Vanuatu. Where FSPI can be particularly helpful in resolving this situation is by: defining good governance; applying civics education as a priority to instil good governance at both community and national levels (See: 6.2, 6.3); and by more fully focussing the affiliates on the overall objectives of these plans through greater communication of the project philosophy and approaches.

The regional Pacific Plan is being developed but does not have any specific focus on improving community governance although a major part of the plan appears to be in improving governance at the government level. In discussions with the Secretary General of the Forum Secretariat, he indicated that the community part is very important work as it will compliment its work with governments, although there seems to be little effort to integrate this as a part of the Forum work. The notion is based mostly on the view that the Forum work

is guided by its leaders which are government, which seems to make the distinction with communities as separate from governments.

The current Aid Agencies working in the Pacific have also mainly been involved with improving governance of the governmental mechanisms with no effort to strengthening the communities and make the governments more accountable. Based on the findings of the V&C, more of the donors are becoming aware of the issues and have expressed views on possibly doing more work in this area. It is incumbent therefore that FSPI continue to work at all levels as stated in the original project documents, the extent, however, is dependent on project capacity at all levels and on the direction from FSPI.

Affiliates do not necessarily perceive themselves as working at regional level. However, the very nature of the project means that they are involved regionally by the every fact of being a part of the region. More communication with what these terms mean: regional, government, provincial, would add to the affiliates' understanding of what they are actually involved in according to project documents and expectations. There was a considerable difference between each affiliate about what the terms mean, how to apply them and where they fit into work plans and expectations. Vanuatu had a good understanding: Fiji moderate, the Solomon Islands and Kiribati were not clear about the distinctions nor their application. The team felt that the affiliates needed more training in what the terms mean and how the project would function around each. Currently there was an ad hoc approach by each affiliate to working in each tier. FSPI management could therefore tighten its approaches to the direction and implementation of its objectives in the next phase.

Each affiliate has been working with its government – some affiliates more than others – and this therefore attests to their being present at the government tier albeit with different levels of commitment and success. However, due to ambiguity about what their role is at government level, capacity issues, and the focus on community level work, affiliates cannot be expected to have contributed significantly at government levels. In many respects, although the project aims at every level, it must be recognised by all parties that the lack of training of affiliates and their lack of capacity means that not all bases can be adequately covered. It is incumbent on FSPI to sort out this conundrum. Primarily, FSPI can start by defining what they mean by 'good governance'. As has been repeatedly stated in this report, the main emphasis should be at educating the communities through formal and non-formal education so that under resourced affiliates have a concise and definable objective which is good governance education. Affiliates stated that they are being asked to spread themselves too thin over too many levels given the scant resources and lack of training.

Considerable work at advocacy and change is being done at government level by many other agencies, as discussed above. The team feels that FSPI should therefore concentrate its efforts at the community level but not lose sight of project objectives at other levels. It is simply not possible, given the resources and capacity issues, to try and be at all levels with the same amount of energy and commitment. If resources are allocated to adequately provide for advocacy and work at all levels, then that would satisfy the review team that the concentration could be achieved at all tiers. However, none of the affiliates stated that they see working at government level as a priority. This appeared to be due mainly to their experience at working with communities where they feel more comfortable. FSPI in Suva, however, is obviously drawn to working at higher levels. It may be that this is where FSPI directorate wishes to be engaged. At affiliate level it is not entirely feasible to emphasise

working at government level given the: low profile of the project in each country; the lack of resources and training of affiliate staff; the affiliates' commitment to community level work; the large number of aid agencies working at government level in governance.

3.5 Task Five: Analysis of NZAID Policy document, Pacific strategy and country strategies

The V&C project fulfils the overarching policies inherent in the various NZAID policies documents. That the elimination of poverty is the main project goal reflects the major NZAID goal. The provision of basic education is also a prime objective in the project as it is a major goal within NZAID policies as they relate to development, the Pacific region and individual countries.

Gender is a major goal in NZAID policies. The emphasis on gender is not reflected in the project documents but appears to be assumed or inherent. As recommendations emerging from this report demonstrate, there should be an increased emphasis on establishing and maintaining greater participation of women, men and youth in ways compatible with NZAID policy.

The enhancement of good governance is the major focus in the project and its links to the elimination of poverty is evident. NZAID policy reflects this objective.

Human rights are also a focus for NZAID policies across the board. The V&C promotes human rights through its objectives. The inclusion of objectives disseminating human rights through national and basic education curricula points to this objective.

The recent emphasis on harmonisation amongst donors is also reflected in the funding approach with V&C. NZAID, DFID and ADB jointly fund V&C. Greater harmonisation in the form of increased linkages between such organisations as the UNDP should be encouraged. For example, the UNDP is launching a major community governance project in Kiribati. The V&C Log Frame should require project implementers to more actively pursue linkages which, in effect, is a form of harmonisation or a sector Wide approach. Harmonisation increases chances of astute fund distribution and minimises duplication of projects. Given the recent growth in the number of governance projects in the Pacific from international donors it is therefore vital to promote harmonisation and the associated promotion of linkages amongst organisations working with similar the project foci in the same geographic locations.

In all, the V&C project is a reflection of NZAID policy. The greater inclusion of gender and linkages with other donors into the project are the most significant aspects for consideration in light of the requirements arising from NZAID guidelines, directives and policies.

4.0 Objective Three

Analyse the project's development to date, specifically: social and institutional aspects including unintended or unexpected outcomes; issues/areas of importance and relevance to the project objectives that were not affected; opportunities and hindrances experienced in achieving development outcomes.

4.1 Task One: Goal and purpose of the project

The project Goal as stated in the FSPI project proposal document is: "To build a sustainable future and alleviate poverty for the Pacific region by promoting good governance and democracy".

The project Purpose from FSPI description similarly is: "To garden good governance and democracy at all levels of society in the Pacific, with particular focus on rural/disadvantaged communities".

The project Approach is to work at three levels – community, national and regional but the focus is on promoting a "bottom up" approach to governance. Therefore, the V&C project proposes essentially to work on governance from the community level upwards and to empower communities to act on their own behalf.

The origins of the V&C project, funding arrangements and organisational structure have been presented above. This section focuses on the experiences of FSPI and affiliates in implementing the project and assesses the project's development over time and during the course of implementation.

Issues of interest identified by NZAID for the review team to address were: awareness of governance structures and processes; institutional strengthening, effects of the project on women and men and on different groups.

The project has different impacts and different degrees of importance for different stakeholders. FSPI as the co-ordinating organisation conceptualised the project in response to increasing political and ethnic conflict and instability in the Pacific. After raising initial funds for the project, FSPI proceeded with implementation and soon had to focus primarily on administration and the disbursement of funds. At the review stage, FSPI has been able to reassess its role and once more have a greater involvement in analysis of the project goal and purpose, before beginning phase two. The review team noted, however, that before completion of the review report, FSPI was again developing phase two in response to funding pressure and donor deadlines, rather than having time to consider the purpose of the project in light of its own, or NZAID's review.

Affiliates have had a longer actual involvement in the project through piloting its key activities: community-level awareness raising, research, analysis and practice of strengthening community governance. In producing the community-based results of the phase one of the V&C project, FSPI affiliates and the pilot communities have both created

and defined the project's potential which FSPI, other regional organisations and programmes and donors can now see and assess from their various standpoints.

Development of awareness of governance structures and processes

It was evident to the review team, that greater community awareness of governance structures has been created by the V&C project in all the communities and this is one of the main achievements of the project. Through the project, the communities have understood the decision making bodies and processes in their communities, analysed traditional leadership roles and responsibilities, and identified the governance structures that are significant for communication and action on their communities development needs. The review team heard firsthand how traditional leaders have found it very helpful to have their roles clearly explained to them. In Fiji, the village chief explained how he understood his role differently; in Vanuatu, the chiefs also reiterated their positive development of a community-responsive awareness of their function, through the project. Community representatives explained to team members that they were now aware of the decision making structures immediately above them –for example, the area councils (Vanuatu), town councils (Kiribati) and provincial councils (Fiji, Vanuatu). The team did not get the impression, however, that there was clearer awareness in communities, of national governance structures or processes, or of concepts of citizenship rights and constitutional issues. In Vanuatu, the project seems to have been the most successful in moving between community, village, area, and provincial levels and with the preparation and capacity to engage in education of communities on national level governance structures and processes. In phase two of the project, it is critical that FSPI, the affiliates, project staff and organisations which support FSPI, examine the gaps and needs in political education and awareness raising and whether its implementation can or should cover all levels in the second phase of the project.

The project has taken a pragmatic approach, explaining governance structures of relevance to meeting the immediate development needs of communities, e.g for water supply, rubbish disposal. The project planners may wish to consider whether and how the principles of democratic government, national government structures and policy decision making, citizen rights, constitutional issues, can also be raised by V&C. Given the origins of the project in the concern of FSPI over growing political conflicts and instability in countries expressed at national and regional level, it is relevant for V&C to consider what role it wishes to play in education, comment or awareness raising at community level, on these issues. For example, would communities through the V&C project engage in discussions on the reasons for national conflicts that have community impacts (e.g. ethnic conflicts in Solomon Islands, Fiji)? These issues have not been covered in the project although it was conceptualised as a response to growing ethnic, political conflicts and violence.

The V&C project has had an impact on the knowledge communities have of their relationships with local, area and provincial council structures and decision makers. In Kiribati, the Bonriki community were more aware of the role and responsibilities of the town council for meeting their immediate needs; in Fiji, the project had forged new links with local and provincial government personnel and leaders, and in one community, created confidence that communications with relevant authorities could be followed up on to implement development projects. In Vanuatu, the impact of the project on forging links between governance-aware communities, and area and provincial council structures and decision makers, appeared more substantial because of feedback the team members heard in

interviews with national government personnel in Vila and in provincial government offices. The pilot communities have not experienced a greater success however, in gaining access to area councils or local government decision makers, to achieve their basic needs or have their community priority issues readily addressed. In Vanuatu, in Middle Bush, a highly motivated, articulate and aware community involved in the V&C project nevertheless still pleaded with the NZAID team member for some response to their need for water; in Bonriki in Kiribati, the review team as a whole heard a similar plea for action when it met the small community group there. The team has concluded that there is a positive effect on the project communities' awareness of local governance structures in all the countries. However, the team is unable to assess the significance of the project in impacting on the government personnel who are in decision-making positions to assist communities. Concrete examples of greater receptiveness on the part of local officials, to meet community needs –should be part of monitoring and evaluation of the project. This issue also could be added to ones that FSPI considers when proposing its focus for phase two: how will the V&C project bring about changes in council decision making and allocation of resources?

Communities representatives did report to the review team that their communities now were aware of "who we have to go to". In Fiji, the community visited placed particular significance on being visited by the representatives of many government ministries: this was a highlighted achievement of the V&C project in the Fijian community. Overall, however, the review team noted that in all the countries, the communities visited stated their need to have assistance or support in asserting their needs and getting results from their development projects. The review team heard appeals for development assistance (Kiribati) or observed the need for continued need for support from FSPI affiliate staff, for the empowerment of the communities to be sustained. (Kiribati, Fiji). An open question for FSPI and affiliates is whether the communities can pursue their community goals so confidently without the assistance of FSPI or affiliate project officers.

Communities have been empowered to make better communications with authorities through the V&C project. Links have been made for the communities with the relevant local level structures but the V&C project officers have often played a role in facilitating these. The review team heard through communications by community representatives that communities have not yet experienced greater success in having development needs met.

The team was quite struck by the appeals at meetings for some action on communities' basic needs. Learning of the relevant local government structures to access for community needs, has not necessarily helped communities to receive positive responses to their urgent requests. This is a key issue for analysis that could be made central in FSPI's planning for phase two of the project. The team was made aware by FSPI and affiliates staff, that these appeals were considered seriously in determining FSPI's conceptualisation of the project and its role in building community capacity to meet basic needs. The review team felt that FSPI and affiliates were being side tracked into supporting communities in dealing with officials over basic needs, (for examples, a new classroom (Solomon Islands) or waste disposal (Kiribati), when this role is not, or should not be, the project objective for FSPI.

Recommendation: That national level structures, the role and responsibilities of decision makers and politicians, accountability and transparency, democratic processes, constitutional issues of national importance, how inequalities occur and are

maintained, should be amongst the content of future awareness raising on governance in civics education at all levels.

Institutional strengthening

The review team found that institutional strengthening in all the countries could not be gauged at this stage of the project as such an impact could only be observed over time and would need a method of determining a direct relationship with the V&C project activities. Where the project did appear to have had incidences of impact in strengthening institutional relationships – the team members had differing opinions on the significance of the project activity – for example, in Fiji, on whether the project had contributed to new relationships between government and the community, or had been a one-off meeting that did not change community/local government decision making or outcomes. Where positive linkages were made between communities and local government structures, the team felt it was still unable to conclude on institutional strengthening impacts, due to the small sample of communities in each country in this pilot project.

The review team, however, did observe the potential role of the project in institutional strengthening, in reviewing the project in one country, Vanuatu, where the V&C project is having an impact on community, local and provincial linkages between officials and communities. Two team members visited Vanuatu and jointly attended interviews with a range of stakeholders; separately, they visited two of the pilot communities, in Santo and Tanna. One visit (Santo) involved an overnight stay and discussions with provincial officials. The review team had in depth interviews with government and non-government organisations, including national and provincial level officials, chiefs, NGO partners and networks, donors and development agencies. Both team members were in agreement that the Vanuatu project was contributing to institutional strengthening and had further plans for making stronger linkages, fostering good governance principles and communicating good governance to a wider audience in Vanuatu. The widespread knowledge of the project was impressive but more notable was the significant linkages the project has made between different government actors and ongoing project plan indigenously developed in Vanuatu by the affiliate and project staff, to build good governance as a principle, practice and development benefit for communities, people and government in Vanuatu. The team was impressed with the project's contribution to institutional strengthening in Vanuatu.

In Fiji, the team had lengthy discussions on the institutional strengthening role of the project. One member of the team found the affiliate's linkages with the local government and provincial authorities in implementing the project and the V&C introduction of representatives of all government ministries to the community, were positive developments that could be a model for other countries on how to strengthen government and community linkages and make government more responsive to community needs. Another team member viewed the close use of government structures in the implementation of the project, as a less innovative approach that used well established existing government administration processes, including local government structures, perhaps limiting the potential of the project to allow communities to freshly review and analyse their community governance experiences and local, and provincial governance practices and problems. The review team's differing views on the institutional strengthening role of the project in this case, and difficulty in agreeing on what was institutional strengthening in this case, could be an opportunity for the project to

raise this question in phase two, on implementation for empowerment in communities. The other view expressed in the team was that the affiliate had implemented the project by maintaining well established local and provincial institutions which had a mixed record of responding to communities. The project therefore did not allow scope for communities to examine their governance structures and how to improve community governance in an independent way, as the affiliate had worked closed with the leadership of the local and provincial administration: (See Case Study: Fiji: Annex Five)

From team visits to countries and communities in the project, it concluded that the communities have felt empowered particularly by information on the relevant local government structures and their roles. Chiefs and traditional leaders in the communities visited by the review team explained that information about their roles it made their work easier and built better relations with their communities. The institutional strengthening potential of the project could be enhanced if consideration were given to the role of "transforming" or influencing officials and office bearers in the relevant local and provincial authorities, to be more responsive to the needs of communities, so that there is better response to community representations.

Hindrances to community empowerment are the distance of most Pacific rural communities from local or area council bases. FSPI and some affiliates expressed concern that the communities they had worked with must feel the impact of the project with positive improvements to their lives, or the implementation of at least some of the items in the community development plans. This dilemma needs in-depth discussion amongst FSPI, affiliates and donors when considering the next phase of the project. Does FSPI support institutional development beneficial to communities, e.g. further develop the understanding of governance issues amongst other relevant stakeholders, or does it address the communities' material and development needs? The review team feels that an emphasis on awareness and advocacy is the most efficacious way forward.

Social analysis

The participatory methods of working with the communities have had a positive impact in the countries studied. In Kiribati, a group of men and women from a community were vocal in expressing their opinions on the project and their new community development committee, which was formed to address a range of community needs. In Vanuatu, a visit by the review team consultants to two community sites, showed similar active participation in proactive community initiatives. In the Solomon Islands one site demonstrated a firm commitment to V&C albeit with a goods and services delivery outcome expected.

Community organisation and structures

In two countries, Solomon Islands and Fiji, the review team consultants were concerned that the community groups exhibited no new features of community participation, were dominated by traditional male leaders and elders and had very limited, if any, understanding of the principles of community governance that the project was supposed to convey. The equal participation of women and youth, and other marginalized groups, is not explicitly raised in the FSPI project proposal and this is reflected in the community research methodologies and content. The community organizing by affiliates also was initiated without any preparedness for identifying and reducing the risks of unequal participation of

certain groups, particularly women and youth. The review team affirms from its country visits and community meetings, that women are present but generally do not have conditions that make it easy for them to participate fully in project activities. Project staff did indicate cultural practices of exclusion (for example of women from the maneaba in Kiribati) could hinder women's participation in the project.

A team observation was that FSPI and its affiliates have not made direct interventions or considered methods of guiding project staff in handling marginalisation of certain groups and communities have not been exposed to any messages that support the equal participation of women and marginalized groups in community decision making.

As a conceptual issue, FSPI needs to consider whether its governance project, V&C, will address equality issues and convey that good governance requires equal participation for all members of the community, or whether it is more concerned to promote community participation, where the community is presumed to be represented along traditional lines, where men and women's roles and the position of youth will not be changed or challenged. Team members were in agreement that the exclusion of women and youth needed to be addressed by the project. It was observed that issues of unequal status and representation in Pacific communities and in traditional social systems, have not been critically examined in the governance project. Equality and equity issues have not been made explicit or promoted through the project. It is relevant to NZAID's aid policy and principles of support for gender equality, that any future V&C project funded by it should include strong encouragement to FSPI that it focus on these issues as part of the project development. On a practical level, the review team would like to recommend that FSPI can provide guidelines to its affiliates and project officers, on methods of ensuring equal participation and representation of marginalized groups, including women and youth, when carrying out all project activities.

Recommendation: That FSPI and the affiliates consider the need for more social analysis in the V&C project, to inform their work with communities and raise awareness in communities on equality and equity principles as part of gardening good governance.

Recommendation: That FSPI needs to clarify its promotion of the principles of equality and equity in the V&C project, including in its proposal, research, analysis and advocacy.

Gender issues

The review team had noted in its reading of the literature on the project and the ADB assessment of the country reports, that the marginalisation of women and youth had occurred. In its own visits to the four countries, the review team had this view confirmed in its visits to communities and discussions with project staff. Men and women have been differently impacted on in the project.

From the team visit to four countries and its talking with women and affiliates staff, it is clear that the project has had positive impacts on women in some communities: women are vocal in some village development committees where new committees were formed (e.g. Bonriki community, Kiribati) and women have more say in development decisions for the community if they have gained confidence in decision making for communities, through this project.

To list project achievements:

- women involved in the community mapping research
- women's information given on community life and issues
- women's work and contributions recognised
- women involved in community development plans
- women introduced to new ideas
-

To list project negative impacts:

- women still not attending community meetings
- women fewer in number on committees
- women cannot attend meetings at times set by others
- women disregarded when they speak despite V&C focus
- women not included in new committees

In a meeting in Middle Bush in Vanuatu, the women to a review team member that they had greater recognition of their work and contribution after the PLA work, when men realised all the things that women do. When asked if it helped improve their participation in decision making, the women could not really say.

There are problems of women's position and participation in the project, however. In two of the countries visited (Solomon Islands and Fiji), review team members observed that women did not participate in the discussions on the project. From reviewing country reports and the overall project assessment, the V&C project included women in project activities where gender balance was obviously needed (for example, surveys of communities) but did not take a progressive position on the need for women's voices to be heard in community affairs and decision making. From observation and analysis by the team, the project has not challenged the pattern of women's marginalisation in traditional or modern systems of governance or in community organizing generally. This is a disappointment for a project that addresses issues of voicelessness and lack of power. It is internationally recognized that women's subordination, marginalisation and lack of participation in decision has a direct impact on development outcomes. For this reason alone, FSPI needs to take a progressive stand in advancing gender equality and equity in the V&C project and in all its programmes and projects.

In analysing the project, the team has concluded that the V&C project has contributed to maintaining gender stereotypes and exclusions, even though there are many opportunities in a project of this sort on community governance, for the project implementers to find means to address this. In one community visit, the backward position of women, untouched by the project, was observed: women sat at the back of the meeting place, sitting in traditional fashion, silently fanning the food they had prepared for the review team, while a group of men and the chief, responded to the review questions. A team member who visited Solomon Islands participants in the project observed the dominance of older men and the complete absence of women from the project discussions.

Summary gender analysis of the four countries visited by the review team : FSPI implementation:

1. The project does not display any particular measures to institutionalise a gender analysis of the communities.

2. There is little attention given to men and women's roles in the communities, to contribution to livelihoods and the impact of women's reproductive responsibilities, on their participation in the project.
3. There is no gender analysis of decision-making in communities.
4. A few questions on men and women's roles in decision-making in the family were raised in one country survey, but the question isolated women's participation in decision making to the family, not anywhere else in the community, thereby indirectly limiting women's decision making arena to the family structure.
5. Survey information on men and women's work and time-use questions are in most of the community surveys but it is not clear if this information was used by project implementers in their discussions on communities' governance practices.
6. The time of project meetings should be sensitive to women's family and work obligations, so that women can attend V & C meetings.

Example: in Vanuatu, women at a community visit, told a team member that "we have so much work to do", when asked if they knew of the V&C post-PLA committee.

7. Community development plans may need to be monitored for ensuring women's and men's inputs are there. From reading the development plans of the communities in Vanuatu, Kiribati and Fiji, men's views of needs (mostly on infrastructure)of the community dominate, rather than other community needs, for example, health or child care needs, violence against women, security .

The team has concluded that although the project offers opportunities for women's participation, and women have participated in the project activities, it is not clear if the project is producing positive impacts for women overall. The project has not been proactive in encouraging women's participation, or making space for women's voices to be heard, particularly in societies or communities where this is not practiced in formal settings (e.g. the maneaba in Kiribati). V&C has not raised traditional exclusions of women as an issue even for discussion. The V&C project which is about all voices being heard and on building democracy and equity, should, as a minimum, raise issues of gender inequality through encouraging and promoting women's participation in the V&C project.

Recommendation: That the project begin by raising gender awareness amongst project staff and in the participating communities, as part of the "gardening good governance" campaign.

Recommendation: that FSPI consider measures to increase participation of marginalized groups, particularly women and youth, in participation in all project meetings and activities.

Specifically, FSPI and the affiliates need to address the following issues or areas for improving women's inclusion in the project:

- Gender sensitisation of FSPI and affiliate staff on gender issues and needs in the Governance Programme and projects (and all projects in FSPI).
- Gender analysis of V&C proposal, survey methods, community organizing and governance concepts.
- Practical measures: ensure project staffs have awareness and skills to increase participation by women and other marginalized groups, in the project meetings.
- Monitoring by FSPI and project staff of the inclusion/exclusion of women in the project and ensuring that gender stereotypes and discrimination are not perpetuated by

FSPI and the project -(for example, women preparing food for meetings but not being part of discussions; women excluded when project meetings are at times they cannot attend; women receiving project information indirectly (from men/husbands) on the project and meetings; men only attending meetings and gaining information on the project(This was relayed to the review team by women in Vanuatu).

- FSPI find out more about the reasons for women's marginalisation in community meetings and decision making and address these obstacles as part of gardening good governance in the communities
- Build skills of project staff in approaching communities on issues of male dominance and the need for women's participation, as part of the good governance project.
- Encourage project staff to take measures to assist women's participation in the project, by providing an environment where women can speak at meetings, setting examples of inclusiveness by listening to women and encouraging them to present their views, and holding separate meetings for women if necessary, to bring them into the project.

Empowerment

It is not evident that all the people in the project communities have been empowered by the project in terms of having greater access to relevant local authorities or of having success in achieving their development needs or of having more influence as communities in governance decisions or resource allocations. Some community leaders have been empowered by the project to promote their roles in decision-making and to understand the principle of governance. In some cases community leaders have taken ownership of the opportunities that this power promises them, excluding a more representative core of stakeholders (See: Solomon Islands Case Study). FSPI is strongly advised to concentrate on issues of power and legitimacy in all issues surrounding its goal, purpose and activities in communities to ensure that equity does flow from this project in order to address governance as a progressive not a static construct.

Unintended outcomes

Development needs – or to be specific – the urgent basic needs of the communities for water, rubbish disposal, better health and education facilities, were a major preoccupation of all the communities visited. The review team was made aware, in all the countries, of the community needs that were not being addressed by local authorities or government ministries. The V&C project has also inadvertently developed as a community needs identification exercise and there are now considerable expectations by the communities and supported by FSPI and the affiliates, that these development needs must be responded to by FSPI to maintain its credibility as a project, and to not leave communities without some successful implementation. This outcome and view on the development of the project, was considered at great length by the review team. The review team concluded in its final discussions on the project, that the important issue now is for FSPI to clarify its objectives and the concept of the governance project in its entirety. This is needed to help make clear its decisions on such issues as: what should be the FSPI response to requests for development assistance from its pilot communities; what are the implications of FSPI responding – or not responding positively – to these requests? What is the impact on the governance project objectives, goals and direction, if it wants to respond to the needs and expectations set up by the first phase of the project?

The team was disturbed by the urgent development needs of the communities for assistance to meet basic needs. This was an unexpected outcome of the FSPI project on community governance. The review team also felt the difficulties of this dilemma for FSPI and its affiliates and strongly agreed and recommends that choices will need to be made by FSPI and its affiliates, between the development and governance focus of the project.

Recommendation: That FSPI and the affiliates critically analyse the implications for the project of providing assistance to communities to help meet their development needs before implementing the next phase of the governance project.

NOTE: Objective Four (from the "Specific Areas of Interest for NZAID" (See Annex 1) has been integrated into the report.

5.0 Objective Five: Monitoring and Evaluation

5.1 Adequacy of current monitoring

The review team was generally satisfied – although with some caveats - with the systems in place for monitoring the project.

Quarterly reports are submitted by each affiliate to FSPI. Each country must submit a monthly activity plan and disbursement plan. There was ample evidence that a high standard of reportage is expected and submitted. Where poor reports were submitted, FSPI addressed the causes and new reports were requested. In cases where acquittals were deemed inadequate, FSPI withheld funding.

Affiliates are expected to monitor and evaluate throughout the project. The reports read by the review team demonstrated a consistently high quality of analysis.

Significant also were the detailed reports submitted by FSPI on completion of the 2003 and 2004 regional network meetings. These extensive reports noted the issues that arose in discussions on the achievements and problems facing the project. Analyses were in depth and perceptive and were generally corroborated in this review. The review team used the reports as templates and analysed events in the field using affiliate's assessments.

FSPI's quarterly and annual reports are detailed and consistent with donor expectations. DFID requires quarterly reports, NZAID annual reports. The full 2003-04 Annual report has been included in Annex Eight as a demonstration of the level of FSPI report writing. The Report also includes the Log Frame.

The evaluation of the entire PLA process resulted in the excellent ADB funded Report described elsewhere in this report and elsewhere. Similarly, the excellent V&C funded report on curriculum and civics education in Fiji by Len Flier is testament to on going and in depth and appropriate responses to issues, which require significant analysis.

As noted and recommended in Objective One, there is a need to harmonise donor reporting requirements. Currently, the quarterly reports required by DFID detract from effective time management at FSPI. NZAID requires an annual report.

Although the review team is generally appreciative of the current monitoring and evaluation system, it could be improved by adding a risk identification and a risk management process into the Log Frame (See: Objective One, Task Five: See Annex Eight for the full V&C Log Frame located in the Annual Report). One of the most effective ways to enhance monitoring and evaluation is through having such a system included in project design documents. FSPI affiliates agreed that they would be more able to be pro-active in looking for problems or risks if they were presented with such a focus in project design documents. Having FSPI contribute to the Log Frame would also be helpful. Staff could identify risks and how best to manage them. This would make the project process more inclusive and participatory and it would also bring together potential risks both common amongst all countries and those more country specific. FSPI in Suva would then also be able to see what risks may occur in field. The monitoring and evaluation process would benefit from such a design.

It is also recommended that a mid-term evaluation occur. This would be to assess from an independent level how project implementation is faring. The ToR would not need to be as extensive as the current review.

Measures/ indicators

Measuring social impact requires particular skills and processes, especially where such amorphous issues, as 'governance' are concerned. The project Log Frame (See Annex Eight which contains the Log Frame) addresses issues of measurement and evaluation in appropriate ways due to the fact that there are achievable activities. Measurement indicators reflect the Log Frame structure. The notable exception is the project goal. Comments already made in the "Lessons Learned" section of this report point to the overall project goal as being very ambitious and impossible to measure given the relatively small size of the project and enormity of the problems it seeks to address. It was therefore advised that attempts to measure the project goal be dropped in the next phase.

No base line data were collected against which the project can be significantly measured in order to record social, economic or other relevant social impact categories. As noted, it is not feasible to do so. This situation makes it impossible to assess the project goal, which is the elimination of poverty.

The review was satisfied that FSPI is self-analytical and self-critical which is a vital aspect of evaluation. In discussions with the Regional Secretariat, it was apparent that there is a healthy approach to ameliorating the weaknesses within the project. Most notable was the issue of project direction and the debate as to whether this is to be primarily a 'development' or a 'governance' project and what the distinctions are. This issue relates here to the application of learning from project processes and concerns project implementation at community level. In this case, FSPI is strongly advised to learn from the outcomes of the community governance mapping which indicated community requirements for further education in all aspects of governance including, but not exclusive to, economic outcomes through infrastructure and services delivery.

Monitoring and evaluating around the issue of what the project actually stood for was either weaker than could have been expected, or did not have the conceptual imperative to promote this endeavour in formal monitoring mechanisms. The review team feels that the direction of the project was increasingly guided by the PLA tools which, in many cases, were leading communities to expectations of services, infrastructure and goods delivery. There was no centralised directive from FSPI at project start up time over how best to guide the PLA process along governance lines and what that might mean. The PLA and action plans process should in itself be a monitoring tool, or should be used to seek continuing assessment of project rationale against PLA directions and outcomes. PLA tools are as open to ideological emphasis of whatever persuasion as much as any other curricula. That the PLA ultimately led to an unsustainable 'wish list' in some communities can now be addressed by applying the knowledge learned from this review and the informal monitoring that did occur and was made abundantly evident through discussions with the secretariat and affiliates.

The roles of the affiliates and FSPI in monitoring and evaluation in the next phase should follow the template set in the pilot phase. In addition to the generally sound monitoring system in place, the V&C would benefit from an increased visiting schedule by appropriate FSPI Secretariat staff to all project sites. Similarly, increased training and capacity development in all areas pertinent to the Log Frame objectives would enhance staff understanding of all processes and requirements and therefore the depth of analysis in evaluating the project. Presently, although staff generally write very good reports, there is room for improvement especially around the areas of what governance actually means, and in civics education. Increased awareness by all affiliates in these areas is recommended.

It was recommended elsewhere in this report that a mid-term evaluation of the project be conducted.

6.0 Objective Six: Programme expansion and future focus

This section addresses the issues raised in the NZAID Review document "Specific Areas of Interest for NZAID". Other tasks within this document have been integrated into the report as per the ToR.

6.1 Task One: Expansion to other countries

FSPI expressed its plans to expand the project to three additional countries: Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu. FSPI has affiliates in each country and each requested the V&C be implemented. FSPI has agreed in principle to fulfil this request should funding be made available. The review team concurs with the FSPI and affiliate decision to expand the project. The review team felt that should the minor weaknesses evident in the project be strengthened, there would be no significant risks in replication.

6.2 Task Two: Civics education

The review team feels that the emphasis on promoting civics education as outlined in the Log Frame should, in most cases, be continued (See Annex Eight: Annual Report which contains the Log Frame). The activities in Component 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 (See Annexes V&C Report 2003-04 Report) are particularly sound and valid – with only minor caveats. The emphasis on what governance 'means' in its multiplicity of forms is what V&C is about. Civics education at both the non-formal and formal levels will help address the issues that the communities themselves isolated during the action plan process as being vital for increased harmony within communities and within the nation state. As such, the Log Frame largely addresses the areas that constitute what civics education should engage with. The exceptions are: FSPI should not engage in FSPI funded writing of civics materials or teacher training at the national, formal education level, the costs of which would be prohibitive. FSPI also currently lacks the expertise to do this. Teacher training and substantive curriculum development at the national, formal education level are the prerogative of national curriculum units. FSPI is advised to play an advocacy role in these two areas. By advocacy the review team means that FSPI should link with other players attempting to promote civics education (UNICEF, UNDP, RRRRT etc). FSPI should limit itself to advocacy and coordination of reform at the national, formal level in civics education. There is much opportunity for well trained affiliate staff to play an advocacy role in promoting civics education at the national formal level. Affiliate staff will otherwise be fully engaged in organising civics education at the non-formal community level. The FSPI funded report on Civics Education in Fiji by Mr Len Flier clearly details the pitfalls of engaging at national level in curriculum reform. Recommendations in this excellent report must be taken seriously.

Recommendation 30: That at the national formal civics education level, FSPI should play an advocacy role to promote teacher training and curriculum reform but should not attempt to fund training or the preparation of extensive curricula on civics education.

Non-formal civics training

With respect to non-formal civics education at community level, the Log Frame activities would best be addressed through using local trainers or Community Governance Workers (CGW). The model that this suggestion is based on comes from the SIDT governance projects operating in approximately 100 communities in the Solomon Islands. The community workers there are named Community Development Workers. Under the proposed model, the V&C civics education would be incorporated into a training manual to be produced by FSPI and affiliates for use in V&C communities. FSPI is well advised to hire trained curriculum development writers to work on the proposed modules on civics education for community level, non-formal education. Local affiliate variations to what constitutes civics education should be respected and encouraged. Information /awareness / advocacy on health, Lifeskills, human rights, economic activity and governance would be disseminated throughout communities by CGW using the proposed professionally written civics education manual. It is crucial that FSPI recognise and respond to the need for a manual and not rely on CGW to disseminate knowledge without such professionally written and often up-dated resources.

What typically happens without special resources and considerable training in any curricula event is the poor quality of knowledge and a high level of personal content in the delivery. This is a lesson learned from knowledge-based projects in the Pacific. One of the biggest problems is where trainers abuse their roles and incorporate their own religious, social or political dogma. An Ethics Contract and training in relevant ethics is also highly recommended, an experience borne out of other community education projects. FSPI is strongly recommended to contact UNICEF Lifeskills personnel in Suva and the Adolescent Reproductive Health Project at the Fiji Ministry of Health to get feedback on their respective education projects around the Pacific and how their manuals are constructed and delivered to communities. There is ample scope for harmonising these projects with V&C civics education. The review consultants spoke with representatives of each of these organisations all of whom were keen to hear from FSPI about where links and harmonisation can be made on community level civics education. The review team was unable to meet with Suva based ADB or UNDP specialists in civics education. However, the team did meet with UNDP personnel in Kiribati and learned that there is scope to harmonise at community and national level in civics education in many Pacific countries. FSPI should follow up on these contacts.

CGW come from the communities in which they will train. Typically, CGW are individuals with a comparatively high standard of education and responsibility. Governance issues to be addressed would include those raised by the communities in the action plans plus those more typically associated with civics education such as government structures and processes and human rights including gender perspectives. Issues relevant to conflict and post conflict societies are also important to include. The SIDT CDW also work actively in Village Quality Life Index processes and V&C are strongly recommended to adopt this framework within which the civics education would nestle appropriately. As noted, of critical importance is the training of CGW in all aspects of their curriculum. Quarterly refresher courses are recommended in order to keep CGWs involved in their mission and to upgrade their knowledge. Where insufficient training is provided, community workers do not necessarily remain committed or knowledgeable. The points raised here relate to the activities in Component 3.3.

Crucial to maintaining a core group of community-based educators such as those proposed is the type of education they will disseminate. As noted, information on governance is essential to describe how modern and traditional patterns operate. However, it is crucial to ensure that

critical analysis is also an integral aspect of the discourse. This is to enable people to assess their own situations more critically and to increase their understanding as to why they are marginalized. V&C promotes its main goal as the elimination of poverty. It is not therefore sufficient to limit its civics instruction at formal or non-formal levels to mere descriptors. For example, the proposed new civics curriculum in the Solomon Islands, which is funded by NZAID, is a descriptive one in which there is no critical assessment of the role of the community or the individual in political discourse or actions. There is nothing on how ideology constructs our lives, or how people are socially and politically constructed. It is merely a descriptor of the various roles of government players. What V&C may be doing is providing information which supports a stasis that does nothing to move an understanding of how power constructs the very systems that maintain poverty. For example, citizens facing exploitation from logging companies and the politicians who serve those companies need to understand the multiple roles more critically.

Civics education at the formal level

At the formal education level, FSPI is advised to continue working with national curriculum units but should take an advocacy role. The preliminary work conducted in this area during the pilot phase has indicated, the lack of capacity of and training for Project Officers in each affiliate is a major drawback to optimal success in this area. Project Officers have not displayed a sufficiently proactive approach to engaging with civics education at either formal or non-formal levels. This may be due in part to the activity plans not engaging with this. However, as in the case of the Solomon Islands affiliate, the Project Officer has been paid since March 2004 to engage with civics education. There is no sign that any work has been accomplished. This state of affairs may be due more to the Project Officer having little or no knowledge of how education systems function, of what civics education is actually about and why there is an activity that appears so 'abstract'. In discussions with Project Officers in the affiliates it became very clear that they lack training, experience and knowledge in these areas. None of the Project Officers has a teaching or education background and none had received special training in how civics operates at the non-formal or formal levels. It is therefore imperative that FSPI consider at great length how they will operationalise their future non-formal and formal civics education. Having trained personnel, i.e. a teacher or curriculum development specialist in charge of this activity is vital.

The FSPI commissioned report of formal education and civics curricula in Fiji by Mr Len Flier points to the complexity of adopting civics curricula into the national education systems. This excellent report points indirectly to the problem faced by affiliates in their attempts to implement the activities associated with curriculum reform. Simply, the affiliates do not have the knowledge or experience to engage in such activities. The Fiji report details the conceptual and logistical problems associated with developing materials for civics education in a complex bureaucracy such as the Education Department.

Activity 3.2.4 in Component 3.2 seeks to 'train teachers'. There is little indication about how this might occur and who would fund it. Training teachers at a national level is a highly complex and expensive enterprise. FSPI I is advised to review the activities around education with the help of educationalists experienced in curriculum policy, design, budgeting and logistics. However, as noted, the review team does not recommend that the project engage in training teachers nor in writing curricula materials at the national levels. This is too complex a task. The project should remain play an advocacy role in promoting reforms and it should do this in conjunction with the many other players who wish to promote curriculum reform in

civics and human rights education. The review team envisages that the affiliates will be busy with organising civics education at the community levels and that an advocacy role at national levels is sufficient given time and capacity constraints.

Clearly there is a need to promote civics education through the national school systems. FSPI is not the only player in governance or civics education in Pacific countries. FSPI is advised to liaise and network with other organisations to learn which ones are already working in such areas. The UNDP has a major endeavour in each country to promote civics education into mainstream curricula. In revising the Log Frame for the second phase, FSPI is advised to take into account the Len Flier report, which clearly details such issues. The reports findings can be sufficiently extrapolated to each affiliated country. The main issue with civics education at both the formal and non-formal level is that people with sound training and or expertise in education must be the ones who are applying the Log Frame directives.

Defining 'civics education'

Crucial also is for FSPI to define what it means by 'civics education' and how that definition is reflected in its subsequent education. Already noted in this report is the need to make civics education more than just a descriptor of what constitutes a government structurally. Promoting critical analysis is important. However, what the communities defined as civics education incorporated issues of health education (including reproductive health), human rights, youth related issues, gender issues and economic activities education. These combine to promote the curricula materials that perhaps best constitute 'civics education'. Certainly this is what the findings from the ADB Report point to as what communities need and desire for their fight against poverty which is, after all, the main goal of the V&C project. However, at the formal national level there is obviously a variant directive for what would constitute civics education. This would be a more descriptive and critical approach to government. At the non-formal community level, incorporating the more holistic approach is an evident situation to be followed. Again, liaison with RRRT, UNICEF, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA is considered critical to finding common ground for a sensible and holistic approach to civics education which does not duplicate those already operating in many Pacific countries. The recommendations about civics education reflect this concern.

Overall, the review team feels that there is excellent scope for continuing at both the non-formal and formal levels of civics education and that this objective is of major importance to the V&C. The rationale for the objective and activities is valid and should be pursued but only after further critical analysis of the risks and issues involved. Under no circumstances should the civics education activities be treated as ad hoc and directed without the aid of trained educationalists and/or affiliate staff who have been fully informed of their responsibilities. It is highly recommended that the project hire a specialist in civics / development education to work with FSPI and affiliates on civics education. The complexity of the issues involved in promoting civics education across multiple countries in both formal and non formal education cannot be under estimated. It is beyond the immediate scope of this report to plan the full extent of the civics education for Phase Two. In light of this fact is the recommendation that a period contract officer / consultant (i.e. three to four months throughout the year) be contracted for the purposes of working on what is essentially FSPI's major thrust.

It is also incumbent upon FSPI to provide appropriate training for staff in civics education and how to promote it at national level. To not follow this guideline is to continue with the same situation that occurred in Phase One.

Of importance also is for all appropriate FSPI staff to read the Len Flier report commissioned by FSPI on civics education at the formal level.

At the non-formal sector civics education can be promoted through greater liaison with other agencies such as UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP all of whom have opportunities for FSPI to work in existing Life Skills and associated civics education programmes or to link with those programmes. What is of major importance is that at community level the structure to be set up for the dissemination of civics education must be highly organised and systematic. Crucial to this is the necessity to work out a budget that reflects the capacity of FSPI finances. The UN agencies cited have immense experience in this field and should be consulted at length as to how to approach a community based education programme.

Recommendation 31: That civics education is promoted at the non-formal and formal levels in each affiliate country.

Recommendation 32: That FSPI recognise the considerable difficulties and expense of curriculum reform and teacher training at national level in the formal civics education sector and reconsider their Log Frame activities accordingly; and that the Len Flier report be fully considered for the implications it details in the area of formal civics education.

Recommendation 33: That FSPI initiate a meeting amongst the following organisations and individuals in Suva in order to discuss a common approach and strategy towards formal and non-formal civics education in the Pacific: UNICEF, UNFPA, UNDP, UNAIDS, Fiji Curriculum Development Unit, Mr Len Flier.

Recommendation 34: That community based non-formal civics education should follow a well organised, highly structured and systematic model incorporating community based trainers highly proficient in civics education that includes Life Skills, economic activity training, health promotion and human rights and that SIDT, UNDP, UNICEF and UNFPA models be utilised for this purpose.

Recommendation 35: That given the complexity of the situation of incorporating non-formal and formal education into the FSPI programme across seven countries, it is imperative to hire a recognised educationalist on a period contract basis to facilitate this process.

Recommendation 36: That affiliate staff receive substantial training in civics education and its application processes in both non-formal and formal sectors.

6.3 Task Three: Focus on working in communities versus working at governmental level

The review team has considered this issue at length. Issues pertaining to it are integrated throughout this report. The following summarizes the discussion:

The work with communities is the strength of the V&C project, which was conceptualised as working from "the bottom up" to build good governance in the Pacific. This focus should continue. There are a many areas for future work with the communities that were part of Phase One. Follow up of knowledge requested or training needed, deepening of community organizing on good governance principles, etc, could be pursued in Phase Two. Follow up activities (often overlooked in favour of "new" activities) should be incorporated as civics education within the communities and should concentrate on: human rights and civic education; organization and financial management skills, gender equality and gender awareness raising, basic literacy education (in partnership with other organizations). The range of capacity building and assistance that FSPI and affiliates could provide through continuing to work in the communities on governance issues is endless, considering communities' marginalized positions and limited access to information of relevance to their participation. Assistance to communities in the form of materials and implementation of community development plans should not be the first response of FSPI in Phase Two. Rather, civics education should be promoted.

Working with governments at national and regional level

FSPI as the Regional Secretariat and coordinator of the project has a significant role to can play in interfacing with other development agencies and regional organizations. FSPI also assists the affiliates and takes on the role itself, of national level advocacy and awareness raising on governance issues. FSPI and affiliates should balance community level work and working with governments, always with a view to assessing what will be the most strategic focus and contribution of the project activities to positively influence governance principles and practices in the Pacific. FSPI must assess its human resource capacity and funding in order to see where it can best work within its niche. Most commentators said that the project fits best at community level. Some commentators stated that FSPI was worthy of working at all levels. The review team has faith in FSPI to be able to work at all levels but in consideration of its limitations, namely: civics education at national level must not become involved in teacher training or in-depth curriculum reform due to the huge expenses and complications of this enterprise – advocacy is much more valid at this level (See 6.2, 6.3). Similarly, funding for virtual governance must be clearly demarcated and assessed. The RGAG is also to be assessed as for its current validity and utility

Human Rights addressed by FSPI in the project

FSPI has stated that the work on human rights that the project does will be subcontracted to RRRT. This is one explicit reference to human rights that FSPI made to the review team in discussing the project. Obviously, the V&C project advances the human rights agenda and framework in its focus on good governance. This is an indirect approach. FSPI should have a clearer focus on human rights education and consider how it will include knowledge and information on human rights principles in its work with communities in the project.

The training in human rights provided by RRRT should not be seen by FSPI as the main human rights component of the project. Communities and governance and the realities of human rights abuses and conflict in the Pacific need to be discussed and understood especially in communities where the wider national context of support or otherwise for human rights conventions is relevant to the lives of specific communities. In Fiji and the Solomon Islands, for example, the project has not discussed the following situations: ethnic and armed conflicts; governance issues after violent conflict; and how violence impacts on

communities and individuals and communities' human rights in this context. Communities and individual citizens need to know their human rights and the conventions outlining human rights principles as part of building good governance in the Pacific. These principles should be understood as universally agreed to and committed to by Pacific governments. FSPI has not yet used the V&C project to raise human rights issues at community level, or used community level conditions and marginalisation to raise human rights issues to governments at regional level. The preoccupation with development projects appears to have sidelined human rights and civics education at community level.

FSPI should consider the content of its V&C project, particularly the places of human rights education in the project work with communities and consider how it can more adequately include human rights education into the governance project. Presenting descriptions of what government is not sufficient: what the V&C needs is a more focused critical approach to human rights, power and how power works to marginalize and oppress people. A project that has as its Goal the elimination of poverty needs to move beyond small remedies such as help with a waste disposal project (as in Bonriki, Kiribati). Much more emphasis on critical discourse is essential to address good governance and have people begin to think critically about their lives within the poverty that the project seeks to address.

That human rights is an integral part of good governance is, then, an *a priori* assertion. What has been recommended so far in this report is that at community level civics education must be incorporated into the project through a well planned community level civics education programme similar to that used in the Solomon Islands by the GOAL and BLESS projects run by the FSPI affiliate SIDT (See 6.2). Of crucial importance therefore is a coordinated civics education programmes (which include human rights)at community level that utilizes other agencies' areas of expertise and existing programmes such as UNICEF and UNFPA.

Recommendation 37: Human rights presented as critical discourse should be integrated into V&C as an integral aspect of 'good governance'.

Mapping and research: the future

The ToR presents the following question which this section addresses: The First Phase has predominantly focused on mapping and research and developed action plans but implementation has been limited. How to address this in Phase Two?

The mapping and research findings are a solid foundation for Phase Two, which could focus on FSPI as a leading regional organization and its role in disseminating the findings at national and regional level with a value-added analysis of the policy implications of the community level findings. The quality of this level of regional interventions undertaken by FSPI can take the governance project forward. V&C is one of only a handful of governance projects that has been implemented. With some necessary changes that invigorate its educative role, the project can utilize the community-based data and perspectives on governance issues in a Pacific context. Incorporating more critical analysis of what governance means and how power is distributed through communities and at all levels will aid community members in understanding how they fit into the social system and what strategies they can promote to make qualitative changes. Because the goal of the project is to enhance good governance, in less stable counties issues of conflict should also be incorporated.

The affiliates also have many avenues to pursue to consolidate the knowledge, relationship with government institutions, and awareness of their rights to participation, that the project has established in the communities. National level civic education and advocacy based on the community level mapping and research findings also would be significant interventions by affiliates to advance the good governance agenda nationally. Capacity building in the communities and building partnerships with other organizations on the good governance agenda are activities that could add value to the findings at national level.

The action plans developed by the communities should not be regarded as areas for direct development assistance from FSPI in implementation, although this is a preferred option by FSPI and affiliates and the projects staff based on their empathy with the communities needs and marginalized position. The review has indicated elsewhere in this report that the project implementers' response to the community action plans and implementation of them, presents an important decision that needs to be made by FSPI and the donors supporting the project: should the FSPI V&C focus on community empowerment in a framework of building knowledge and capacity for good governance or should the project spend time in supporting the communities to implement their specific development plans and provide development assistance? Essentially, this is the main issue to arise from the review.

The review team has concluded that the significance of the V&C project is its contribution to strengthening good governance rather than as a development project. If FSPI, affiliates and donors still have a preference for supporting communities in implementation of their action plans, the support should be in the form of capacity building, providing new skills to assist in implementation of the plans and training in how to negotiate for service delivery (which is what most of the plans cover) – rather than the project allocating funds to implement the actual items in the community development plans. Technical support and organizational development for communities to develop the plans would be consistent with the governance project objectives.

The review team also is concerned that if the FSPI project activities remain focused on addressing the communities specific needs, this may use time, personnel and funding in development assistance rather than policy analysis and advocacy on the good governance lessons learned in Phase One, which could present the development and governance needs of the disadvantaged communities, to a wider audience.

FSPI and the Good Governance programme should draw on the lessons learned from the V&C project Phase One and communicate the findings to a range of development actors and governance stakeholders. The review team considers that FSPI has the opportunity to lead in regional advocacy on good governance from a community perspective in Phase Two and should focus on its areas of strategic intervention. Other development agencies and organizations could be drawn in to assistance with implementation of community development plans. Most notably are the UN organizations all based in Suva, that run extensive community based education programmes in the FSPI affiliate countries. UNICEF runs Lifeskills, which develops youths' potential and is a popular and well-organized programme in seven Pacific countries. UNFPA and South Pacific Community (SPC) the Adolescent and Reproductive Health Programme (ARHP). UNDP is currently extending its civics education programmes. FSPI has an excellent opportunity to link with these well funded and high profile organizations to see where educative links can be forged. For example, in conversations with UNICEF and UNDP staff it was thought possible to link with the networks FSPI have in order to establish training in ARH, Lifeskills and Civics Education

through FSPI auspices in its community sites. FSPI staff are well acquainted with all of the UN staff. UNICEF also indicated that it would need to have a local organisation run its Lifeskills programme at some point. By linking now, FSPI positions itself more clearly with major organizations. Lack of linking is one of the main findings in the review. Whether this is because, like most NGOs, FSPI is keen to establish its own programmes without 'big' institutions is a question for FSPI to fathom.

For the future, the excellent work in community mapping needs to be built upon through integrating community requirements for education and advocacy by negotiating with UN agencies and such groups as RRRT to integrate programmes into V&C activities. V&C should be focused primarily on education in the areas that constitute governance. By linking with UN agencies that already have avenues in which FSPI can forge alliances, the project will go a long way to utilizing well-planned methods without duplicating them. FSPI will not lose any independence or direction.

Recommendation 38: FSPI should make substantial links with UN and other agencies that already run relevant social, governance, health and human rights programmes in affiliate countries in order to promote education in areas that combine to provide direction to the alleviation of poverty and an increased understanding of governance.

Annexes

Annex	Name
Annex One	Terms of Reference/NZAID Briefing Questions
Annex Two	Literature Reviewed
Annex Three	Case Study: Kiribati
Annex Four	Case Study: Solomon Islands
Annex Five	Case Study: Fiji
Annex Six	Case Study: Vanuatu
Annex Seven	List of people interviewed
Annex Eight	FSPI V&C Annual Report

Annex One: Terms of Reference



Approved Contractor Scheme ASSIGNMENT SPECIFICATION

SCHEDULE ONE

Name of assignment: V&C Review

1. Assignment background

V&C is a community action, research and awareness programme aimed at "gardening" stronger, more effective governance structures and democracy at local, national and regional levels in the Pacific. The project was developed and is coordinated by the Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FSPI), a regional NGO based in Suva with affiliate members in most Pacific nations. The programme consists of regional activities as well as in-country work implemented by FSPI's affiliate members in Vanuatu, Fiji, Solomon Islands and Kiribati. The programme targets grass root communities as well as local, provincial and national government. It embraces a participatory approach to development and has sought to engage and develop innovative learning and needs based approaches. Action-oriented research using participatory action-learning tools, which bring together communities to analyse governance issues and as a group develop action plans.

The project commenced in 2001 as an initial three-year programme. It was jointly funded by DFID, ADB, and NZAID, with committing \$150,000 per annum. In 2003, NZAID and FSPI discussed the potential for a second phase of the project to build on the knowledge and mobilisation produced in the first phase and address areas not covered. It was agreed that NZAID would commission an independent participatory review of the project before the completion of the first phase in October 2004.

2. Desired assignment goal / outcome(s)

The purpose of the review is to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the project to date and to provide information to guide the future of the project.

3. Objective(s), and related Task(s) to be undertaken by the Contractor

Objective One

1. Assess the achievements of project to date and analyse the efficiency and effectiveness of the project.

Tasks

- Assess the achievements of the project, including but not exclusive to progress towards achieving the project objectives as set out in the project log frame.
- Assess project management structures, with particular attention to the capacity, capability and respective roles/responsibility of FSPI and country affiliates,
- Assess communication structures/processes and stakeholder engagement.

- Assess financial management systems and appropriateness of the project budget expenditure
- Assess the effectiveness of the action-learning approach to implementation and of risk identification and management strategies.
- Assess the multi-donor funding structure and effects of these on project implementation.
- Assess effects of the project implementation on the implementing organisations

Objective Two

Determine the extent to which the approach for the project is still valid and the original project goal and objectives are still relevant, from the viewpoint of NZAID, FSPI, the FSP affiliates and communities involved. Specific aspects to be assessed include:

- Location of the project,
- Beneficiaries targeted - i.e. rural communities, provincial/national government, NGOs and regional inter-governmental institutions
- Focus on civic education and relationship between traditional and western forms of governance.
- Methodologies used

Tasks

- Update and verify the contextual information that guided the project at the outset.
- Identify key stakeholders interests and opinions of the programme
- Analyse key project documents, including the original project proposal, log frame, progress reports and findings from PLA work.
- Analysis of relevant community/national/regional plans and statements, and a review of relevant processes, events, and trends currently prominent in the region.
- Analysis of NZAID Policy document, Pacific strategy, and country strategies (where they exist)

Objective Three

Analyse the project's development outcome to date, specifically social and institutional aspects. The analysis should include unintended or unexpected outcomes and identify any issues/areas of importance and relevance to the project objectives that were not affected. The analysis should also identify any opportunities and hindrances experienced in achieving development outcomes.

Tasks

- Social analysis specifically addressing outcomes for community governance structures and processes, and on the attitudes, knowledge and relationships between, communities and provincial/national/regional stakeholders. The social analysis will include at least;
 - An analysis of the different effects of project activities on women and men
 - An analysis of the effects of project activities on different groups and communities

Outputs

4. Outputs to be achieved by the Contractor

1. Draft report (electronic version only) written for NZAID, FSPI and target beneficiaries that summarises finding of review and provides options and recommendations for any amendments to;
 - project objectives, components and scope,
 - project management structures, monitoring and evaluation systems, financial budgets and funding structures
 - identification of any additional risks/constraints and/or additional risk management strategies required
 - If appropriate, exit strategy options for NZAID and/or FSPI
 - Recommendations for the timing and nature of future reviews
2. Final report, following feedback from NZAID and FSPI on the draft. (electronic version and 10 printed copies for distribution to FSPI)
3. The team may also be requested to facilitate and/or just attend a workshop with NZAID and FSPI to discuss the findings and implications of the final report and to agree on future plans and process.

5 Methodology and approach

Primary beneficiaries of the project to date have been identified as all members of the targeted communities and local community-based and non-government organisations.

The project implementers are FSPI, FSP Vanuatu, PCDFi, FSP Kiribati and ECANSI, and the members of the RGAG are project partners.

It is expected that the review team will firstly undertake an initial literature search of key documents and publications relevant to the project and attend a pre-briefing with NZAID and a representative of FSPI in New Zealand. Following which the team will be expected to present a proposed methodology and work plan for undertaking the review, specifying type of methodologies to be used in gathering the information. These methodologies should be compatible with those used in the V&C project and therefore should embrace principles of participation and action-learning. The work plan will be approved by NZAID in consultation with FSPI.

The work plan for the review is likely to include:

- Visits to all countries where the project has been operating (Fiji, Vanuatu, Kiribati and Solomon Islands), visiting FSPI in Suva first and involving:
 - Workshops with primary beneficiaries to gather and produce the information required to meet the objectives of the review.
 - Workshops with project implementers and other partners to gather and produce the information required to meet the objectives of the review.
 - Consultation with key stakeholders, including:
 - Relevant regional, national and local NGO's and community organisations and governance structures (village councils, local/provincial government)
 - Others affected by the project including those excluded from participation in the project if possible.
- Consultation with DFID and any other directly relevant donors and/or organisations operating in country
- Post-field work briefing with NZAID in Wellington to present and discuss initial findings
- Preparation of a draft report

- Preparation of a final report following comments from NZAID/FSPI
- Attend debrief/workshop with NZAID and FSPI

The review is to commence in late September 2004. It has been estimated that the review would involve up to a total of 35 days (not including travel days), consisting of approximately 4 days preparation time prior to country visits, 2 days in Suva, Fiji with FSPI, 5 days for each country visit, and 5 days to prepare and finalise the report.

6 Key dates

See #5 above

7 Reporting requirements

See #4 above

8 Contract milestone(s)

An advance payment for travel expenses can be made at the commencement of the project, and final payment will be made at completion of the final report.

9 Quality indicators or key performance indicators

The Contractor shall ensure that the assignment is carried out with all due diligence, efficiency and economy in accordance with the time specified in this Contract, observing sound management and technical practices, and complying with professional consulting standards recognised by relevant professional bodies.

NZAID Briefing Notes: The following notes were provided to the review team for consideration. They have been assessed under individual objectives following on from the objective under the ToR. Some point have been integrated into the report body.

Specific Areas of Interest for NZAID

1. Coordination and connections at national level
 - Extent of and opportunities for enhancing connections and collaborations with
 - national strategies, priorities and initiatives
 - NZAID bilateral programme strategies , initiatives and priorities
 - Other donors and regional organisations national level activities eg RRRT, UNDP
 - How well integrated is the V&C into affiliate organisations own strategic programme and priorities?
2. Resourcing and donor relationships
 - Has funding been sufficient for the programme overall? At national level? At regional level?
 - Multi-donor funding - opportunities for greater harmonisation in terms of reporting requirements, funding arrangements, extent of and need for greater engagement between donors in relation to the programme?
 - Need for other donor ' s funds to be leveraged?
 - Respective roles of NZAID, FSPI and FSP-affiliates in seeking additional funding and new funding partners, enhancing donor coordination, etc.
3. Relationship and respective capacities of FSPI and Affiliates
 - Role of FSPI as support/resource for affiliates - has this been adequate? Does it need to be strengthened and if in what ways and how?
 - Capacity of affiliates in terms of skills, knowledge, adequate relationships at community as well as government level, to advocate using findings of V&C programme?
 - Management burden of V&C programme on affiliates; reporting, financial administration, succession planning issues, including situation where affiliates funding for other projects ends this often means staff responsible for V&C programme are lost.
 - What is the process and criteria for ' selecting ' the NGO to implement V&C e.g. in Solomons the FSP affiliate wasn ' t used. If the programme expands, how will NGO ' s be identified and does this make them affiliates? How does the FSPI relationship to affiliates differ from that of non-affiliates but involved in FSPI programmes?
 - Is FSPI a tool for affiliates to enable them to achieve their goals, or the reverse?
 - FSPI programme management costs - are these reasonable? What is provided for these costs? Does the regional/national resource ratio need adjusting?
4. Regional network and advocacy

- Regional network has been limited - what have the barriers been? Does the idea still have validity? How does it fit with other regional networks recently established/planned?
 - Opportunities for capacity building and greater information/resource sharing between affiliates - e.g. Solomons staff working with Kiribati staff
 - Information sharing with other NGO 's, regional agencies, government bodies.
 - Extent of regional partnerships with other regional agencies RRRT, USP, PACFAW
5. Human Rights component
- Programme concept is situated in a human rights context, however focus seems to have been largely on processes of governance, decision-making and resource management. To what extent has the programme addressed the broader human rights issues and agenda, in particular the links between human rights and development? To what extent should the programme take a stronger human rights approach? And if so, in what way?
 - Opportunities for programme to contribute to raising human rights on the regional agenda?
6. Monitoring and Evaluation
- General assessment of adequacy, appropriateness, effectiveness of M&E.
 - To what extent has " adaptive management " approach been implemented - at national level and regional level?
 - Respective roles of affiliates and of FSPI in M&E
 - NZAID role in M&E
7. Issues related to Programme Expansion and Future of Focus
- Expansion to other countries - NZAID funded it as a pilot with aim of replication
 - First phase has predominantly focused on mapping and research – developed action plans but have achieved little implementation of them. How can this be addressed in Phase two. Improvements to project design and management so that research is more directly linked to immediate use of the findings
 - Heavy focus on civic education to date - to what extent should this focus continue? If not, what should the focus be? Sustainability of civic education in the curriculum - to what extent have Ministry 's of Education actually integrated and taken ownership of civic education?
 - To what extent has capacity actually been built at community level, particularly the areas of advocacy, networking, and accessing funding? How can the programme be strengthened in this regard, if necessary?
 - Focus on working with communities versus working at government level – what has the balance been and what should it be in future?

Annex Two: Literature reviewed

Author / Organisation	Title
FSPI/ADB/Diana Guild	Assessing Community Perspectives in Government in the Pacific, 2003
FSPI: V&C / Len Flier	Research for an Initiative in Civic and Citizenship Education in Fiji, 2003
FSPI	Annual report 2003
FSPI	Regional Governance Inventory
FSPI	Draft Report of First Meeting of RGAG, 2002
FSPI	Strategic Plan and Record of Annual Conference 2003
FSPI	Affiliate Quarterly Reports
NZAID	Scoping Study: Alternative ODA Delivery Mechanisms and Management Approaches, 2003
NZAID	Towards a Strategy for the Pacific Islands Region, 2002
NZAID	Five Year Strategy 2004/05 – 2009/10
UNDP	Solomon Islands: Peace and Development Analysis
Wadsorth, Y.	Everyday Evaluation on the Run, 2002
<p>Note: Numerous papers and documents associated with the affiliate countries are not recorded here</p>	

Annex Three: Case Study: Kiribati

1. Introduction

The consultants visited the Republic of Kiribati from November 10 – 20. The time in Kiribati was extended by one day due to airline delays. The V&C (V&C) Project is implemented in Kiribati by the Foundation of the People of the South Pacific Kiribati (FSPK). FSPK is not an independent affiliate of FSPI. The consultants met with stakeholders from all sectors of Kiribati society from community level to government departments and government ministries. V&C has three project sites in Kiribati: Bonriki is on the main island of Tarawa and can be described as peri-urban. Buamoia is on the atoll of Onotoa and Temaono is on the atoll of Butaritari. Because of time constraints and the sheer distance of the latter two locations from Tarawa, the review team was unable to visit these sites. The following profile outlines the issues arising from the review of V&C.

2. Achievements:

This section briefly describes the achievements of the project:

- ✓ **PLA, KAP methods:** Involvement in, and community ownership of participatory processes leading to action plans is a major objective, and achievement, of the project. 338 people were directly involved in the process across the three communities.

From observations and discussions at the Bonriki meeting with community members it was evident that this objective had been met. The data collected from and by the Bonriki community during the PLA and KAP processes were collated by FSPK staff using community involvement. The research findings from the PLA and KAP both established and confirmed the efficacy of the community based action methodology. The Bonriki community expressed their gratitude to the donors and stated that the process had been affirmative. They stated that the action research process had involved a considerable number of community members with equal participation of females and males. Non-participants had also come to know more about the process and the results of the project and its objectives. Overall, the Bonriki experience was positive in that many community members did feel they had some ownership of the process and had attempted to initiate subsequent action plans.

It is a limitation of the review that the consultants could not visit the other two project sites. However, the very thorough ADB report "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific", which analyses the data collected from all three communities, demonstrates that the research methodology was effective.

- ✓ **The ADB Report "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific":** As noted above, the contribution of the three participating Kiribati communities towards the results of the PLA and KAP processes are included in the ADB report. The contribution of these three Kiribati communities to the overall excellence of the report is a major achievement and output from the Kiribati V&C project. The report was funded by the ADB in order to promote and disseminate the

information gathered from the PLA and KAP processes on governance and community issues at each project site. The information comes directly from the community findings and was collated and analysed with their help and that of the branch affiliates and the author, Dr Diana Guild. The report has immediate validity for further project development purposes and for academic and political interest and application.

- ✓ **Gender and youth participation in the PLA process:** Youths of both sexes, women and men were all well represented in the PLA process. This is evidenced from the surveys recorded in the ADB report and acts as evidence of this successful inclusion. The meeting held in Bonriki for the review team consisted of community members who had participated in the PLA process and who continued to meet to implement action plan activities. At the community meeting it was evident that women play a significant role in community processes, certainly their voice was heard in the meeting attended by the review team. There were significantly more women than men in attendance and their contribution pointed to their knowing much about the history and processes of the V&C project and their involvement in it.

There was anecdotal evidence from FSPK staff that female representation in the remoter communities may be less than in semi-urban Bonriki. However, again, the ADB report confirms that women and youth were well represented in the PLA process. Discussions with the leader of the Bonriki Youth Group indicated a low level of youth participation in community affairs, which reflects the ADB report that youth continue to be marginalised. That PLA incorporated youth into its process says more about the discreet nature of that process where youths were invited to participate. What must be encouraged to occur in subsequent activities linked to the action plans is youth involvement. This appears not to have occurred in the Bonriki situation.

- ✓ **Linkages:** There is evidence of some links being made between the V&C governance initiatives and other FSPK projects. For example: The FSPK Capacity Building Project worked closely on the ADB Report; drama shows on good governance were funded by the Capacity Building Project; *Over the Waves* radio programme run by the Capacity Building Project linked V&C principles into its programming. Further and more substantive links, which promote V&C and come directly from their project rather than as spin offs from within other FSPK projects are recommended.

3. Areas of concern

- **Management issues:** There were three different directors during the first phase of the V&C. The review noted, as did the current FSPK governing committee, that this has impacted negatively on both the morale and efficiency of FSPK as a whole, and on V&C. There were three different Project Officers during the pilot phase (one current, one now employed elsewhere), both of whom confirmed the general disquiet at management processes and attitudes towards the various roles expected by directors. The review team was informed that the current absence of a director was impacting negatively on the entire organization. Given the current situation at FSPK, it would be advisable that the V&C expand its current capacity in the next phase when strengthening of FSPK management has been accomplished. The governing board

noted that guidance and leadership from a suitable director is vital for their improved morale and performance.

- **Linkages:** Arising from the issues surrounding management is the lack of links made that would have increased the profile and, ultimately, the success of the V&C. Stronger and more thorough links should have been established with other areas of governance, both within FSPK projects and with other NGO and Government projects. The links made with governance issues were noted above in that some governance issues were linked with projects within FSPK. The depth of these links appears somewhat ad hoc and superficial, or certainly not optimized. However, it was difficult to establish what links were made due to a lack of institutional history and a paucity of information in V&C reports. Greater emphasis on the nature of what governance means, how it is applied, how it functions, and how it is integrated into projects throughout FSPK is advisable as a major strategic initiative within FSPK projects. Staff noted that these initiatives were the prerogative of the director.

A major omission in establishing links and promoting V&C and FSPK in Kiribati occurred with the absence of FSPK's voice on the proposed UNDP funded initiative "The Strengthening Decentralized Governance in Kiribati". FSPI and FSPK should take immediate steps to contact UNDP and the Ministry of Internal and Social Affairs (MISA) to ascertain where their organization can take part in what is a major governance project in Kiribati. FSPK staff were fully aware of this major UNDP governance initiative. The former director removed the one FSPK representative from the committee overseeing the UNDP strategy. When the director vacated his position, FSPK did not take up the initiative to rejoin the process. The review team met with MISA officials who expressed genuine concern that local (i.e. FSPK) capabilities and skills existed. MISA recommended that FSPK advise them immediately on where links can be made with the UNDP initiative.

Increased linkages with other NGOs in Kiribati through FSPK are highly recommended. The review team met with Amak, which is a high profile organisation with both NGO and Government affiliations. Amak stated there were few contacts between FSPK and themselves "despite there being so much in common". Both organisations promote good governance. V&C's objective of increasing civics awareness programmes would synergize well with Amak's collaboration with RRRT training. RRRT is a human rights / governance NGO based in Suva with strong regional connections. In discussions with Amak there were many areas where synergy would avoid project duplication. Similarly, FSPK, and in particular V&C personnel, had not approached the NGO umbrella group KANGO despite very obvious areas of mutual concern and possible engagement and extension of V&C objectives. Linkages will increase the strength and capacity for V&C to optimize its presence in Kiribati.

- **Allowances:** The November 2004 V&C report details the participating communities' expectations for meal and participation allowances. The number of people wishing to join project activities has increased "not because of the benefits that 'Maurin Bonriki' activities could have for them, but only as a means of getting workshop allowances.' Currently the project allocates A\$10 per person per meal during meetings. Food is not supplied: rather, the cash is distributed. Members are now requesting payment for participating at meetings. FSPI and FSPK need to investigate options that would prevent the apparent commodification of V&C goals and processes.

- **Budget:** Because of inconsistent budget and acquittal processes being followed, FSPI has on occasions suspended funding to FSPK/ V&C. There was no funding released by FSPI for V&C for six months. "This had a negative impact on the V&C," noted one committee member. Increased communication between the two agencies would avoid such occurrences.

The problems encountered through the funding anomalies with DFID and JWP (DFID's managing partner for V&C) have also impacted on project results: "Sometimes we have to rob Peter to pay Paul when the donors don't pay up on time," was a comment by an FSPK staff member. FSPK stated that FSPI had always kept them informed of why funding was not forthcoming and that FSPI also suffered from the delays in funding tranches particularly from those from JWP.

The review was not involved in an audit of accounts. The FSPI financial controller showed the team the V&C FSPK balance sheets and budget and assured the team that all processes were now functioning optimally and that any problems with accounting had been for capacity reasons and not through misuse of funds.

Overall, the inconsistent budget allocations have impacted on the project. FSPI officers noted that there is no budget line for FSPI to travel to affiliates to aid in acquittals and capacity development in this area. The donors would be advised to include added budget allocation for acquittals training.

- **Raised expectations:** It was evident from discussions with the Bonriki community that there were misapprehensions about what the project goals and objectives were and what the ultimate 'benefits' for their involvement are from the PLA process. Notable in the meeting with the Bonriki community was the heavy reference to continued community perceptions that V&C is primarily a service delivery mechanism. The role of the donor as supplier of goods and services inevitably accompanies any form of engagement within a community, even within a project designed for edification on a wide spectrum of governance issues. The general recommendation that the PLA / action plan tools are revised and appropriate emphasis is placed on achieving knowledge based governance outputs should go in some way to alleviate this situation.
- **Civics education:** there was not an optimal amount of liaison by V&C with the appropriate curriculum development officials despite reports that there have been achievements in this area. Partly, this was due to there being no V&C Project Officer for six months prior to October 2004. However, a significant curriculum reform project (the Kiribati Education Sector Programme - KESP) is underway at the Kiribati Curriculum Development Unit and there are opportunities for FSPK to investigate how governance can be included in the up-coming curricula. Two visits to the Unit by the consultants established that there is ample opportunity for developments to occur. The Unit expressed its willingness to participate in the process with FSPK and encouraged greater liaison. The affiliate staff appeared to have little understanding of curriculum reform and what it takes to achieve this. This is not the fault of the affiliate.

4. The second phase: the Kiribati situation

The second phase will include generic regional approaches for V&C. Keeping this in mind, there are areas specific to FSPK in the next phase:

1. FSPK should be involved in the PLA KAP processes within the MISA-UNDP project "Strengthening Decentralized Governance in Kiribati" to explore how synergies can be achieved. Avoidance of duplication of project goals could be a significant outcome of this synergy. The involvement of MISA Island Development Officers (IDOs) in the communities is an example of this situation. Given the high cost of travel in Kiribati, such options should be explored.
2. Civics/ Governance education at formal level: Increased and continuing involvement with the Kiribati Education Sector Programme (KESP). Contact person: [REDACTED]. Increased emphasis at the non-formal community level for initiating a civics education programme is also vital.
3. There is room to establish links with other NGOs and government agencies to further promote and sustain FSPK initiatives in governance.
4. Enhanced communications and management between both FSPK and FSPI is highly advisable.

Annex Four: Case Study: Solomon Islands

1. Introduction

One consultant visited the Solomon Islands from 20-30 November. Because of airline delays and missed schedules the proposed visit was extended from seven to ten days in duration. The consultant visited the project site in Marau, which is located at the South Eastern end of Guadalcanal Province, some 6 hours by outboard motor from Honiara. Remaining time was spent with the implementing agency in Honiara and meeting appropriate contacts to discuss the project.

V&C was implemented in the Solomon Islands in-mid 2002. There are three project sites: Murau, Leitongo and Langa Langa. The implementing agency is the Environmental Concerns Action Network of Solomon Islands (ECANSI). ECANSI is contracted by the Solomon Islands Development Trust (SIDT), which is the FSPI affiliate. In the next phase SIDT will implement the project.

The Solomon Island communities targeted suffered during The Tension. Marau in particular was the scene of much destruction of infrastructure. The Malaitan population fled to outer islands. All three communities were subjected to several years of military and political abuse and manipulation by various forces. Systems of governance were under severe threat. It is within this context that V&C operated.

2. Achievements

- ✓ **PLA, KAP Methods:** From discussions with community members in Marau, it was obvious that community participants had gained knowledge and community action awareness from the project methodology. Involvement in, and community ownership of participatory processes leading to action plans is a major objective of the project. The ADB report detailed that 320 community members were involved in the process from a total population of 3650. There was near equal participation of females and males. Positive gender inclusion is confirmed in the ADB report "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific".

The data collected from and by the Marau community during the PLA and KAP processes were collated by ECANSI staff using community involvement. The research findings from the PLA and KAP both established and confirmed the validity of the community based action methodology. In addition to speaking with individual community members and PLA participants, the consultant met with eight representatives of the body that emerged from the V&C process, the Marau Leaders Council (MLC). The MLC stated that non-participants in the PLA had also come to know more about the process and the results of the project and its objectives. Overall, the Marau experience was positive in that many community members did feel they had ownership of the process and had gained a certain success in fulfilling subsequent action plans.

It is a limitation of the review that the consultants could not visit the other two project sites. However, the very thorough ADB report "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific", which analyses the data collected from all three communities, demonstrates that the research methodology was effective in that the data from all of the three communities is detailed and substantial and follows due methodological process.

One major caveat to the success of the PLA process is the type of tool used in promoting action plans. In the next phase of the project FSPI should attempt to focus the community more on knowledge based outcomes i.e. education in civics and governance, life skills, and other issues listed by communities in the ADB report as necessary in their communities. This could be done effectively with revised action plans that demarcate between 'wish lists' and more practical community based solutions to problems such as are available through the SIDT action plan process namely the Village Quality Life Index (VQLI). Comments on the action plan process and how it may have raised expectations for development projects is discussed in the first section of the report.

The ADB Report "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific": As noted above, there was an excellent contribution by the three participating Solomon Islands communities towards the results of the PLA and KAP processes published in the ADB report. The contribution of these three communities to the overall excellence of the report is a major achievement and output from the Solomon Islands' V&C project. None of the various agencies or offices visited by the consultant in the Solomon Islands actually had a copy of the document.

- ✓ **Gender and youth participation in the PLA process:** Youths of both sexes, women and men, were all well represented in the PLA process in all three Solomon Island locations. This is evidenced from the data and surveys recorded in the ADB report.
- ✓ **Management:** V&C has been generally well executed in the Solomon Islands through the implementing agency ECANSI in partnership with SIDT and FSPI. ECANSI is run by a board and administered by a Director. In discussions with the Director and Project Officer the consultant established that the management is responsive to the difficulties faced by implementing a project in a post-conflict society. ECANSI is a relatively small NGO and the staff is clearly committed and, as was demonstrated in Marau, highly regarded. Quarterly reports are substantive and responsive to the issues involved.

There is no funding provision for action plan implementation. Of significance is that ECANSI funded several activities to aid participating communities in implementing their Action Plan activities and in follow up work: "We did this with our own funds as we feel we have an obligation. Why the Log Frame would ask for this action plan but not provide funds is not explained, but we did many actions anyway.... from our own pocket." This assertion from ECANSI staff was verified in Marau and attests to the commitment of the agency. The agency sees the need for such work as "You can't drop them. It takes a long time, very slow, years...you need to stay in for the long run with communities and not just drop in and out..." Unfunded activities in the Action plan phase included: assisting communities to find donor funds; writing proposals;

delivering letters and other communications; site visits at ECANSI expense; organising workshops.

What was less obvious to the consultant was why an equal amount of energy had not been put into the other two communities of Langa Langa and Leitonga as it had in Marau. It was suggested that because project staff are from Marau there were 'natural links'. Links with Lea Lea and Leitongo have not been maintained since the PLA process finished as opposed to efforts in Marau.

✓ **Marau Leaders' Council**

The Marau Leaders' Council (MLC) is a direct outcome of the V&C process in Marau. From initiatives arising from the PLA and KAP processes, the MLC was established to represent the interests of the communities that participated in the surveys and which constitute the combined Marau area. The MLC has achieved a number of successes from the action plans including:

1. The establishment of its own entity as a responsible local body involved in governance and the promotion of development activities in the area.
2. Liaising with the health committee to facilitate community participation and funding in reconstructing the destroyed health clinic; the same process occurred for to help facilitate the reconstruction of two school classrooms that remain uncompleted due to lack of donor funds.
3. Promoting workshops on governance and socially relevant issues for community members;
4. Galvanizing and liaising with other committees in the area on development and governance issues of mutual concern.

The MLC acts under considerable restraints and the apparent successes are small given the enormity of the issues facing the communities. During The Tension most people fled their villages. The entire local station was destroyed, including the aid post, police station, school, stores and private homes. Having established itself as an entity, the MLC has demonstrated that V&C can act as a catalyst to promoting local governance. MLC feels they cannot operate unless V&C provides it with stipends and funds to transport members about the area. Further aspects of this group are discussed below where concerns on gender and youth participation are addressed along with issues relevant to the future of the project and MLC's contribution.

3. **Issues for consideration**

• **Management issues: ECANSI, SIDT, FSPI**

It did not become entirely clear during the review process as to what constituted the continuing deterioration of communication between all three agencies throughout the V&C pilot stage. FSPI and SIDT have met to re-establish and strengthen their relationship and in the second phase have pledged to work more effectively to avoid the issues and problems experienced in the first phase. FSPI recognizes that communication issues need to be addressed in the interests of optimizing all processes and its own institutional strengths.

• **Gender, youth inclusion: the managing agencies**

Of concern to the consultant is the apparent lack of understanding on behalf of the implementing agencies and the MLC of the actualities of promoting, applying and sustaining gender and youth inclusion and equities within the project, especially in the Solomon Islands. The MLC, for example, is the one governance organisation to emerge from the V&C. All members are selected from the participating communities to represent their particular community in the MLC. What has resulted from this apparent lack of understanding of inclusive processes is tokenism towards gender and youth inclusion. Had there been relevant V&C policy, then application may have been enhanced.

The significant inclusion of females and youths in the PLA process is well documented and commendable. However, in the follow up activities such as the V&C supported MLC there is weak evidence of an equally impressive representation of women and youth. The consultant spent two days at the project site in Marau. In a full day meeting with the MLC all nine male members were present. There are four female representatives, none of whom attended the meeting. No youths were on the MLC. The review had paid over S\$200 to send a boat the previous day to invite all members to the meeting, including the women members. However, women later stated that they had not been informed on the previous day of the meeting to be held. It appeared men had been notified. When asked why the women had not attended, comments included:

- The women are very busy organizing a craft show.
- We did not have sufficient time to organize for the women to come.
- Women are very busy doing their work.
- Women are very happy with this organisation.

What appears to be occurring within the establishment of post PLA groups to drive the V&C objectives of promoting local governance is the re-establishment of a male centred, patriarchal system. The ECANSI representative accompanying the consultant did not have a sufficient understanding of gender policy as it pertains to the donor requirements. The ECANSI personnel cannot be held responsible for this as the Log Frame does not specify directives nor have personnel received appropriate gender training. They operate in a conservative male centred culture with an enduring and fused tradition of both local and Judeo-Christian attitudes towards power constructs. One non-Solomon Island commentator noted that it was specious to require new groups to be inclusive given the depth of gender affected relations in the Solomon Islands. He noted that such accommodations would need to be included when 'the groups have at least been established.' It is the opinion of the review team that minimizing gender and youth participation at such an early stage legitimizes their absence in the long run.

It is evident that gender awareness and inclusion has not been a specific and targeted objective. In order to avoid tokenism and obfuscation of gender policy and its application in all participating countries as it relates to V&C and donor objectives, FSPI should implement this report's recommendations on gender and youth.

- **Budgeting for communities**

Similar issues relating to the V&C budget being insufficient to fully and meaningfully follow up on post PLA activities are a problem in all participating countries, including in the Solomon Islands. ECANSI personnel expressed their concern that there is no V&C budget to fulfill Log Frame objectives around the Action plans. This leaves communities in all countries frustrated with the processes they have been through and for the agencies there is the added frustration that their reputations suffer locally. The recommendation that seed funding be made available for each community arises from this issue.

- **Linkages:** There is a general need for greater linkage and communication amongst NGOs and Government agencies in the Solomon Islands. FSPI would be advised to promote such linkages in all affiliate countries.

The Solomon Islands representative on the Regional Governance Advisory Group, the [REDACTED], has never contacted ECANSI. ECANSI was unaware that the [REDACTED] was on the Advisory Group. The [REDACTED] was unable to meet the consultant during the ten-day visit to the Solomon Islands due to "the [REDACTED] heavy schedule." Further high placed commentators suggested that alternatives to the Advisory Group composition could be a focus for attention. What emerges from this lack of networking relates back to the issues confronting the RGAG.

- **Curriculum**

As manager of the V&C ECANSI was responsible for implementing Log Frame objectives surrounding curricula activities. These activities have remained largely unfulfilled despite there being a full time Project officer with no other scheduled V&C duties since March 2003. Little contact had been made with Curriculum Development Unit or other education officials. No or little advance had been made in any curricula areas.

NZAID has been funding a major curriculum initiative for two years within the Education Department and Curriculum Development Unit. Links with these programmes could have been more fully established. The consultant visited the Curriculum Development Unit and reviewed the new materials. A ten-unit section on governance within the new English Curriculum at Class Six has incorporated, but still lacks materials to support it. ECANSI has not provided the materials it had promised, six months after making that commitment. The consultant suggested an Internet search would produce the materials required for the new curriculum. At the secondary level, the same NZAID funded initiatives have been set in place and SIDT would be advised to consult with the [REDACTED] on issues relating to additional governance inclusion across the curriculum. A significant issue arises from the Log Frame requirements around curriculum objectives and relates to the experience with ECANSI: FSPI and affiliate staff are not necessarily trained in education nor in the specific area of curriculum, which is a highly specialized aspect of pedagogy. That the objective was not fulfilled may be in part to lack of capacity or understanding. Also, when ECANSI was relieved of its management role in March 2003, there was some ill feeling and a certain lack of incentive was felt, despite the continued provision of a salaried position for the Project Officer.

Just prior to the submission of this report the consultant received an email from the Curriculum Unit asking for help in putting together the proposed curriculum on governance. This demonstrates that the Unit requires help in accessing information and coordinating it into a suitable format for school materials. It is not within the scope or realm of reality for the current Project Officer to do this. FSPI and its affiliates need to have expert help to implement the activities in their Log Frame.

Recommendation: That FSPI ensure that all affiliate staff have sufficient training and capacity development to cover all of the expectations in the Log Frame.

4. Phase Two: Introduction

There are two successful community governance projects currently in place and managed by SIDT: the GOAL Project and the BLESS Project. The former is an AusAID funded community governance scheme and the EU funds the latter. For a number of reasons possible harmonization of V&C into one or the other projects was felt to be problematic. That V&C should remain a discreet project within SIDT was considered the best option. FSPI is recommended to closely analyse the two projects to find common ground for V&C as both projects utilize many successful aspects of governance practice at community level. The SIDT CAP model is called Village Quality Life Index (VQLI). This model should be explored in full by FSPI as a possible model for running PLA CAP tools/methods. These tools may answer the problem that FSPI and affiliates have been having with PLA tools that inadvertently promote a wish list of unattainable development needs such as schools, roads, wharves etc. VQLI are used successfully in SIDT's other community governance projects: BLESS and GOAL. Because the VQLI is a proven PLA tool that maintains sustainable and realistic goals and objectives at community level it is highly recommended as a template for a regional PLA tool.

5. Specific points

- Before the political and social crisis in the Solomon Islands, SIDT employed 260 CDWs on its projects. This number was reduced to 100 during the Tension. There is therefore a pool of CDWs.
- The V&C curriculum development objective: The NZAID Curriculum Development Project currently being implemented in primary and secondary schools through the Curriculum Development Unit (CDU) is a multi-million dollar curriculum reform initiative. The project has sufficiently addressed the areas of governance education in the primary level and proposes to do so at the secondary level. The project is on going. A number of governance issues have been included in primary level courses namely a 10 session (approximately 12 hours) in the Class Six English course. The new material focuses on structural descriptions such as the role of government and its offices. SIDT would be advised to liaise with the [REDACTED] on how best to further incorporate governance issues. The CDU was open to suggestions and help on these matters.

6. Conclusion

Overall, the Solomon Islands' involvement in the V&C has been positive. The PLA process is the major achievement, along with the modest successes in Marau. The recommendations made in the body of this report apply also to the Solomon Islands, while those recommendations made specifically for the country arise from local conditions and need to be addressed within the local context. Finally, ECANSI has proven itself to be generally well organized and efficient and should be commended for its significant contribution to the V&C in the Solomon Islands.

Annex Five: Case Study: Fiji

1. Introduction

The Fiji country implementation was undertaken by Partners in Community Development (Fiji), formerly known as Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific Fiji (FSP Fiji). PCDF has two key areas of focus: Human Resources Development and Natural Resources Management. Under Human Resources Development, it has projects on Human Rights, Good Governance, Capacity Building in Rural Schools, School Nutrition and Disaster Management. The V&C project involved five communities chosen for different representation of interests: Muanikoso settlement (Melanesian community); Nukutubu village (Rewa province) and Tikina of Jubaniwai (Nadroga province) both Fijian communities; Tavarau and Busabusa (Ba)- Indo-Fijian settlements.

The PCDF conducted workshops for the communities on the project and did the community governance mapping in the communities. In one village, the community wanted to know more about its origins, so considerable research was done on the history of the settlement, using archival and oral sources. A literature review was also done. The PCDF also covered human rights awareness and capacity building through rural education/governance in another project (funded by AusAID). The approach of PCDF to implementing the V&C project was to carry out the project's community governance mapping and related activities but also to carry out the governance education and awareness raising through its other programmes and projects. PCDF has integrated the governance project work into its programmes.

The review team experienced a degree of frustration in not being able to conduct as many interviews as was expected. The reasons for this are: PCDF did not respond adequately to the team's requests for interview schedules / meetings with key stakeholders. The delays experienced in Kiribati due to airline problems meant that the Fiji visit was shortened. Although extra time was negotiated with NZAID by the team, that time was meant primarily in team meetings in Suva with FSPI and amongst team members discussing the review before team members returned to their respective countries.

2. Achievements

- ✓ Community governance mapping – 5 communities
- ✓ Workshops on governance
- ✓ Literature review and primary research
- ✓ Linkages made between communities and government ministries
- ✓ Linkages made between communities and provincial councils
- ✓ Development of Community Action Plans
- ✓ Analysis of social problems in surveys and discussion
- ✓ Civic and human rights education through other projects and partners
- ✓ Participated in UNDP project on developing school-based civic education and human rights programme
- ✓ Development of a "Train the Trainers" Manual

3. Linkages

PCDF worked closely with the Ministry of Fijian Affairs and the Fijian Affairs Board officials and built linkages between communities and government officials; the project used the existing government administrative structures for work with the Fijian communities. For the Indo-Fijian communities there was no equivalent structure. PCDF appointed someone at one stage to liaise in the communities. PCDF explored linkages with UNDF on governance work but considered its approach was "top down", not bottom up work with communities. PCDF facilitated networking amongst community development organizations and rural advisory councils; it included respected elders and chiefs in the implementation strategy for the project.

4. Issues for consideration

- **Choice to work with existing social and administrative structures in implementation**

The project implementer used the existing government structures for administration of Fijian communities – particularly the Fijian Affairs Board – as a central actor in the good governance capacity building project. Though a relevant and important part of Fijian communities' relationship with government, this use of the Fijian administration as a reference point for the Fijian communities engagement with the project, differed from other countries where the implementers' in their interaction with the communities on the project gave more space for the communities to consider their own perspectives on governance structures, relationships and needs, and then their relationship with the most relevant government structures that were important in their lives. Although there were benefits possible from the implementer making linkages between the communities and the local administration, because of the administrative dominance of these structures, in at village level village there needed to be some creation of separate space for communities to analyse these relationships independently for the project to build their capacity. Some significant problems or issues of governance which did come out of the V&C project (e.g. leadership roles in the traditional and modern system) which could have been discussed in the communities, were relegated to the Fijian Affairs Board "to clarify roles" by the implementer. The choice the organization to work closely from the beginning of the project, with the main local government administration, resulted in the project missing opportunities to raise awareness and capacity in communities to discuss their governance issues.

- **Affiliate's role in facilitation and building governance relationships for communities**

The implementing organization played an active role in facilitating exchanges and communications between the communities and government representatives. It involved itself more prominently in community development projects in implementing the V&C project, where in other affiliates, project staff deferred involvement in development work while concentrating on the governance exercise. This less detached role of the affiliate in organizing village or community activities in the course of implementing the V&C project sometimes blurred the objectives of the project. Nevertheless, the communities appreciated the assistance and exposure to better communication with the administration. However, this cannot be judged as a positive project outcome because of the close role PCDF played in the linkages.

The affiliate's perception of its role in the communities changed some of the intent of the project to initiate community level discussion and awareness raising on governance issues.

Participation and decision making in the community on the project followed traditional village leadership lines in the Fijian communities thus limiting opportunities for new developments to emerge in community roles and relationships during or as a result of the project. The project also then showed traditional exclusion of women in the village meetings or discussions. Some project outputs claimed as examples of the success of the governance project were organized to show how the communities were aware of and could fulfil their obligations to their chiefs. As in the other countries however, chiefs in some communities also said they benefited from the discussion on governance and it clarified their roles in the community.

- **Focus on building peoples relationship with chiefs**

The project started with a choice made by PCDF to work with existing social and administrative structures in the Fijian communities. Community discussions on roles did not appear to look at both relationships between people and chiefs – i.e. good governance and fulfilling obligations to chiefs by the people was emphasized in practice as part of the project while the chiefs roles and obligations as leaders of the people –traditionally and in modern systems, were not given equal emphasis or scrutiny. A practical decision to work with existing structures is understandable for the implementer. The impact on the project's implementation and achievement of the project objectives and goal, needed to be considered also.

- **Wider issues of conflict and community governance work**

In the Fiji case study, the project did work on bringing different communities and stakeholders to dialogue on difficult issues of dispute: a land issue is one example. It is a credit to the PCDF that it initiated discussions between landowners (Fijian) and tenants (Indo-Fijian) and drew on officials in the Lands Commission to participate as well. This sort of broadening of the project to discuss overarching and major issues of conflict was a good step taken by the implementer. In the Fiji context, recognition of the problems for communities of higher-level policy issues and problems such as land ownership and use – could be a very useful follow up for PCDF as a contribution to Phase Two of the project.

- **Interpretation of capacity building**

The role of the implementer in the project and the interventions that it made to link communities and government officials has strengths and weaknesses as an approach. Is it sustainable to make links for communities and to help them present problems? Is capacity building about initiating progress if it is dependent on the intervention of the NGO or CBO organizer/s or project staff? The project has not built capacity in some of the communities because of the implementers' ambivalent view of the communities' interest in the project (e.g. Indo Fijian communities were implicitly seen as less keen because they did not come to meetings because they were fulfilling livelihood needs). These are interesting issues for debate and consideration by the implementer of the Fiji project. The in depth research, attempt to discuss larger issues (e.g. land) and beginning of efforts to link communities across ethnic divisions, provide opportunities for more innovative work in the project by PCDF in Phase Two.

5. Lessons learned

Clarifying the principles of good governance and the governance issues the project aimed to promote, needed to be made in depth before implementation of the project as the Fiji case shows. The development work of implementers may often blur the goals and intent of governance activities.

FSPI and the affiliates had different interpretations of the governance project. Some implementation in the Fiji case study followed the existing work and strengths of the affiliate, which was engaged in rural education and development projects. The organisation's focus may have influenced the approach taken by it to implementing the V&C project – which can produce innovations or be a limited unintentionally. These lessons learned in interpretation of governance implementation will continue to happen in the absence of a central clarification by FSPI and affiliates, on what the project was about, the role of the implementers and the intended outcomes. Skills needed to do this work also should be considered by FSPI.

The project has not addressed the wider issues of conflict between communities. In the Fiji case study, PCDF did attempt to get communities to look at an issue of conflict: land. This was a good start and on track. The project's role in developing methods of linking communities of Fijian and Indo-Fijians and assisting in discussions of critical issues, e.g. land, could be a major contribution to building good governance in Fiji.

Annex Six: Case Study: Vanuatu

1. Introduction

Two of the Review team members visited Vanuatu from Nov 20th -27th. The V&C project in Vanuatu is implemented by FSPV, which is a national affiliate of FSPI. The project has two full time project employees (project officer and project assistant) and the administration and financial management are executed by FSPV core staff. The project was initially implemented out of Island Consulting (previously, the consulting arm of FSPI) until 2003 when it was moved to FSPV due to the previous project manager leaving for other employment.

2. The project

- Initial country review on projects and activities relating to governance within Vanuatu, and consultations with various stakeholders on their view in relation to community governance
- A national consultation workshop was conducted in which various stakeholders from throughout Vanuatu (government agencies, provincial and municipal councils, national council of chiefs, NGO's, State enterprises, private sectors and some community members) provided guidance on the interpretation of good governance and the community level, and identified areas of concern for the project to tackle
- The project team developed the PLA methodology for the communities, identified the communities based on criterion identified in the national consultation workshop, and developed a stakeholder questionnaire for the good governance assessment report
- Project team conducted PLA governance mapping in 8 communities throughout Vanuatu
- The assessment survey was conducted throughout the country from a sample of 400 population which took note of gender, and other social equivalencies
- Analysis were undertaken of each communities with reports presented to the respective communities to develop Community action plans.
- The survey and the community action plans were used to compile the Vanuatu Country report for the "Assessing Community Perspectives in Governance in the Pacific"
- Results of the Country report and the regional assessment were repackaged by the project team and presented at various groups throughout Vanuatu, such as Aid donors, government officials, provincial and municipal councils, communities, some parliamentarians, political parties, national council of chiefs and the general public. Further presentations are being negotiated for the parliament and the council of churches.
- Advocacy and public awareness materials such as pamphlets, video and radio programmes, have been produced and distributed throughout the various networks

3. Other governance related work within Vanuatu

- The REDI and ISTAC projects have focused on strengthening of service delivery for the communities. The plans and training undertaken through these projects are very important vehicles for the V&C information and tools to be utilized if the

communities are to be empowered to voice their choices and services provided to improve their livelihoods

- The VDRTCA (ASPBAE) project on good governance training for rural development trainers is an important link that needs to be strengthened for the V&C as it is already working with CDU to integrate governance materials from the training into the school curriculum
- The Malavatumauri National Council of Chiefs proposed plans for strengthening the capacity of its Island, Area and Ward Council of Chiefs to better support the needs of the communities will be another important area in which the V&C will do well to make the appropriate linkages and possibly provide the capacity building training

4. Achievements

- ✓ Based on the review of project reports and consultations with various stakeholders and communities, the project has been a catalyst in improving understanding of communities on the different forms of governments (traditional and modern). Furthermore, the communities have been empowered through the Community Action Plans (CAPs) to take actions amongst themselves with gentle assistance from the project to improved community governance as well as making the different levels of government more accountable to the communities.
- ✓ The results of the assessment report has been widely known within the various stakeholders of Vanuatu such as government Aid agencies, and provincial councils from awareness programmes carried out by the project officers. These include national consultation workshops and presentations by the project team to various stakeholder groups. The presentations have led to closer collaboration amongst the project and other government ministries and projects relating to improving community governance. Several of the stakeholders consulted relayed the need for projects to work closely through the utilization of the information generated from the V&C and skills of the V& C project officers in engaging communities through their respective projects
- ✓ The project had been successful in improving participation of marginalized sectors of the communities such as women and youth in the development and implementation of community action plans.
- ✓ Positive progress has been made with the integration of the outputs of the project into ethos and work plans of other agencies and communities with some of the political parties utilizing the outcomes of the report to formulate their policies. In addition, the National Council of Chiefs are advocating for the utilization of V& C project officers in its programmes to build the capacity of its island and area council of chiefs to better service the community needs
- ✓ The project has overspent on its allocated budget, but only after approval from FSPI as the coordinating office. The budget overspent were appropriately expended for activities relating to the project due to the high costs of project operation in Vanuatu and the extra activities needed to produce the project outputs which were not adequately budgeted for in the initial budget.

- ✓ The existence of the same project officers over the majority of the project length was seen as beneficial in the transition period of management from Island Consulting to FPSV as well as the engagement with the communities
- ✓ The capabilities of the project officers with good grounding on participatory processes, and project management as well as good standing in the community certainly contributed to the good reception of the project by the local stakeholders and government.

5. Areas of concern

- The project is seen as a very successful project in identifying issues of community governance and initiating linkages with other agencies and organizations. Despite the initial information generated, the project has not had sufficient time to make the appropriate changes identified in the CAP's and monitor the progress of the communities in the CAP's implementation. Additionally, since a fair amount of the CAPs require external technical and financial assistance, the project was not able to fully advocate for such assistance with the appropriate authorities. The concern is that the project will not continue and the good information and progress will not be fulfilled
- The initial empowerment work with the pilot communities is showing signs of progress, but due to the limited funds and more activities that now take up the project officers time, the shepherding of the pilot communities will lapse thus jeopardizing the provision of a possible model for community governance
- The salaries were reduced instead of increased over the period of the project when it was transferred from Island Consulting to FSPV. Despite this, the project officers have stayed on due to commitment to the success of the project. If the project is to continue with the same staff, a more comparable salary package and benefits will need to be ensured in order to retain the staff. It was clear from the review that several of the other ministries and agencies are keen to utilize both the information and the project officers themselves.

6. Completion of the project Phase One

- V& C needs to develop an advocacy paper based on information generated from the project. This paper then needs to be presented and lobbied at the different levels of government decision-making. This advocacy or positional statement should highlight the problems currently identified by communities, and identify actions based on activities carried out by V&C to improve service delivery and assist communities.
- V& C needs to produce a handbook and manual on participatory planning processes (PLA) for improving community governance. The handbook and manual should be distributed to appropriate rural development agencies and organizations working on community development.
- V&C needs to engage the Ministry of Provincial Government (REDI team) and National Council of Chiefs to identify specific areas where V&C outcomes can be integrated into their programmes and institutionalize the community participatory process to improve government service delivery to communities

- V&C needs to liaise with the ASPBAE and CDU on the integration of community governance work into the school curriculum
- Refine the model for improving community governance in the pilot communities and continue to shepherd the communities in providing support when appropriate and directing them to organizations, which could provide assistance.
- Strengthen collaboration within the good governance advocacy group in identifying areas of similarities and potential partnerships as well as providing a stronger voice for the communities at the national and international level

7. The second phase: Vanuatu Activities

- Community governance:
 - develop a model on improving community governance based on experience and information generated from phase 1
 - Advocate the information from phase 1 for institutionalization into the regular government processes such as the development and implementation of provincial plans
 - Continual monitoring and support of existing communities used in the pilot phase as they progress and new areas of support are identified
 - Advocate the need to institutionalize the PLA and CAP processes within the Vanuatu government. These are to serve as mechanisms for communities to identified their needs which can be used to focus rural and regional assistance as well as improving the overall national governance
- Advocacy
 - Present positional statements from the information and experience from the pilot phase and advocate at the different levels within the country at so actions can be taken to address them
 - Produce a community governance planning manual and a community empowerment handbook on the provision of services by government to communities and processes for accessing support to community needs
 - Develop a network whereby communities can direct views and issues to be raised at the national level. Even though communities will be empowered, issues of distance, costs, and technical capacity could limit them from taking their concerns to the appropriate authorities, but a network that can be managed by the V&C project or a national NGO can at least ensure the V&C of the communities can be addressed at all levels.

Case study: Community governance at work:

The community of Mango in Santo, through the project established the Mango Community Association (MCA) where representatives of different groups are included to provide guidance, advisory and management for the implementation of the CAP. Since the introduction of the V&C project, the women's committee has been reestablished which are implementing some of action related to them in the CAP such as the establishment of the new preschool. The youth group has organized activities to bring the youth together such as fundraising for instruments and forming a string band. The MCA have visited the Municipal council requesting for land to build a community center to house the preschool, Aid Post, and community meeting house to store community equipment. Thus far the request has been unsuccessful, but the community is continuing to advocate for land.

Despite some differences amongst the community members during the election, the MCA and the respective groups have continued with its efforts to unite in activities that will improve governance at the community level.

The MCA and the chief's feel the eroding respect for decisions by the leaders will need to be addressed stronger to improve law and order in the community

Annex Seven: List of People Met

Name	Position	Organisation
FLJI		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Pacific Island Forum Secretariat
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Foundation for the People of the South Pacific International [FSPI]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	NZAID
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	RRRT
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AusAID, Suva
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Partners in Community Development, Fiji
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Women
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting - Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Nukutubu Village, Rewa Community Meeting – Men
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Partners in Community Development Fiji
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Fijian Affairs
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPI (2 nd interview)

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Pacific Centre for Public Integrity (phone interview)
KIRIBATI		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Min. of Island and Social Development
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPK
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPK
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPK
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPK
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AMAK/RRRT
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MEYS
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Kiribati Women's Teachers National Association [KWTNA]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	KWTNA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	KWTNA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	KWTNA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	KWTNA
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	RRRT
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	NZHC Kiribati
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPK (former)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Kiribati Association of NGO [KANGO]
VANUATU		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Mango Community Association
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Mango Community Association
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Currently UK FCO small Grants Manager
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Santo Hardware Vanuatu Football Association
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPV
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPV
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPV
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	FSPV
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	AusAID Vanuatu
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	School Committee, Lowehau Village
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Naiara Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Loweihau community
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Loweihau community
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Provincial Government Council
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MNCC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Department of Provincial Affairs, Ministry of Internal Affairs
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Department of Provincial Affairs, Ministry of Internal Affairs
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Department of Provincial Affairs, Ministry of Internal Affairs
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Department of Provincial Affairs, Ministry of Internal Affairs
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Asian South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education (ASBAE)
Solomon Islands		
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	NZHC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Environmental Concerns Action Network of Solomon Islands (ECANSI)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	ECANSI
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Ministry of Health
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Marau Leaders Council (MLC)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MLC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MLC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MLC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MLC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	MLC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SI National Council of Women
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SIDT
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SIDT
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	NZHC
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	SIDT
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Curriculum Development Centre

Annex 8: V&C Annual Report 2003-04 (Prepared by FSPI)

**VOICES AND CHOICES (CSCF 146)
ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2003
(April 2003- March, 2004- Year 3)**

- **Funding-** A project funded by the Development Fund for International Development (DFID), the New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB)
- **Project Name -** Voices and Choices: Gardening Good Governance in the Pacific
A regional project operating in Fiji, Kiribati, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu.
Website at <http://www.fspi.org.fj/program/governance.htm>
- **Agency**
- Coordinated regionally by the Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FSPI) in partnership with Partners in Community Development Fiji (PCDF), Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific Kiribati (FSPK), Concerns Action Network Solomon Islands (ECANSI), and Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific Vanuatu (FSPV).
- **CSCF Number** 146
- **Countries**
Fiji, Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu
- **Local Partners**
PCDF (Fiji), FSP Kiribati, ECANSI (Solomon Islands), and FSP Vanuatu.
- **Reporting Period**
Annual progress report for the period April 2003-March 2004.
- **Report Production Date**
25 June 2004
- **Report Compilation**
Lionel Gibson with contributions from team members:
FSPI David Hesaie
Fiji: Sachin Chandra and Setefano Nauqe
Kiribati: Tiroia Tabwea and Kaingateiti Maerere
Solomon Islands: Morgan Wairiu and Stewart Tabo
Vanuatu: Alice Kalontano, Charles Vatu, and Jenny Whyte

Voices and Choices: Gardening Good Governance in the Pacific

The goal of the Voices and Choices (V&C) project is to address the threats to peace and sustainable development in the Pacific region by fostering or "gardening" civil society,

democracy and good governance initially in four Pacific nations – Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, and Kiribati.

The project aims to work at three levels:

- At the community level: To identify and promote areas, particularly rural and disadvantaged communities, where failing or inadequate post-colonial structures can be influenced to provide a more Pacific-orientated, consensual form of good governance.
- At the national level: To build capacity in the area of human/civil rights and civil society in order to increase civil representation, engagement and social justice.
- At regional level: To establish a regional network that will seek to strengthen national level good governance procedures, promote greater accountability and transparency, and lobby for increased participation by civil society in decision-making processes.

Significant Changes

- The PCDF project manager, Roshni Chand migrated and was replaced by the team of Sachin Chandra and Setefano Nauqe, the project officers.
- These changes did not constitute a major change in approach although in all countries the cross-cutting nature of community governance work has meant that governance has become integrated into other community development areas of work. PCDF and ECANSI, for instance, now integrate community governance into all of their development projects including community work on coastal, rural education, and environment and disaster projects which all now include initial governance analyses upon which the practical development initiatives are now built.

Project Progress

Regional Project Staff Meeting – June 2003

In June 2003 the Voices and Choices project staff held the first regional project staff meeting which reviewed the work of the first eighteen months of the project. The meeting agreed on the following community governance lessons learned:

1. Both modern and traditional systems play an important role at the community level.
2. Community participation and inclusiveness at decision making and planning levels is important. There are many instances where culture has excluded women and youths from participating in governance. Voices and Choices needs to include strategies to ensure youth and women participate.
3. People need to have knowledge of both the modern and traditional systems to be able to use them effectively. At present adequate knowledge of both systems is lacking.
4. Transparency and accountability are important at every level. Community members find that traditional systems are more transparent than modern systems.
5. It is not easy to work in close partnership with diverse communities with the budgets we have.

6. Modern education is highly valued in our communities today. Achieving balance within the curriculum so that both modern and traditional values are respected and to develop relevant and productive skills in our young people are major challenges in all our countries.
7. It is difficult to measure the impact of *Voices and Choices* directly. We need to develop effective strategies to monitor and evaluate our activities so as to ensure we are meeting our goals and to help the communities evaluate their condition. This was something that had been envisaged in the original logical framework as coming out of the community governance mapping. The meeting agreed that the governance analyses would provide a clearer guide to evaluating the impact on communities of the *Voices and Choices*.
8. It is important to avoid making assumptions and be open to hearing the diverse voices and choices of the community members.
9. We need to be networking with all facets of communities.
10. An important criterion to apply when choosing to introduce a new governance practice or to strengthen a practice that has lapsed is to ensure that people want and request the practice.
11. The links between communities being able to meet their needs and being able to achieve good governance are complex and interlinked. Governance provides the context within which communities can sustainably make and manage decisions on the use of resources and come to consensus about any needs and problems. To help communities to achieve good governance *Voices and Choices* needs to help them to address the problems they have.

At an administrative level it was agreed that there was a need for at least one more regional meeting of V and C project staff to share lessons learned and to collectively plan the final education component of the project as well as to consider the possibility of a second phase. It was further agreed that there was a need for lateral communication between countries to share their experiences. FSPI agreed to facilitate this process. FSPI now produce a quarterly newsletter. The newsletter serves to inform project staff of major developments in countries.

Community Governance Reports

The most significant progress during year 3 has been the completion of one regional and four national community governance reports, based on community research in 6 urban and 14 rural communities in the four project countries. The reports analysed the community governance mapping information, considered relationships between traditional and modern governance structures (complementarity or potential conflict) and identified ways to integrate community and modern governance systems. The full reports are available on request to Just World Partners. The findings have been presented to national stakeholders and at regional fora. Findings were also presented to communities before publication. At community level they were used as resources to facilitate the construction of community action plans.

Perhaps the most significant community governance issue in all communities, without exception, was that the linkages between communities and governance structures (district, local, provincial and national government) were poorly functioning. Even in Fiji where the provincial government system for indigenous Fijians is well developed, communities saw provincial government as clumsy, unresponsive and unsympathetic.

Governance Education

The education component of the project has been put in place. At a regional level FSPI has taken the findings to regional (e.g. the Asian Development Bank Pacific Islands Governance Meeting, the Foundation for Development Co-operation /University South Pacific Governance Symposium) and international fora (e.g. The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific/United Nations and the Urban Governance Initiative Meeting). Discussions are currently in place with the South Pacific Board of Educational Assessment (the examination Board for regional countries, which are also members of the Council for Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP)) on integrating the community governance analyses into their development studies curricula. At a national level PCDF has provided its civic education report for Fiji to the United Nations Development Program and also the Curriculum Development Unit (which is currently revising the national secondary school curriculum). This report identifies, by subject and level, where citizenship education may be integrated into civic education.

Progress on main outputs is detailed below. A summary is also to be found on page 8 of the report.

Output 1: Regionally and culturally representative “virtual” Pacific Centre for Good Governance established

There has been much interest expressed in the three major elements of the virtual Pacific Centre for Good Governance. The list of individuals on the Regional Governance Advisory Group (RGAG) is given at Annex A.

The Regional Governance Advisory Group (RGAG) has provided an informal source of encouragement for the Voices and Choices and has in the last year supported FSPI's work in general and the V and C in particular. Their next meeting is confirmed for September 20th and 21st. The delay between meetings has been caused by timetabling difficulties as well as the departure of two members who needed to be replaced.

Whilst the RGAG has not been as active as it perhaps could have, they remain a very powerful advocate of the V and C. The issues raised by the community governance analyses will form one of the two major foci of the next RGAG. The second focus will be the provision of direction on the next phase of the Voices and Choices.

The group has focused on the following piece of work this year:

- (i) The Governance Inventory

A comprehensive list of all the regional and national organisations across 12 countries in Melanesia, Polynesia and Micronesia has been compiled. This represents a first in the Pacific. The inventory provides information on the major governance institutions as well as their particular governance focus. Most interestingly, the report shows the differences in the governance concerns in each of the Pacific sub-regions. In Melanesia governance priorities centre on national consensus, law and order, corruption and reconciliation. In Micronesia, by contrast, the focus is on leadership education and reconciling tradition with modernity and national unity. In Polynesia governance concerns revolve around transparency, accountability, human and civil rights and the strengthening of Civil Society Organisations.

Output 2: Regional Governance Mapping and Research

All the activities in this objective have been implemented in each of the countries. The community mapping data collection, analysis and reporting have been completed and presented by FSPK, PCDF, ECANSI and FSPV at national stakeholder level (in each of the four countries) and also at regional meetings by FSPI. Quarterly reports record that the independent governance analyses has worked to stimulate discussion by stakeholders (government, civil society and community) about the important role that community governance structures and processes play in Pacific livelihoods. At a regional level, FSPI presentations of the governance research have been well received by a range of institutions (the FORUM, the University of the South Pacific, Pacific Islands Governments and regional NGOs). There is a growing consensus that communities and traditional cultures in the Pacific are part of the governance solution rather than simply an element of the problem.

The regional and national community governance reports are currently being uploaded to the FSPI website. These are to be linked with the more detailed community governance information and plans (including community maps, data, issues and priorities for action) obtained from the community mapping and Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice surveys. It is intended that stakeholders will be able to access this information. The RGAG will also discuss in year 4 how the work can be disseminated further afield and integrated into other workstreams.

Output 3: Culturally appropriate in-country governance/civic education training incorporating the results of RGM and research

Initial community action plans (CAPs) have been designed. Affiliates (PCDF, FSPK, FSPV and ECANSI) are involved in facilitating the CAPs and working with communities to build capacity and strengthen existing governance structures within communities (e.g. household governance, community leadership and decision making. They are also through stakeholder consultations, facilitating better linkages between communities and government (at all levels).

The education and awareness components of the project have moved at different speeds in each of the countries. In Fiji, as already mentioned, curriculum development work is currently under way with UNDP and the Curriculum Development Unit of the Fiji Ministry of Education. The other three countries have conducted civic education at community level (ECANSI, FSPV) and through the media (FSPK).

Next Steps

Kirabati

Annual work plans have been developed by each of the affiliates focusing on output three. In the case of Kiribati, radio programmes conducted by the project officer during the course of the year have been undertaken on a weekly basis. These consider governance issues in general and community governance issues in particular. Links between community governance concerns and national government policy have been a special focus.

Vanuatu

FSPV have with the help of UNDP funding, produced a video outlining the community governance issues and challenges uncovered by the CGM. They plan to move towards integrating the governance research into the school curricula during year 4.

Solomon Islands

ECANSI are at present working with NZAID who are revising the school curriculum in Solomons to incorporate civic education into the secondary school syllabus.

Fiji

PCDF have completed an analysis of civic education in Fiji and produced a report that outlines, by subject and level, where civic education could be put in to the syllabus. This has been made available to the Curriculum Development Unit, and PCDF are currently working with the CDU to incorporate civic education into the curriculum. They have also used the governance findings and methodology in their rural education programmes.

Centrally, FSPI intends to take the findings of the community governance mapping and analysis to meetings on regional governance and is currently working with the SPBEA to incorporate the regional governance issues into their form 6 and 7 Development Studies curricula.

Risk Assessment

There has been no increase in the risks to the project. In the case of the Solomon Islands the political situation has, under the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI), stabilised and enabled ECANSI to undertake detailed and effective community work in areas that last year were not accessible.

Two important opportunities have presented themselves.

1. In response to the community governance analyses, the Asian Development Bank has approved a pilot project under their Poverty Reduction Co-operation Fund. This initiative, which begins in August 2004, focuses on facilitating dialogue between communities in Fiji and Vanuatu and Provincial and District governments. The project will promote the constructive engagement of communities in the budget process at sub-national level. Unlike the broader linkages identified in the V and C, however, this pilot has a specific budget theme.
2. The UNDP has requested FSPI, along with the University of the South Pacific, to be part of its regional governance programme in order to provide electoral education which will build on the governance education work that is now being undertaken as part of the V and C. This will present an opportunity to facilitate the expansion of the community governance analyses to other communities and also gives an opportunity to integrate these findings into broader electoral education.

Summary of Activities

This section of the report summarises the regional secretariat and country affiliates' activities within the Voices and Choices project. For each output, general achievements have been stated. Separate tables have been compiled for different components in a given output (Please see Annex B). Level of achievement for activities has been rated as follows:

- 1: Likely to be completely achieved
- 2: Likely to be largely achieved
- 3: Likely to be partially achieved
- 4: Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent
- 5: Unlikely to be realised
- 6: Too early to judge the extent of achievement

Table 1 Goal and Purpose

	Achievement rating	Comments
Goal – to build a sustainable future and alleviate poverty for the Pacific region by promoting good governance and democracy	2/3	The links between poverty and good governance have been clearly identified by communities. It is anticipated that community empowerment and improved linkages between communities and governance structures both outside and within them, will help build a sustainable future. However the actual concrete benefits will only be fully realised at the stage when government policies become responsive to community needs. The relatively small scale of the project and the complexity of the processes render partial achievement at this early stage a success.
Purpose – To garden good governance and democracy at all levels of society in the Pacific, with a particular focus on rural/disadvantaged communities.	2	The project has worked to increase dialogue about good governance at all levels of Pacific society. Strengthening linkages between and understanding of central and community governance structures and processes will benefit disadvantaged communities and enhance their appreciation of and commitment to it.

Table 2 Main outputs with an overall rating.

	Achievement Rating	Comments
Output 1 - Regionally and culturally representative "virtual" Pacific Centre for Good Governance established	2	The RGAG is a committed body and shows significant potential to be a force for good governance in the region. The governance inventory is perhaps the most important piece of information/data relating to governance in the region.
Output 2 - Regional Governance Mapping and Research	1	This component has been completed and the results have been launched and form the basis of the education component.
Output 3 - Culturally appropriate in-country governance/civic education training incorporating the results of RGM and research	2	Community sensitive action plans have been developed and affiliates are working at facilitating linkages with government and other stakeholders toward the implementation of these plans. Civic education component is at various levels in the different countries. Strengthening existing governance structures is also an important activity.
Overall assessment of output delivery	2	Overall outputs 1 and 2 have been either largely or completely achieved and the education component is underway. This is a very important component as it takes the outcomes of the research to communities. The project management believes that the fourth year needs to focus very tightly on working with communities and on dissemination and partnership work with other projects.

Inputs/Activities

a) Appropriateness (quality):

The community work (KAP and PLA work) was completed to an acceptable standard in all countries. Many of the difficulties with the process stemmed from the absence of a regional meeting at the inception of the project. Standardisation of method and selection criteria and the addressing of capacity issues was slowed progress in Kiribati and Fiji. Following the June 2003 meeting and in completing the community governance analyses these issues were satisfactorily resolved.

b) Sufficiency (quantity):

The primary concern of the implementing agencies was that the funds available for project implementation were limited and thus representative selection of communities was difficult. Funding also made regular and prolonged community work difficult.

c) Efficiency (timeliness)

The delays encountered (particularly in Solomons) in 2002 have been resolved and the governance analyses in 2003 was completed on time. The annual work plans for year four have been received from all four implementing agencies.

Overall Assessment: The project has, despite some difficulties with methodology, political instability and funding sufficiency been able to achieve two of its three outputs and is in a good position to meet the third educational output in the coming, final year.

Lessons Learned

Please summarise below any lessons arising from this project that may be of use for future work:

1. Project level lessons

Funding for project implementation was a constant challenge. FSPI has provided retrospective payments to their affiliates which has had a negative impact on progress. The limited funds available for activities made effective and regular community work difficult. This is being addressed by FSPI. Another lesson that was learnt is that FSPI staff should visit project sites regularly to improve the overall management and effectiveness of the project. This will be accounted for in future budgets should the V and C continue.

2. Sector level or Thematic lessons

It was found that Governance is something that people 'live' on a day to day basis and understanding is innate and difficult to translate. It can not be assumed that individuals will comprehend terminology which professionals in governance use routinely. This was a challenge for the governance mapping and the community work. Communities on the ground automatically link governance (i.e. structures and processes for decision making and implementing decisions (or not)) with their practical everyday concerns. Community PLA and KAP work therefore should take a practical as well as an awareness raising approach to governance because communities own experience is that good governance is linked to improved standards of living.

3. General development lessons

Active economic and political change at national level relies on the political will of government. It is a process over which communities can feel they have little control. The V and C has worked to help facilitate dialogue between communities and government (local or national) but it may take many years before this work is translated into robust government policy which is responsive to communities needs. The community aspect of V and C has worked to raise awareness amongst communities about structures and processes of governance and has isolated the particular governance or livelihood issue of concern to them. However communities want to see tangible changes and benefits in their communities from a project like this and therefore governance projects need to deliver tangible results through the project as well as raising the level of awareness of 'rights' and 'governance structures'. This can be done through by working with communities to actively engage with governance structures on an issue of concern and seeing it through to completion.

Attachments

Annex A Regional Governance Advisory Group members

Annex B Details on progress on Activities by Output

Annex C Governance Article published December 2003

Annex A

Output 1: Activities and Achievements

The Regional Governance Advisory Group members (RGAG)

The Regional Governance Advisory Group (RGAG) is made up of the following eminent persons in the Pacific:

- [REDACTED] (Solomons)
- [REDACTED] (Australia)
- [REDACTED] (Vanuatu)
- [REDACTED] (New Zealand)
- [REDACTED] Hawaii (USA)
- [REDACTED] (Kiribati)
- [REDACTED] (Fiji)
- [REDACTED] (Fiji)
- [REDACTED], Fiji (United Kingdom).
- [REDACTED]

The RGAG's role, agreed at the meeting in 2002 is as follows:

- i. To provide advice to the Governance Project Team.
- ii. To advocate good governance principles in general and the "Voices & Choices" Project in particular.
- iii. To promote the long term goal of the project in addressing peace and stability in the region through building on good governance at community level.
- iv. To encourage governments in the Pacific region to implement in their own countries regional declarations pertaining to good governance and the environment.
- v. To monitor the quality of the project and ensure in particular that community level concerns are taken into account in national and regional good governance policies.
- vi. To review progress reports and advise on ways and means of improving outputs both at national and regional levels.
- vii. To encourage donors to financially support the project.

Annex B

Table 3: Details on progress on Activities

Output	Achievements	Rating	Comments on Progress
1.1 Identify core members for Pacific Centre who are from the region, and from diverse backgrounds.	Members have been identified.	1	Please see Project progress section of this report (page 4 and also Annex A)
1.2 Develop web-site & internet conferencing/ communication with members	Website has been developed.	1	The material to be uploaded onto the website has been edited and put into PDF format. It is currently being put in by a volunteer.
1.3 Hold first regional roundtable to establish members, discuss CGMs, and Centre governance themes	Core RGAG members met in Suva in December 2002.	1	The inventory is complete and in a form to be installed on the webpage
1.4 Put together an inventory and establish a database on organisations involved in governance in the region	Regional inventory of organisations involved in governance within Forum Island countries is near completion.	1	At regional level formal links have been established with CCF, ECREA and RRT through the governance forum. Links to USP and UNDP have been developed and USP, UNDP have mapped out areas of ongoing collaboration including community electoral education.
1.5 <i>Establish (formal and informal) linkages with other stakeholders implementing similar projects e.g. USP School of Law, RRRT, Transparency International, Citizens Constitutional Forum etc.</i>	Informal linkages have been established with a variety of other stakeholders implementing similar projects.	1	Regular internet communication between FSPI and the four national partners continues.
1.6 Continue internet conferencing and e-mail dialogue		1	This has been re-scheduled to September 2004 due to the need to replace 3 departing members and scheduling problems.
1.7			FSPI has published 5 articles in a

Hold second regional roundtable to discuss results of CGM			regional periodical (Islands Business) two of which are on community governance (see Annex C). The CGM reports have been distributed to national and regional partners
1.8 Begin regional awareness media campaigns with Centre		2	This is ongoing
1.9 Continue dialogue and oversight of Voices and Choices project by internet		2	3 presentations of the V and C project findings have been delivered to governance roundtables. Another Fiji workshop is planned for August 16 th with civil society partners (PCDF and Ecumenical Centre for Research, Education and Advocacy)
1.10 Hold 2 to 3 roundtables per year		1	ADB has approved a project (beginning August 2004) focusing on Fiji and Vanuatu by linking Communities and government aligning provincial budgets and policies with community needs from the V and C Community Action Plans. A project proposal for community Governance education with UNDP and USP is in process.
1.11 Forge collaborative project activities with partners in the Pacific Centre for Good Governance, and other stakeholders, in the areas of human/civil rights and civil society capacity building		2	
		1	

Table 4: Component 2.1: Pacific governance structures and pressure points identified in rural/grassroots communities

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments on Progress
2.1.1 Identify and engage appropriate technical people to conduct community governance	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved		1	See Community Governance Reports (1-5) ¹

¹ The Community Governance reports are all available on request. They have not been included as part of the report as they are very long (100+ pages in length).

mappings in target countries						
2.1.2 Select sampling of communities in target countries in Solomon Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Vanuatu (and East Timor)	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	See Community Governance Reports (1-5)
2.1.3 Implement CGMs in identified communities which will in a participatory way analyse with communities the relevant structures- their strengths and weaknesses, and opportunities for improvements	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	See Community Governance Reports (1-5)
2.1.4 Examine in-depth priority issues raised and check with communities through community radio programmes or video shows	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	See Community Governance Reports (1-5)
2.1.5 Process data/information collected and prepare for relevant identified target audiences	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	See Community Governance Reports (1-5)

Table 5: Component 2.2: Information gathered through mapping is disseminated locally, nationally, and regionally

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments on Progress
2.2.1 Written and audio-visual of the CGM produced and distributed for the participating communities and wider stakeholder groups	Achieved Written reports distributed to all communities. 2 videos of CGM and discussions produced and distributed.	Achieved Written reports distributed to communities and stakeholder groups.	Achieved Written reports are being compiled.	Achieved Video and Written reports have been completed and presented	1	
2.2.2 Information on CGM made available to wider regional and international community	Achieved Information disseminated to national and international communities for purposes of addressing priority issues and funding.	Achieved Information disseminated to international communities.	Achieved.	Achieved	1	See progress report

Table 6: Component 2.3: Relevant linkages between local community governance structures and current formal governance structures, systems, and processes

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments
2.3.1 Engage consultant to do case studies in target countries	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	The DFID funding allowed teams to undertake detailed case study work as part of the CG reports. Separate reports on traditional and

2.3.2 Collate CGM findings and local government case studies to construct regional governance map	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	modern legal frameworks were conducted for Vanuatu
2.3.3 Prepare appropriate reports and publicise findings widely	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	
2.3.4 Post information on web site					2	Material has been prepared and is currently being posted

**Table 7: Component 3.1:
Communities that participate in the Community Governance mapping will have increased understanding of community governance issues and greater participation in community governance**

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments
3.1.1 For each community produce a Community Action Plan for strengthened community governance.	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	All CAPs were completed by December 2003. Vanuatu has included 2 more communities with whom CAPs are now being prepared
3.1.2 Facilitate CAP implementation in each community.	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	2	Facilitation continues in Kiribati and Vanuatu, V and C communities are being linked to an NZFPAID trust fund (administered by FSPI) and in Fiji and Solomons being linked to Cotonou funding.
3.1.3 Build capacity of each community to strengthen governance structures and increase self-sufficiency	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	Capacity in each community has been built...more monitoring and evaluation is required to determine impact on self-sufficiency

3.1.4 Nurture good governance in each community in facilitating development projects particularly involving livelihood and management of cash income	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	All communities see good governance and development being inextricably linked. This is reflected in the CAPs.
---	----------	----------	----------	----------	---	---

Table 8: Component 3.2: Increased awareness and access to information on governance issues for school students and teachers

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments
3.2.1 Recruit consultant as needed. Design materials	Achieved	Not yet Started	Partially achieved-work plan developed and consultant recruited consultant	Partially Achieved Material Design in process.	2	These activities will be addressed in year 4
3.2.2 Collaborate with partners to train trainers	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	2	
3.2.3 Forge partnerships with Ministry of Education and teacher networks		Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	Partially Achieved	2	
3.2.4 Train teachers	Not yet started	Not yet	Not yet	Not yet	2	In all countries collaboration with the Ministries of Education curriculum

3.2.5 Furnish relevant materials	Not yet started	started Not yet started	started Not yet started	started Not yet started	2	sections is in progress Not started yet but likely to be achieved.
3.2.6 Forge programmatic linkages	Not yet started	Not yet started	Not yet started	Not yet started	2	
3.2.7 Design and produce radio shows	Not yet started	Not yet started	Not yet started	Not yet started	2	

**Table 9: Component 3.3:
Culturally appropriate in-country materials and activities applying research results to informal community education**

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments
3.3.1 Design training and outreach materials on human/civil rights, incorporating CGM results and other relevant materials produced and effectively utilized by stakeholders for community education. Recruit materials, development consultants as needed.	Not yet started	Not yet started	Not yet started	Not yet started	2	
3.3.2 Conduct training of community level trainers as needed.	Achieved	Partially achieved	Achieved	Partially achieved	1	These activities have not yet been started but likely to be achieved

3.3.3 Forge partnerships with local governance structures as appropriate.					2	
3.3.4 Monitor use of materials in a sample of communities and partners					2	
3.3.5 Conduct community level training through village/grassroots outreach and radio broadcasts.						

**Table 10: Component 3.4
Culturally appropriate in-country materials and activities applying research results to advocacy and policy decisions.**

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments
3.4.1 Provision of results, information, materials and resources to national committee members and regional virtual centre members for wider application, policy discussions, advocacy					2	Governance analyses to be discussed at the next RGAG meeting in September 04 and next steps agreed.
3.4.2 Provision of results, information, materials, and resources to national NGOs, churches, and other civil					2	

society networks.					2	Through the virtual governance centre, regular presentations and publications information will continue to be distributed.
3.4.3 Provision of results, information, materials and resources to regional and international networks and fora.						

Table 11: Component 3.5
Statistically significant increase in civic engagement within communities participating in the project in target countries (based on baseline surveys)

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments
3.5.1 Design survey to collect baseline data					3	The activity is currently being undertaken for target communities.
3.5.2 Conduct surveys to monitor civic engagement at 2 year intervals if possible. These should include participation in elections and understanding of election process, campaigns, advocacy, etc.					2	These activities are planned for year 4
3.5.3 Conduct and/or facilitate partners' community level outreach and training in civic processes and advocacy through local community structures and radio or drama shows.					2	These activities are planned for year 4

Table 12: Component 3.6

Forge partnerships with local governance structures as appropriate in order to facilitate effective governance for local communities served

Activities and Achievements

Activities	Fiji	Kiribati	Solomon Islands	Vanuatu	Rating	Comments
3.6.1 Promote discussions of findings at national level to encourage policy and other relevant changes to improve governance at local government levels.	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved	1	All countries have seen this process initiated and is ongoing
3.6.2 Contribute to policy papers as needed to bring about necessary policy changes.					2	Collaboration with government community governance issues is ongoing