
SPC/USAID LESSONS LEARNT WORKSHOP REPORT

Project Title: *“Vegetation and land cover mapping and improving food security for building resilience to a changing climate in Pacific island communities”*

Novotel Hotel, Nadi, FIJI

19th – 20th October, 2015



Contents

List of Abbreviations & Acronyms.....	III
List of Figures	IV
1 BACKGROUND.....	1
2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES.....	2
3 PARTICIPANTS OF THE WORKSHOP	2
4 PROCESS.....	3
5 OUTCOMES	4
5.1 General Points.....	4
5.2 Successes.....	5
5.3 Lessons for the Future	6
5.4 Sharing of Experiences.....	8
5.5 Presentation of findings of the End of Project Internal Assessment.....	8
6 SUMMARY.....	11
7 EVALUATION	11
8 ANNEX.....	13
8.1 List of Annexes	13
ANNEX I Agenda	i
ANNEX II Participant List	ii
ANNEX III Country Achievements Timeline.....	iv
ANNEX IV Transcribed Notes from Group work and Discussions.....	ix

List of Abbreviations & Acronyms

CC	Climate Change
HIES	Household Income and Expenditure Survey
MAL	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
MECDM	Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Disaster and Meteorology
NPC	National Project Coordinator
PICTs	Pacific Island Countries and Territories
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community

List of Figures

Description	Page
Figure 1	1
Figure 2	2
Figure 3	3
Figure 4	3
Figure 5	4
Figure 6	5
Figure 7	6
Figure 8	7
Figure 9	8
Figure 10	11

1 BACKGROUND

The project, “Vegetation and land cover mapping and improving food security for building resilience to a changing climate in Pacific island communities”, is a USD4 million project which aims to assess and implement innovative techniques and management approaches to increase the climate change resilience of terrestrial food production systems for communities in selected PICTs (Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu). The project period is from January 2013 to September 2015. However, given the recently approved no cost extension period, the project will end in February 2016.

As part of the project closure phase, SPC has undertaken an end of project evaluation and gender impact assessment to inform new project designs and delivery of cross-sectoral regional projects/programmes.

The “Lessons Learnt” meeting with project stakeholders aimed to document key achievements and lessons from the SPC/USAID Project. The outcomes of this discussion will complement the findings from the SPC/USAID end of project assessment and the gender impact assessment. It will also be an opportunity for project stakeholders to increase their awareness of the project achievements and provide input to the two project assessment reports.

An independent facilitator was recruited to facilitate the workshop (refer to *Figure 1*).



Figure 1: The independent consultant, Ms Seema Deo, giving a brief introduction of the workshop.

This report outlines the process and findings of the workshop.

2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

After the formal introduction of the workshop and agenda (attached as *Annex 1*), the objectives and expected results were then briefly presented by the SPC USAID Project Manager, Ms Vuki Buadromo (refer to *Figure 2*), as follows;

- End of project evaluation results presented, discussed and verified.
- Project achievements and Lessons Learnt shared and documented.

Minor housekeeping rules were also announced before the meeting proper commenced.



Figure 2: The SPC/USAID Project Manager, Ms Vuki Buadromo, officially opening the Workshop.

3 PARTICIPANTS OF THE WORKSHOP

The workshop was attended by 24 participants, inclusive of 10 females and 14 males.

These participants were from the implementing countries; Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu, including the respective National Project Coordinators, finance personnel, agriculture and climate change specialists.

A list of participants is attached as *Annex 2*.

4 PROCESS

The highly interactive workshop encouraged participants to share their successes by completing a “walk through” country project timeline (attached as *Annex III*). The process of developing the timeline allowed all participants to see what other countries had done, stimulated discussion and provided a visual representation of project achievements, including gaps (refer to *Figures 3 & 4*).



Figure 3: Part of the completed “walk through” timeline constructed by the participants.



Figure 4: A participant from Solomon Islands adds an event to the timeline (left), while a participant from Samoa presents on their activities (right).

A facilitated discussion helped highlight successes for each country in terms of what they believed to have worked well. The level of and need for gender inclusivity was addressed during this and subsequent discussion. Participants then worked in mixed country groups to delve further into the operational aspects of the project implementation and to consider improvements and gaps (documentation is attached as *Annex IV*). This also served as an opportunity to share experiences between countries (refer to *Figure 5*).



Figure 5: The country participants sharing experiences in their group discussions, from left; Samoa & Kiribati, Fiji & Tonga, Vanuatu & Solomon Islands.

Following a report back session, the Project Manager, Ms Vuki Buadromo, presented the results of the independent end-of-project evaluation. Further discussion and a “round the table” commentary session provided additional opportunity for clarification and highlighting of important issues.

5 OUTCOMES

5.1 General Points

1. Although the project period is from 2013 – 2015, the work to develop the project and establish relevant agreements commenced in 2011/2012. The work in 2012 largely involved consultations with the government and getting approval for the project.
2. With the exception of Tonga and Vanuatu, national project coordinators (NPCs) were not recruited until the end of the first quarter of 2014. However assessments and site selection, establishment of nurseries and animal husbandry facilities had commenced prior to this with technical input by SPC.
3. The main reason for delay in recruitment of the NPCs was related to availability of funds.
4. The range of activities include setting up of fruit tree nurseries, piggery and poultry units and “farmer field school” training programmes. Reduction in use of pesticides, awareness raising on management and control of rhinoceros beetle, and leadership training have also been addressed as part of the project.
5. Samoa noted that some activities have been conducted in partnership with or have built on other initiatives such as POETCOM (organic farming).
6. The project in Fiji supported a relocated community with establishing its agriculture programme.
7. The ‘whole of island’ approach of Kiribati and Solomon Islands has also meant improved integration across partners and better direction of resources for the benefit of the community.

8. Although gender inclusivity was not mentioned specifically, participants noted that different groups of the community had benefited from different aspects of the project. This included women and youth in several cases.

5.2 Successes

Participants were asked to state what they were most proud of in terms of their projects.

1. Exit Strategy/Project Sustainability – there was confidence in some cases that the training, involvement of the community and the focus on leadership and governance stands the project in good stead for sustainability once the funding ends.
2. Community involvement – participants felt that the project has been able to engage the community in a participatory and active manner (reflecting on the project sustainability aspects).



Figure 6: Participants engaging in group discussions and sharing experiences on what worked best for their respective project activities.

3. Governance mechanisms/collaboration – because of the cross sectoral approach, agriculture and climate change experts have come together for the first time.
4. Diversification of production – participants noted that the project encouraged and supported animal husbandry and planting of a range of crops and fruit trees as a food security measure and that this has encouraged greater interest within the community.
5. Implementation of tangible projects in remote locations – noted that often projects tend to be run in easy to access locations while this project allowed those most in need to benefit. (In the case of Vanuatu, the National Advisory Board on CC decides where CC projects are implemented and accessibility was one of the criteria – this criteria has now been removed enabling the involvement of remote areas).

6. The example was given of how the application of the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) used during this project can be used as a model for future work – overall, the training and systems from this project will be built upon and similar approaches used in upcoming projects.
7. The dedication and commitment of the NPC was commented on as key to success or otherwise of the project.

5.3 Lessons for the Future

Participants discussed key lessons that they considered would be useful in addressing future projects, which is also documented in Annex III.



Figure 7: The SPC/USAID Project Manager, Ms Vuki Buadromo, presenting the lessons learned from the end-of-project evaluation conducted.

These included:

1. The need to take into consideration traditional knowledge, skills and practices. An example was given where the community had ‘humoured’ the project personnel until they had left the site and then returned to their own way of planting, thus nullifying the input of the project. By understanding and recognising the current/traditional practices, there is a greater chance of synergising these with the science and ‘modern’ agricultural practices and thus ensuring longevity of interventions.
2. Take into account the development aspirations of the community and recognise that while the project may have a limited scope, we can still help and advise the community on how it may secure resources for their other requirements. (Example given where the community used the project to seek additional funding from other sources to continue their own development aspirations).

3. Partners need to coordinate and integrate their approaches so that the community aspirations are at the forefront – this will also ensure better community engagement.
4. Project coordinators and field officers need to be ‘speaking the same language’ so there is clear understanding of expectations and what is happening on the ground.
5. Costs of transportation requirements and of additional staff needs to be budgeted in the design phase.
6. Improve awareness among [key stakeholders] of the project and its objectives.
7. Reconsider the idea of ‘community based’ and look at options of identifying groups of individuals from within the community who will be best able to champion and implement the initiative. Suggestions include youth, women or farmers’ groups.
8. To ensure sustainability of the project in terms of maintaining knowledge and skills, suggestions were made to either second national government staff to work on the project or to re-engage project officers as much as possible. Also recommended to look at including private sector and retirees with agricultural and fisheries expertise.
9. On the issue of procurement and fund disbursement:
 - (i) It was recommended that separate bank accounts be considered similar to that of GIZ projects. However this would not be feasible for all countries where, unless funds go through Finance, they are not recognised in the government budget.
 - (ii) Consider employing a procurement officer for each country project.
10. Recommend 6-month progress meetings to be able to share information and learn from each other (similar to what was being done at this meeting – refer to *Figure 8*).



Figure 8: A group of participants listing the results of their group work activity on challenges faced in their project activities.

5.4 Sharing of Experiences

Participants noted the need to document the lessons from the project so that these could be shared to guide future projects.

Suggestions included:

1. Develop a handbook or manual that provides guidance on “do’s and don’ts”.
2. A case study or similar document that highlights the lessons – noted that a documentary film is being made, which will address this.
3. Utilise the experience and knowledge of the project coordinators.



Figure 9: Participants from Samoa and Kiribati exchanging experiences they face from their respective project activities.

5.5 Presentation of findings of the End of Project Internal Assessment

The Project Manager, Ms Vuki Buadromo, presented a summary of the findings of an End of Project Internal Assessment completed in July 2015, which outlines lessons learned from the project based on interviews with stakeholders, review of country reports, country visits and discussions with national coordinators. Key lessons and recommendations drawn from the end of project evaluation are as follows:

1. Communities expressed interest in continuing project activities on their own after project funding ends. At the same time, they noted that frequent training maintains interest and motivation. With limited resources within the agricultural extension offices, there is a risk that communities will indeed lose motivation. Several communities included individuals who could take on a trainer role if provided sufficient training. Therefore, **future projects should promote train-the-trainer courses to enable community-based trainers to supplement or take over for project staff.**
2. Community members felt comfortable with the skills they learned but often lacked clear understanding of why interventions are important. As understanding the rationale behind interventions being introduced is important for uptake, an **increased emphasis on behaviour change**

communication should be included going forward.

3. Situational analysis such as the vulnerability assessments and participatory rural appraisals carried out under the project are important for providing contextual information and baseline data to inform project design and the accompanying gender strategy. For this reason, **situational analysis teams should include representatives from cross-cutting sectors such as gender and health and collect information relevant to both of these sectors to ensure linkages to applicable sectors are recognised and the project builds in activities to promote gender equality.**
4. The vulnerability assessment and the participatory rural appraisal are to include identification of gender roles, gender timeline and a gender analysis of these and data gathered from the household income and expenditure survey (HIES) to provide information on the specific inequalities to be addressed.
5. SPC collects a wealth of data on Pacific Island countries but the assessment found that government ministries are not using the data to its fullest potential. SPC should **prioritise technical assistance on the use and application of data**, particularly in countries where capacity to conduct analysis is limited. This will not only strengthen decision making, but also increase demand for data collection at the national level.
6. The project experienced delays in financial disbursements in most countries, which in turn delayed implementation. Although the cause wasn't clear, it was likely due to a combination of unclear workplans and budgets, national procurement procedures and regulations not being followed, and routine budget cycle delays, such as annual audit periods. **Future projects would benefit from building in training for national coordinators on the national finance and procurement rules, as well as SPC's, in addition to donor rules and regulations.** Involving Ministry of Finance staff in project planning meetings would increase awareness of the project needs and timelines.
7. The USAID food security project worked differently from other SPC projects as it included staff from multiple teams and divisions. This provided the benefit of increased collaboration and a cross-sectoral approach but also caused difficulties for planning and reporting. **As SPC increasingly works across sectors, corporate structures need to adapt with clear plans put in place to address logistical concerns of cross-team engagement.**
8. Data is important to understand progress and communicate achievement however, planning and decision making at SPC is sometimes completed without data to back it up. **Projects need to develop key indicators that are collected on a regular base to inform project management and demonstrate results.** Furthermore, **record keeping needs to be strengthened in order to maintain trust in the data collected.**
9. Collection of routine monitoring data is important but resource intensive. Beneficiaries themselves, if given the proper tools and training, can collect much of the data. This frees up time from SPC and its partner governments to instead focus on validation, a much less time intensive activity. **Projects need to build in systems for beneficiaries to collect routine data and provide capacity building to support their efforts.**
10. Community members credited strong leadership and teamwork for the success of interventions. **Organisational strengthening/leadership training aimed at strengthening project management and governance skills within target groups (such as the village development committee) may improve the efficiency and effectiveness of future community based initiatives.**
11. Communicating scientific information such as climate change is best done in the beneficiary's primary language. **Technical or scientific information needs to be translated into local languages.**
12. Community members have many competing priorities between income generating activities, children, and religious activities. **Working through existing structures such as churches and schools allows project activities to complement rather than be in competition with other obligations.** In addition, religious leaders are influential and as such, their buy-in and participation is important for project success.
13. The USAID food security project didn't include a specific gender approach. While staff were aware of the importance of gender and made efforts to engage women, future projects should **ensure the**

systematic integration of gender equality strategies aligned with food security strategies at the beginning of any food security project. Furthermore, all food security projects need to take into consideration the policy direction in regards to gender equality within the specific countries and ensure that project implementation is aligned accordingly. In this regard **all food security projects should seek the engagement of the Ministry of Women in each country.**

14. Staff are generally aware of the need to mainstream gender but don't always have knowledge of concrete ways to do this. SPC should **increase awareness of its Gender Mainstreaming Strategy across the organisation**, which provides tools for gender integration. Furthermore, SPC should **implement the capacity development component of the strategy immediately to equip staff with the ability to identify gaps for gender mainstreaming in each project, conduct gender analysis and develop gender equality strategies for future food security projects.**
15. Mainstreaming gender equality is more than including the views of women or involving women in project activities. **Gender equality strategies must clearly outline how the project not only responds to addressing the practical and productive roles of women but also how it can contribute to transforming social norms and practices that are discriminatory against women.**
16. Monitoring progress towards gender equality is just as important as other data collection. **Monitoring and evaluation plans should include a mechanism to report not only how the project has benefited women in their practical and productive roles but also how gender relations have been transformed.**



Figure 10: The participants were presented the End of Project Internal Assessment, outlining lessons learned and outcomes of the Project.

6 SUMMARY

It was agreed that there is a need to strengthen the idea of sharing knowledge from projects with donors, community, government ministries, etc. While SPC successfully mobilises funds and provides support at the national level, it recognises that innovative mechanisms are needed for sharing the knowledge gained from these projects. To this end, a package of lessons learnt material is being developed. This includes a 10-15 min documentary highlighting key lessons and a report that summarises the key achievements and lists the products from the project. These will be disseminated to countries for sharing further.

7 EVALUATION

Participants had opportunity to comment on the usefulness of the workshop in writing and to also make verbal comment.

All participants indicated they considered the workshop to have been very useful or useful. Several recommended that such activities be done more regularly for such projects. The timeline development process was noted as a useful method of stimulating discussion and engaging participants. Several comments were made



regarding the value of the timeline in enabling countries to see how much they had achieved in terms of actual outcomes.

Participants also used the evaluation session as an opportunity to make final general comments on the project. Some specific comments not already outlined earlier are noted here:

- The efforts of the coordinators and staff of the project were commended, noting that working with communities is a challenging task [All].
 - The need to manage community expectations and to deliver on what is being promised under the project [To].
 - There is a need to strengthen collaboration between the CC and agriculture sector – the project has enabled some collaboration but more work is needed [Sa].
 - Strengthened awareness strategies for communities are needed [Sa].
 - Traditional farming skills need to be given value and integrated into the project to enhance potential for sustainability [Fj].
 - Impact of the project will only be seen beyond the project timeline hence important to support (through investment in capacity building) and champion those individuals/groups who are implementing activities. [Fj, So].
 - The success of a project depends on people's participation and commitment of all stakeholders to work together to produce outcomes for the project and to share experiences and techniques across communities [Fj].
 - Some issues such as finance can generally only be managed by the national governments. It is therefore necessary to identify what regional organisations can do and what must necessarily be the responsibility of countries. Countries to become accountable for this when taking on a project [Van].
 - Although gender was not part of the design, it is clear when looking at the impacts, that different groups have benefitted (eg. income generation) [Van].
 - In terms of an exit strategy, recognise existing institutions that have the capacity – look at other institutions beyond agriculture and consider building their capacity/knowledge so they can train others [Van].
-



8 ANNEX

8.1 List of Annexes

ANNEX I Agenda

ANNEX II Participant List

ANNEX III Country Achievements Timeline

ANNEX IV Transcribed notes from Group work and discussions

ANNEX I Agenda

SPC USAID Lessons Learnt & Finance Meeting
19 – 20 October, 2015
Novotel Hotel, Nadi
Programme Outline

Monday 19 October 2015			
FINANCE			
TIME	CONTENT		FACILITATOR
8.30am – 5.00pm	Bilateral meetings with PICs for project acquittals (1 ½ hours per PIC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samoa – 8.30-10.00am • Vanuatu – 10.00am -11.30am • Solomon Islands – 11.30-1.00pm • Tonga – 2.30pm-4.00pm • Kiribati – 4.00pm-5.00pm 		Sheik Irfaan/ Jenita Prakash – SPC/USAID Finance team
Tuesday 20 October 2015			
PROJECT EVALUATION/LESSONS LEARNT			
Time	Content/ Key Learning Point	Learning Activities	Facilitator
8.30am-8.50am	REGISTRATION		Ms Amelia Caucau, SPC
8.50am-9.10am	Welcome and Introductions Meeting Objectives and Programme outline		Ms Vuki Buadromo Ms Seema Deo
9.10am-9.50am	Build a project timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify key tasks and activities if the project; reflect and identify lessons 		Ms Seema Deo
9.50am-10.30am	What worked well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What did the project do well (what should we do more of) • List top significant project successes 	Group work	Ms Seema Deo
10.30-10.45am	MORNING TEA		
10.45-10.55am	Energizer		
10.55am-11.55am	What can be improved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What could have been improved in the Project • What challenges made it difficult to complete the Project • What was the most frustrating thing • What could be done differently 	Group work	Ms Seema Deo
11.55am-2.45pm	Group Presentations & Discussions		
12.45pm-1.45pm	LUNCH		
1.45pm-2.30pm	Presentation: Results of the end of Project evaluation & Discussion		Ms Vuki Buadromo
2.30pm-3.30pm	Country Assessments on Lessons Learnt (reference: Project Timeline)		Ms Seema Deo
3.30pm – 4.00pm	Wrap up/ Conclusion		
4.00pm-4.30pm	AFTERNOON TEA		

ANNEX II Participant List

**SPC USAID Lessons Learnt & Finance Meeting
19 – 20 October, 2015
Novotel Hotel, Nadi
Participants' List**

Name	Gender	Organization	Designation	Email address
FIJI				
1. Mr Inosi Yabakivou	M	SPC – LRD	Agriculture Technician	InosiY@spc.int
2. Ms Vinaisi Dilikuwai	F	Min. of Foreign Affairs	Climate Change Project Officer	vdiliku@gmail.com
KIRIBATI				
3. Ms Rutiana Kareba	F	Min. of Agriculture and Livestock	National Food Security Coordinator	ruutngai@gmail.com
4. Ms Reeten Bobai	F	Min. of Agriculture and Livestock	Account Officer	tkteingoa@gmail.com
5. Mr Kabuati Nakabuta	M	Min. of Agriculture and Livestock	Livestock Officer	k.teuriaria1984@gmail.com
SAMOA				
6. Ms Emele Meleisea-Ainuu	F	Min. of Agriculture and Fisheries	SPC/USAID Food Security Officer	emele.ainuu@maf.gov.ws
7. Ms Fonoimoana Esera	F	Min. of Natural Resources & Environment	Hydrology Officer	moana.esera@mnre.gov.ws
8. Mr Mateilili Leaana	M	Min. of Agriculture and Fisheries	Senior Information Officer	mateilili.leaana@maf.gov.ws
9. Mr Aleni Uelese	M	Min. of Agriculture and Fisheries	National IPM Project Coordinator	aleni.uelese@maf.gov.ws
SOLOMON ISLANDS				

10. Ms Nelly Kere	F	Min. of Environment, Climate Change & Meteorology	National Climate Change Coordinator	nzkere@gmail.com
11. Mr Mark Biloko	M	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	Food Security Coordinator	mbiloko@gmail.com
12. Mr Paul T. Ne'e	M	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	Agriculture Financial Controller	Paul.Nee@sig.gov.sb
TONGA				
13. Mr Manu P. Manuofetoa	M	SPC-EU GCCA Project	National Coordinator	manuofetoa_m@yahoo.com
14. Mr Toifalafehi Moala	M			fehimoala@hotmail.com
15. Mr Lorfan Pomana	M	Min. of Agriculture, Food, Forestry and Fisheries	Accountant	lorfan.pomana@maff.gov.to
VANUATU				
16. Mr Esron Mark Vano	M	National Advisory Board on Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction	Women's Economic Empowerment Officer	evano@vanuatu.gov.vu
17. Mr Mark Vurobaravu	M	Department of Agriculture and Rural Development	Agriculture Officer	mvurobaravu@vanuatu.gov.vu
SPC STAFF				
18. Jalesi Mateboto	M	SPC – LRD	Forester	jalesim@spc.int
19. Asinate Wainiqolo	F	SPC – RMC	RMC	asinatew@spc.int
20. Cenon Padolina	M	SPC	FGR Officer	cenonp@spc.int
21. Kelepi Koroi	M	SPC	RMC	kelepik@spc.int
22. Amelia Caucau	F	SPC/USAID	Research Assistant	ameliac@spc.int
Facilitators				
23. Ms Seema Deo	F	Independent Consultancy	Consultant	seema@seemadeo.com
24. Ms Vuki Buadromo	F	SPC/USAID	Project Manager	VukiB@spc.int

ANNEX III Country Achievements Timeline

Year 2012

Project Manager	FIJI	KIRIBATI	SAMOA	SOLOMON IS.	TONGA	VANUATU
JANUARY <i>Project Designed Jun-Sep -SPC/USAID Agreement signed</i>		Mapping Activities commence				
APRIL	-Project Manager recruited -USAID reporting due					
MAY	SPC/USAID implementation workplan endorsed Communications between PICs on LOA, Project					
JUNE <i>Communications between PICs on LOA, Project</i>				-Project consultation with MAL, SPC and Choiseul Province		
JULY <i>Country leads identified</i>		-V&A programme				
AUGUST	Fiji sites selected and endorsed by government					
SEPTEMBER <i>Communications between PICs on LOA, Project</i>	First tranche of funding received	-SPC meet with MELAD and Office of the President				
OCTOBER	PRA in Sabeto					
NOVEMBER						
DECEMBER						

Year 2013

Project Manager	FIJI	KIRIBATI	SAMOA	SOLOMON IS.	TONGA	VANUATU
JANUARY						
FEBRUARY					Food Security Officer recruited (SPC)	Country lead recruited – Gibson Susumu
MARCH				CHICCAP first meeting		
APRIL	Scoping Narikoso, Kadavu				PRA in Eva, Tongatofu & Vava'u	Selection of project sites (SPC, DARD) on 25/04/13
MAY						
JUNE	2 nd trip identification of food security component			PRA		
JULY						

AUGUST		Cabinet approve project (WOI)			LOA signed identification of Project sites	Ureparapara PRA (SPC, DARD)
SEPTEMBER	Agroforestry training in Nagado, Sabeto Fj -establishment of agroforestry farm in Nagado	V&A Abaiang	Agreement signed (MAF-SPC/USAID)			
OCTOBER	Liaising with other govt. ministries for PRA; Min of Women, Natural resources and Agriculture -PRA	Presentation of results from V&A -First trip to Abaiang for USAID Project			Recruit Project Coordinator	
NOVEMBER		-Abaiang implementation plan approved by IC & IDC		2 nursery2 chicken house, both at Choiseul	1 st tranche for project implementation	Advert, interview and selection of Vanuatu Coordinator
DECEMBER				MoU by MAL/SPC/MoFL	Establishment of 3 nurseries in project sites	LoA signed – SPC/Van govt. on 05/12/13

Year 2014

Project Manager	FIJI	KIRIBATI	SAMOA	SOLOMON IS.	TONGA	VANUATU
JANUARY						Coordinator contract starts
FEBRUARY		Agreement signed between SPC and MELAD		Food security officer contract signed	Pig and poultry husbandry trainings	
MARCH	Present findings of Sabeto landuse and CC VA Planting 2k pineapple tops, 80 fruit trees, set up of nursery, Distribution of Tivoli, and planted by each household in Narikoso strengthened network and partnership with MoA				construction of concrete piggeries in Kolonga; construction of local poultry sheds; Pig and poultry training VV & Eva	Agreement to work with Torba TVET training program; Vegetable trainings on Sola and Ureparapara; set up project office in Port Villa

APRIL	Fiji NPC recruited				Construction poultry shed in Eva and concrete piggeries in Mouma	
MAY		Village Project Assistant recruited in Abaiang -Project implemented in 3 villages in Abaiang	Recruitment of National project coordinator; land clearance for project sites Sapapali and Savaia; community training on plant propagation at Sapapali	Demonstration of pest repellent	Construction of concrete piggeries in Tofise; Construction of Vavau Poultry sheds	Agroforestry training at VARTC, Santo; Vanuatu Agriculture Policy Workshop, Torba
JUNE	-AHP Training -crop production training -present land use survey -establish communal yam farm			Funds released from MoFT; Piggery and Honey-bee training; All activities on workplan continue		
JULY		National Coordinator recruited -re-visit for training (hands on) at Abaiang		Nursery training		USAID & TVET training on crops, vegetables
AUGUST	-Planning on livestock intervention -consensus on bee-keeping and poultry farm -agreement to start with 90 layers and 100 meat bird + 3 bee hives	-Renovation of livestock -Launching of project in North Tarawa		Chicken husbandry; Agroforest starts	Construction of Biogas; Agroforestry training in Hango, Eva	2 nd tranche of funds received into Vanuatu on 18/08/14
SEPTEMBER			Complete nursery at Savaia (Upolu)	Pest and Disease training		Vanuatu Climate Zone quiz; Charter boat trip from Aanto to Torba to supply planting materials; Build 10 dryers in Ureparapara; establishment of crop nursery at Ureparapara/Sola; establishment of food crops, fruit trees in Ureparapara and Sola; Loading, shipment and deployment of construction materials

OCTOBER	Korobebe agroforestry In Narikoso; training on tissue culture; Discussions on future development plans and exit strategies with committee and village; harvesting of tomatoes (65kg), capsicum (55kg) and eng. Cabbage (108kg); maintenance of demo farm	Implementati on of project in North Tarawa		Goat fence completed and stocked		Build house and install tele-radio in Sola/Ureparapara; Construction of copra dock in Ureparapara; 1 st Vanuatu Steering Committee meeting in Santo; Vanuatu Agr. Policy validation Workshop; Construction of aquaculture ponds in Sola -Construction of goats and poultry sheds
NOVEMBER	Naboutini Demo farm started		Savaia Piggery in Upolu; Training on CC (MAF and MNRE);awareness ad on CC aired for 8 months	-Contouring; Honey-bee projects start	On-farm demo approach (TT, VV, Eva)	Visibility signboards produced and erected at sites; World Food Day Celebration and launch of project facilities
DECEMBER		Abaiang Strategic plan Workshop	Establish and promote FFS on mucuna and Taro (Savaii); Agri-business (Upolu and Savaii)			

Year 2015

Project Manager	FIJI	KIRIBATI	SAMOA	SOLOMON IS.	TONGA	VANUATU
JANUARY			Establish Farmer Field School on Taro & Mucuna at Savaia, Upolu	Piggery Project starts		
FEBRUARY	Narikoso livestock interview				Broiler chicken training in Tonga	
MARCH <i>USAID Coordinators Workshop</i>		Public awareness on taro beetle in North Tarawa	-Piggery at Sapapali -Savaia piggery completed		-Farmer Field School approach, TT, VV, Eva -Agroforestry training	
APRIL		Home-gardening competition at North Tarawa and Abaiang	-Rhino. beetle training -training for trainers on extension on climate change	Rural farmers visit to Honiara to see demo 3 months training (Apr-June) -evaluation on project site	Received 2 nd tranche of funds	

MAY	Narikoso SPC/USAID evaluation; Narikoso handing over (project)	-hands on training N.Tarawa; Coconut mapping at Christmas Island	-Piggery and Poultry training by SPC specialist -End of project and gender evaluation	-Pacific way document project (RMT) -construction of Santo piggery centre		
JUNE		-N.Tarawa food security competition; USAID project cooking training at N.Tarawa; Consultation for extension og project in Abaiang Participaretory Guarantee System and consultation at Abaiang			Broiler chicken training	GIS mapping attachment at GSD – SPC (June-July)
JULY	sharing of challenges and success stories of the initiatives that were implemented in Sabeto district; conduct evaluation with SPC/USAID project stakeholders for Fiji	Abaiang Food Security competition	Poultry unit at Savaia			Coordinator stopped attending work
AUGUST	Narikoso Evaluation; SLA; V&A	Extension of Project in Abaiang to 3 more village	-complete FFS programme at Savaia, Upolu -Sapapalii Piggery completed	Liquid fertilizer demonstration	Agroforestry training in Vava’u	
SEPTEMBER <i>No-cost project extension approved</i>	Landcare training in Sabeto	Follow-up visit to Abaiang – 3 new villages, school visit (High School) and chicken farm			Agroforestry training in Vava’u	Coordinator suspended; Torba landcover mapping and field verification/training
OCTOBER		POETCOM Scholarship for Abaiang	Establishment of Sapapalii Poultry	Stocking of Piggery project		
NOVEMBER						
DECEMBER						

ANNEX IV Transcribed Notes from Group work and Discussions

Country Group work

COUNTRY	TONGA/FIJI	SAMOA/KIRIBATI	VANUATU/SOLOMON ISLANDS
Q1. What could have been improved?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project management a) Co-ordination (within, external, donors) b) Procurement process (lots of red tape causing delays in implementation) c) Recruitment process d) Criterion of site selection – (needs-based? Our needs or benefits?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Implementation a) Involvement of all KEY stakeholders b) To continue guidance on same community project activity after handing over e.g. livestock <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of traditional knowledge and skills • Integration with other partners • Consideration of development aspiration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministries/project and the community agreement on project criteria and activities • Fisheries component should have been included as part of the project in case of food security • Planning process be shortened and implementation process be prioritized • More awareness on project objectives and activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures of handling funds within Ministry – now have SPC office • Selection of project sites – the same communities get selected and then don't get engaged
Q2. What are some challenges?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community participants • Transportation (access to outer islands) • Mindset of people (attitude and behaviour change) • Procurement processes • Long-term commitment form partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speed up recruitment process and more staff • Capacity building for project staff/recruits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short time frame 18 months rather than the 3 years <i>[need the full 3 years to get things done]</i> • Ownership of land – <i>[need]</i> agreement to use

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting works programs for community and project 		
Q3. What was most frustrating?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long hours boat ride in degraded boat condition • Partners NOT turning up at project sites • Lack of commitment • Time management from community • Project co-ordinators and field co-ordinators NOT speaking the same language • Internal politics within communities • Delay in fund disbursement from project team 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for a vehicle • Or fund provided in the budget for hire b. Too much process required by MoF ahead of releasing fund c. Political interference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrequent shipping services – eg a copra project that included building a dock and is now attracting more ships to come to the island
Q4. What could be done differently?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund disbursement through separate bank accounts (e.g. GIZ projects) • Replication of concepts/adoption of potential/modern technology • Employ procurement officer for each country projects • Take into account traditional farming skills (traditional farming vs. new techniques farming) • Project staff to be seconded from National Government to ensure project sustainability and (maintenance of knowledge and skills) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group oriented rather than community based eg a group of farmers <i>[who share the same goal]</i> • More research on climate change related crops, livestock and fisheries activities • Private sector inclusion and inclusion of retirees with agricultural and fisheries expertise • 6 months progress meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assets security – put in place facilities to protect the assets under the project – trying to address this and showcase this as a model • Communication – radio system installed as part of the project – look into use of more modern forms of technology to aid communications • Stakeholder participation - so they can take over the project <i>[upon project closure]</i> eg Choiseul

