

**TEBTEBBA**

**The Indigenous Peoples' International  
Centre for Policy Research and Education  
Baguio, Republic of the Philippines**

**Report on Mainstreaming Gender into  
Fiji's REDD+ and Emissions Reduction  
Program (ER-P) for Forest-Dependent  
Peoples**

**(As Part of the Forest-Carbon  
Partnership Facility in East Asia and the  
Pacific and the South Asia Region)**

**August 2019**



#### Contents Amendment Record

This report has been issued and amended as follows:

Issue	Revision	Description	Date	Approved by
Ver 1	1.1	GAP first draft	May 2019	Chris
Ver 2	2.0.1	Updated and revised draft re-ordered and updated	July/ August 2019	Chris and Shane

	<b>Acronyms and Abbreviation</b>
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ALTA	Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Act
BSM	Benefit Sharing Mechanism
BSP	Benefit Sharing Plan
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
CF	Carbon Fund
CMP	Community Management Plan
CRA	Community REDD+ Agreement
CSO	Civil Society Organization
EAP	East Asia and the Pacific
EMA	Environmental Management Act
ER-P	Emission Reduction Program (area)
ER-PD	Emissions Reduction Program Document
ERPA	Emission Reduction Payment Agreement
ESMF	Environmental and Social Management Framework
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FFHCOP	Fiji Forest Harvesting Codes of Practice
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
FGRM	Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism
GAP	Gender Action Plan
GOF	Government of Fiji
HH	Household
HIES	Household Income and Expenditure Survey
ILO 169	International Labor Organization Convention (ILO) 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples
ILUP	Integrated Land Use Planning
ILUP/IDLUP	Integrated land use plan/ Integrated District land use plan
IMR	Infant Mortality Rates
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
Mataqali	A Mataqali is one clan made up of several Tokatoka (a family unit), several Mataqali will make up the larger tribe or Yavusa
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MOF	Ministry of Forestry
MRV	Monitoring, Reporting and Verification
MSL	Mean Sea Level
MWCPA	Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation
NASDP	National Agricultural Sector Development Plan
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NRT	Natural Resource Transect
NTFP	Non- Timber Forest Product
NWPA	National Women's Plan of Action
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
OP/ BP	Operational Policy / Bank Policy of the World Bank
PA	Protected Area
PF	Process Framework (part of the WB safeguard measures)
PMU	Project Management Unit

	<b>Acronyms and Abbreviation</b>
PPP	Participatory Planning Processes
RAP	Resettlement Action Plan (part of the WB safeguard measures)
REL	(Forest) Reference Emission Level
RPF	Resettlement Policy Framework (part of the WB safeguard measures)
SAR	South Asia Region
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SERNA	Socio-Economic and REDD+ Needs Assessment
SESA	Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management
SIS/SOI	Safeguard Information System/Summary of Information
Tikina	District
TLTB	iTaukei Land Trust Board
TORs	Terms of Reference
TWG	Technical Working Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WB	World Bank
YMST	Yaubula Management Support Teams
	<b>Weights and Measures</b> m = meters; ha = hectares
	<b>Currency</b> M = million; k = thousand Currency Unit = US Dollar USD1 = 2.099 Fiji Dollar (5 <sup>th</sup> of May, 2019).

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Background and introduction</b>	<b>11</b>
1.1	<i>Introduction to the study</i>	11
1.2	<i>Scope of the study</i>	11
1.3	<i>Issues to be raised</i>	12
1.4	<i>Field verification and sample size</i>	13
1.5	<i>Tools and techniques</i>	14
1.6	<i>Overall design of the Emission Reduction Program</i>	14
1.7	<i>The Emission Reduction Program sub-components and gender issues</i>	16
1.8	<i>Conclusion</i>	17
<b>2</b>	<b>Gender in Fiji and the Gender Action Plan</b>	<b>18</b>
2.1	<i>Introduction</i>	18
2.2	<i>Patriarchy and Fijian society</i>	18
2.3	<i>Women and land rights</i>	21
<b>3</b>	<b>The Proposed Gender Action Plan</b>	<b>28</b>
3.1	<i>Objectives of the Gender Action Plan</i>	28
3.2	<i>The Gender Action Plan</i>	28
3.3	<i>Integrating the GAP into the Emission Reduction Program</i>	38
3.4	<i>Post the Validation Workshop</i>	39
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Annexes</b>	<b>44</b>
5.1	<i>Women and Consultations</i>	44
5.2	<i>Livelihoods, Poverty and Forest use</i>	50
5.3	<i>Socio-economic impacts mitigations identified in the SESA and links to the GAP actions</i>	65
5.4	<i>Example of Focus Group Discussion</i>	78
5.5	<i>Validation workshop</i>	79
5.6	<i>Locations visited in Fiji</i>	83
	<i>Bibliography</i>	85

## Tables and Figures

### Tables

Table 1.1 Population and Total Area of Divisions and Provinces in the ER-P Area.....	15
<b>Table 2.1 International Conventions and National Policies with a Gender Dimension.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Table 3.1 Summary of GAP Activities for Fiji's ER-P.....	29
Table 5.1 Location, Date, Village Type, Activity Type, Numbers and Ethnicity of Participants .....	45
Table 5.2 Characteristics of Low-income Households in the ER-P Accounting Area.....	53
Table 5.3 Common NTFPs.....	58

Table 5.4 Summary of Livelihoods Issues and Forest Dependency .....	59
Table 5.5 Socio-economic impacts mitigations and GAP actions .....	66

## Figures

Figure 1.1 Map of the Fiji ER-PD accounting area.....	12
Figure 5.1 Women's focus group consultation Vanua Levu .....	44
Figure 5.2 General community consultations Viti Levu .....	44
Figure 5.3 Impact of Cyclone Winston (February 2016) on mix of coastal and mangrove forest present day (April 2019) .....	52
Figure 5.4 Remains of a locally planted pine plantation after Cyclone Winston .....	52
Figure 5.5 Collection of NTFPs.....	58
Figure 5.6 Women fishing in mangroves.....	58

## Executive Summary

The objective of this Report is to prepare a Gender Action Plan (GAP) that will transparently and equitably benefit both indigenous and non-indigenous women that either live in forest-dependent villages or in close proximity or villages where there is plantation forestry and coastal mangrove villages in 155 villages of 20 districts in 11 provinces of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu (and Taveuni) in Fiji. It has been prepared for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) – Capacity Building on REDD+ for Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples in East Asia and the Pacific (EAP) and South Asia Region (SAR) Project managed by Tebtebba – The Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education, which is based in the Philippines and provided financial support for the sub-project that forms the basis of this Report. This sub-project is referred to as *Mainstreaming Gender into Fiji's REDD+ and Emissions Reduction Program (ER-P)*. It is important to note here that the GAP will be used by the Government of Fiji (GOF) and World Bank (WB) to ensure that all women, not just indigenous women benefit from the Emissions Reduction Program (ER-P) and while the ensuing GAP is directed more to indigenous women than non-indigenous women the latter have not been overlooked. The GAP draws on the Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) document that is used to provide information to support the Emissions Reduction Program Document (ERPD). The GAP also contributes to the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which establishes the modalities and procedures to address potential negative environmental and social impacts from the implementation of activities identified in the ERPD, including the screening criteria, procedures and institutional responsibilities.

The Report is based on over 30 days of in-country field research during April and May 2019, but also draws on earlier field-based studies undertaken in 2018 and 20 days of desk studies in Thailand, Vietnam and New Zealand by the GAP Research Team. More than 352 women, including 279 indigenous iTaukei women and 73 non-indigenous Fijian-Indian women were involved in a series of Focus Group Discussions and Natural Resource Transects and 50 males in 21 different villages in eight of the 11 provinces that the Fiji National REDD+ Program has identified for inclusion in Phase 1 of the ER-P. Although because the GAP Research Team also focused on coastal mangrove villages where 35-40% of iTaukei women reside and carbon sequestration rates are significantly higher (and also acting on the advice of the Fiji National REDD+ Program) it was considered necessary to include women residing in such villages. It also needs to be stressed that there was some focus on non-indigenous Fijian-Indian women because they also reside in some of the ER-P Provinces.

Attempts have been made in this Report, based on a critical analysis of disparate sources and consultations by the GAP Research Team, to debunk or at least question the notion that there are no real issues of gender inequality, because iTaukei women along with iTaukei men are the customary landowners of more than 86% of Fiji's land mass. However, the Report starting from the premise that traditional Fijian society is a patrilineal society and typically, post-marital residence is characterized by patrilocal women, may be owners of land in their natal villages, but they do not necessarily have access to and control over customary land in their spouse's natal village.

Moreover, despite arguments that traditional iTaukei society is based on cultural norms that preclude women from playing a more active role in the public domain, but are influential in the private domain this does not mean women have an equal voice with men. During consultations many women made this clear and while they do not seek to usurp men in the public domain, they would like to be more actively involved than they are at present. This is what they are hoping that the ER-P will make at least a modest contribution to. The same applies to non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women although the analysis has demonstrated that iTaukei women tend to have more social autonomy than the former.

Nevertheless, the Report acknowledges that most women have quite high levels of literacy and awareness based on educational participation rates and quantifiable outcomes – iTaukei women more so than non iTaukei women which is rather unique because typically indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world do not have the same opportunities. Based on the consultations it has been confirmed that the indigenous iTaukei women still highly value the traditional knowledge of the natural resources they have, but also note younger women no longer have the same knowledge or indeed the same interest but this is not always acknowledged. Although most of the men who, on a *defacto* basis, participated, in some of the consultations were inclined to agree with the women. Actions suggested in the GAP are designed to address this shortcoming and contribute



to an enabling environment for women that will not only benefit women but also men at the local level and Fiji at the national level.

The Report has relied on a range of sources including the evidence of the GAP Research Team in the field and the original SESA, to identify the fact that there are over 30% of all women living in the proposed ER-P Accounting Area that are either living in poverty or are in danger of moving into poverty. This is not primarily because of deforestation and degradation although they are also drivers of rural poverty, but because of the state of agriculture in Fiji and the lack of income-generation opportunities in most rural areas. Urban drift to informal settlements has been the partial answer to rural poverty, but the issue is best summed up for iTaukei women: that for the most part they live in resource rich local villages, but are cash poor. The Fiji of today is not simply based on balanced norms of reciprocity because they do not pay for bus fares, visits to the doctor or top ups for mobile phones. For non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women a different issue that contributes to livelihood insecurity is whether existing land leases will be renewed and; also, because the major agricultural industry in the ER-P Accounting Area is sugarcane farming which, is still very important, but Fiji can no longer effectively compete on the world market is highly problematic.

During the consultations it was clear for the most part, that neither iTaukei nor non-iTaukei women, especially the latter, had not really been targeted by the National REDD+ Program. A few of the women, primarily those with good connections had some knowledge, but had not shared it with other women. This indicates a degree of “elite capture” by some women typically the least poor and least vulnerable and this is strongly suggestive as to why the GAP has to ensure that poor and vulnerable women also need to be encouraged to participate in the ER-P, but on both a transparent and equitable basis. The GAP suggests that the Ministry of Women’s Affairs, Children and Poverty Alleviation and CSOs and NGOs with an interest and competency in natural resource management projects and programs be involved, one way or the other. It is also noted that church groups, especially for iTaukei women are also very important and it is well near impossible to conceive of situations where they would not be involved either directly or indirectly.

However, women irrespective of their socioeconomic status made the point that there is no way they are going to participate in the activities of the GAP that require a good deal of time-and-effort, such as afforestation and reforestation, without being compensated for such a form of participation. They unequivocally reject the FCPF argument that they should only be paid on results and in arrears. Thus, the GAP is based on women (and men) being paid at least some advance which is not a “radical” proposal as in most other countries that have been admitted to the Carbon Fund an advance payment has been demanded as part of the ER-P. Therefore, this GAP based on consultations with local women strongly suggests before the Emissions Reduction Program Document (ER-PD) is submitted to the Carbon Fund at the end of June 2019 it be clearly stated that an advance be required and stated under what conditions women participating on the ER-P will receive an advance.

The consultations with women revealed they are a little skeptical about any proposed benefit sharing mechanisms and issues associated with carbon title. Women acknowledged that since 2009 they are more likely to receive a portion of the benefits based on the “munificent” of their spousal partners, but this is not always assured and men often have some different priorities to women, such as physical infrastructure projects versus enhanced household food security projects. Although women acknowledged that ideally a consensus should be reached as to what projects or interventions any financial benefits to be shared should support. There was almost a unanimous decision made by iTaukei women (also shared by non-iTaukei women to a lesser extent) that any carbon benefits should be paid on a collective rather than an individual basis. But iTaukei women also questioned how they and their households would benefit if a carbon title is to be based on customary land ownership and whether the landowning unit (the mataqali in most instances) would distribute the financial benefits based also on women’s developmental priorities as well. No one has explained this to any of the women consulted including those with some knowledge of REDD+.

The GAP strongly suggests that the ER-P needs to reach out to all women in the ER-P Accounting Area otherwise there will be little or no ownership by local women and without their ownership *aka* “buy-in” the ER-P is less likely to achieve its stated objectives. In fact, most women were more interested in the non-carbon benefits than the carbon benefits such as measures to clarify land use or to develop sustainable approaches to NTFP harvesting or whether climate-smart agricultural interventions can mitigate deforestation and

degradation. Non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women suggested that if their names could be legally included on leases that would provide them with greater security than they have at present.

The indigenous iTaukei women's perspective on land and its cultural and symbolic importance to them has not been overlooked in this Report. While indigenous women are very interested in environmentally sustainable development outcomes, they do not necessarily see the world through the prism of non-indigenous or even indigenous persons who subscribe to sustainable natural resource management philosophies or world views. The iTaukei women know where they have come from and would like to know where they are headed, as they do not live in some historical time warp and as a result, they also understand that they have to ensure their household members are spiritually and materially well cared for. This can often mean in some instances a trade-off between conserving the natural environment and ensuring that the livelihood needs of themselves and their household members are met. Thus, it is unrealistic to expect that iTaukei women will simply embrace all ideas entertained by other stakeholders to the ER-P including the GoF and the WB.

One of the areas where there is a sharp divergence from the existing ER-PD is on the question as to whether coastal mangroves should be included in the ER-P. There is no technical reason as to why they should not and there are highly significant social and environmental reasons why they should be as indicated in this Report. During consultations with largely iTaukei women living in villages highly dependent on the coastal mangroves there was overwhelming support for their inclusion. These women are less worried about the actual carbon benefits than how to arrest the deforestation and degradation of the coastal mangroves because not only are they important for a constant supply of protein-enriched foodstuffs, but act as a barrier against "king tides" and rising sea levels. The Report notes that for the most part the Fiji National REDD+ Committee supports their inclusion and a very cogent argument has also been made in the SESA for their inclusion. It simply is not too late to include the coastal mangroves in the ER-P because between 35-40% of iTaukei women stand to benefit.

The actual GAP, which was largely validated by a range of stakeholders at a National Workshop held in Suva on the 9<sup>th</sup> of May, 2019 and based in part on the consultations with women at the local level has twelve different actions ranging from Agreement on Participatory Approaches to ER-P Implementation to Summarizing Progress on Gender Issues and a range of practical actions such as the Establishment of Local Forest and Mangrove Management Entities to the Identification of Climate-Smart Agricultural Interventions. Activities specifically targeted at women, both iTaukei and non-iTaukei women have been identified and the possible range of stakeholders. Estimated costs of FJ\$1,885,900 (US\$869,828) have been made and a range of both output and outcome monitoring indicators suggested. It is not being argued that the proposed GAP will be a panacea to alleviate all of the poverty and vulnerabilities of either iTaukei women or non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women: this is impossible but the GAP can be used within the context of the ER-P to make a modest contribution.

However, if there is real "buy-in" by male stakeholders at the local village level, district and provincial level, divisional and national level it is possible that women will be more empowered as a result of this GAP. This is the one positive non-carbon benefit although as can be seen from a review of the consultations local women are seeking practical outcomes and not just simply what they believe to more "abstract" and "esoteric" outcomes. In conclusion, the GAP Study Team argues it has attempted to take both indigenous and non-indigenous women's issues and their perspectives seriously, but penultimately it will be up to women themselves to make sure their voices are not only heard but they are listened to and their ideas are also translated into actions that benefit them.

# 1 Background and introduction

## 1.1 Introduction to the study

The objective of this Study is to prepare a Gender Action Plan (GAP) that will transparently and equitably benefit both indigenous and non-indigenous women that either live in forest-dependent villages or in close proximity or villages where there is plantation forestry and coastal mangrove villages in 155 villages of 20 districts in 11 provinces of Viti Levu and Vanua Levu (and Taveuni) in Fiji. It has been prepared for the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Capacity Building on REDD+ for Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples in East Asia and the Pacific (EAP) and South Asia Region (SAR) Project managed by Tebtebba – The Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education, which is based in the Philippines and provided financial support for this Report. This sub-project is referred to as *Mainstreaming Gender into Fiji's REDD+ and Emissions Reduction Program (ER-P)*. It is important to note here that the GAP will be used by the Government of Fiji (GOF) and World Bank (WB) to ensure that all women, not just indigenous women benefit from the ER-P and while the ensuing GAP is directed more to indigenous women than non-indigenous women the latter have not been overlooked. The GAP draws on the SESA and has been used in the formulation of the ESMF.


## 1.2 Scope of the study

This Study is a not a comprehensive and generalized account of gender in the Republic of Fiji but is rather specifically linked to the ER-P that Fiji hopes it will be able to implement based on the Emissions Reduction Program Document (ER-PD) – that was successfully submitted to the Carbon Fund Meeting in Washington in July 2019<sup>1</sup> - which in turn is based on the principles of the Carbon Fund Methodological Framework which Fiji accepted when it agreed to participate in the FCPF-REDD+ Program. The gender analysis undertaken is linked to indigenous women's issues as related to the natural resources' regimes (natural forests and plantation forests) in the proposed ER-P Accounting Area (20 districts of 11 provinces in Viti Levu, Vanua Levu and Taveuni) **Figure 1.1**, but also the currently excluded coastal mangrove villages. To date gender and forestry issues have not been very well analyzed in Fiji especially as they relate to iTaukei women with the exception of a study commissioned by Tebtebba that laid bare the important hidden contradictions of indigenous gender relations in forest-dependent communities of Fiji. However, because there are also non-iTaukei women – Fijian Indians or Fijian Citizens of Indian Descent as is the official term used by the Government of Fiji (GOF) – living in rural villages of the ER-P Accounting Area these women are also included in this Study.

---

<sup>1</sup> Fiji's ERPD was presented to the Carbon Fund meeting (CF20 July 8-11<sup>th</sup> Resolution CFM/20/2019/3) and accepted by the meeting in July 2019

**Figure 1.1 Map of the Fiji ER-PD accounting area**



### 1.3 *Issues to be raised*

In this Section a range of relevant research issues is presented that were used to structure the quantitative and qualitative data relevant to REDD+ and ER-P from selected villages in the ER-P Accounting Area and REDD+ and ER-P stakeholders tasked with implementing projects and programs<sup>2</sup>.

- How and why indigenous Fijian Forest-Dependent women are often excluded from forest—related decision-making processes, even though they are also the customary landowners in Fiji of 84% of all land?
- Has climate change, biodiversity loss and deforestation and degradation resulted in the livelihoods of indigenous women becoming more problematic and leading to greater levels of poverty and vulnerability?
- To what extent has the lack of useful and relevant gender-disaggregated data in the forestry sector contributed to generalizations about gender and forestry that lack sufficiently robust credible quantitative and qualitative social and environmental evidence?

<sup>2</sup> Note that the term ‘forest-dependent’ is used, but reference is also made to coastal-mangrove dependent villages as well

- Do social and cultural norms that indigenous forest-dependent women are expected to uphold, contribute to their non-awareness of rights to access and use of the forest resources for their own purposes?
- How have women been marginalized in Fiji by their effective lack of institutional involvement in all or most forms of forest management?
- Is poor market access for NTFPs in Fiji a result of the inability of indigenous women being able to capture more of the value of the products they harvest through a lack of information on market, rights to forest resources, and access to credit?
- Are women effective managers of Fiji's forest landscapes and is this recognized as such, and do they have a greater tendency than men to invest financial gains in community assets while concurrently having a greater commitment to arresting landscape degradation than men?
- Do indigenous women and men work well together to promote the sustainable management of natural resources, or has it been demonstrated in some contexts in Fiji that women have to often rely on their own actions, rather than to work alongside men in such management processes?
- To what extent have successive governments since independence provided recognition of the important role indigenous forest-dependent women play in the management of forests and what are the institutional obstacles that could be effectively overcome or at least attenuated by REDD+ and the ER-P?
- What challenges and opportunities exist to demarginalize and empower indigenous forest-dependent women in Fiji ensuring: 1) women's participation in reforms; 2) understanding the broader systemic effects of global processes; 3) facilitating participation in international dialogue; and 4) that new sources of finance – such as the ER-P – do not restrict women's access to forests and motivate other actors to make claims on the forests to benefit from carbon financing?
- How can a better understanding of: 1) cultural barriers to the implementation of gender sensitive policies; 2) interactions between gender and ethnicity, religion, age and wealth; 3) role of gender in the commercialization of forest products; 4) effect of increasing gender equity on forest governance; 5) implications of gender-based tenure reforms; 6) relative roles and contributions of women and men have in organizing and maintaining social movements against "land grabs/alienation" and other livelihood threats; and 7) incentives, including organizational strategies, improve the implementation of gender-sensitive policies in the forest sector in the context of Fiji and how can REDD+ and the ER-P play a strategic role in supporting such actions.

#### 1.4 *Field verification and sample size*

This is largely not a quantitative study that could be considered highly robust with a confidence level of 95% plus. Rather, it is more of a qualitative study based not simply on a range of primary and secondary sources, but also the evidence and insights gleaned from consultations with 352 females (79.2% of whom were iTaukei) and 50 males. However, where possible quantitative data has been used when focusing on relevant socioeconomic indicators although post 2007 it has been almost impossible to source data disaggregated by ethnicity (due to a change in the approach of government statistics). Thus, the Study needs to be seen in the context of women, where possible, lending their voice to the overall objective of developing a workable GAP. The language/s of consultation were Fijian with indigenous iTaukei women or English if they preferred the latter over the former. Most preferred to converse in Fijian even when they were very good speakers of

English. In relation to the non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women consultations were either in Hindustan or Fijian Baat or as official referred to as Hindi. Native speakers were used in all instances where translations were required.

## **1.5** *Tools and techniques*

Primary and secondary sources have been utilized to glean relevant anthropological and ethnographical data for the Study. This was complemented by a series of Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and Natural Resource Transects (NRT) in selected villages although as indicated in Section 5.1 NRT were not undertaken in all villages either due to inclement weather or non-availability of participants (some consultations were conducted over the Easter Period from the 19<sup>th</sup> of April to the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April). To avoid “elite capture” the GAP Study Team selected women at random and paid a participation fee to compensate them for not only possible lost earnings, but in recognition of the time they spent with the Team. It is sufficient to say it was relatively easy to convince women to participate in the FGD and NRT not least of all because they appreciated the participation fee and meals and refreshments provided to them and their household members. Some semi-structured interviews were also conducted with key informants, but the GAP Research Team relied to a greater extent on *ad hoc* conversations that often took place on the side of the road, at local markets, on public transport and even in and around churches for iTaukei women or temples for non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women.

## **1.6** *Overall design of the Emission Reduction Program*

The overall approach and design of the ER-Program<sup>3</sup> to address the drivers and underlying causes of forest loss and barriers to SFM, forest conservation and enhancement to build on and support implementation of the current ambitious national and sub national programs.

**Component 1: Strengthening Enabling Conditions for Emission Reductions (USD 1.65 million)** - focusing on the development of integrated land use plans and three divisional landscape governances for improved regulatory framework supporting REDD+, and strengthened law enforcement. It also aims to invest in an improved forest information system to support forest sector planning and decision making.

**Component 2: Promoting integrated landscape management (USD 36.68 million)** - the core component of the ER-P and will focuses on the following:

- Sustainable natural forest management contributing to reduction of forest degradation;
- Afforestation and reforestation in plantation forest contributing to the enhancement of forest carbon stocks;
- Afforestation and reforestation to restore ecosystem services;
- Promotion of climate-smart agriculture and enhanced livelihoods contributing to the reduction of deforestation pressure; and
- Promotion of forest protection, to conserve existing natural forest carbon stocks.

---

<sup>3</sup> Updated based on the June 14<sup>th</sup> 2019 version presented to the Carbon Fund July 8<sup>th</sup> 2019.

**Component 3: Program Management and Emissions Monitoring (USD 4.12 million)** - this component includes the program and financial management of the ER-P. It also includes the monitoring and evaluation safeguard monitoring, Monitoring Verification and Reporting (MRV) system and will finance the communication and awareness raising of the ER-P and REDD+.

#### ER-P Divisions and Provinces

The Table 1.1 below identifies the divisions and provinces on Viti Levu, Vanua Levu and Taveuni that are in the ER-P Accounting Area.

**Table 1.1 Population and Total Area of Divisions and Provinces in the ER-P Area**

ER P Island and Provinces	Divisions	Total Area (Ha/Km <sup>2</sup> )	Population (2007)	Population (2017)	% Share of the ER-P Population
<b>1. Viti Levu</b>	<b>Central and Western</b>	<b>1,038,900 Hectares</b>	<b>594,791 Persons</b>	<b>715,219 Persons</b>	<b>83.6</b>
Ba	Western	2,634 km <sup>2</sup>	212,197 (54.4%)	247,708	28.9
Ra	Western	1341km <sup>2</sup>	30,904 (30.1%)	30,432	3.6
Nadroga-Navosa	Western	2,385km <sup>2</sup>	54,083 (37.9%)	58,931	6.9
Serua	Central	830 km <sup>2</sup>	15,461 (31.6%)	20,031	2.3
Namosi	Central	570 km <sup>2</sup>	5,742 (07.4%)	7,871	0.9
Rewa	Central	272 km <sup>2</sup>	101,547 (23.8%)	108,016	12.6
Tailevu	Central	955km <sup>2</sup>	48,216 (72.1%)	64,552	7.5
Naitarisi	Central	1,666 km <sup>2</sup>	126,641 (57.9%)	177,678	20.8
<b>2. Vanua Levu</b>	<b>Northern Division</b>	<b>597,657 Hectares</b>	<b>282,798 Persons</b>	<b>140,918 Persons</b>	<b>16.4</b>
Bua	Northern	1,378km <sup>2</sup>	14,988 (16.6%)	15,466	1.8
Macuata	Northern	2,004km <sup>2</sup>	80,207 (16.3%)	65,983	7.7
Cakaudrove Includes Taveuni	Northern	2,816km <sup>2</sup>	44,321 (38.9%)	59,469	6.9
<b>Total</b>		<b>1,636,557</b>	<b>734,307 (42.9%)</b>	<b>856,173</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The percentages in brackets are those of the Indian-Fijians that were included in the 2008 Statistical Data prepared by the GOF based on the 2007 Census. At the time 32.5% of Fijian-Indians resided in rural villages compared to 67.5% of iTaukei persons. But for the 2017 Census demographic data by ethnicity was not collected and therefore the GAP Study Team cannot provide accurate data, but “unofficial” estimates indicate that approximately 37% (36.5%) of the total population of Fiji in 2019 (currently estimated at 917,965) is Fijian-Indian. The main reason for this decline is the emigration of largely “urban” Fijian-Indians to countries such as Australia, New Zealand, Canada, USA and Britain for a variety of reasons some of which are or were not “political” in nature. However, in Macuata the decline in population between 2007 and 2017 was largely due to Fijian-Indian sugar-cane farming households seeking to leave the ailing sugar industry and uncertain

nature of lease renewals, but this was largely in just three districts (Tikina) where over 75% of the population was non-indigenous.

In relation to women the percentage of iTaukei women living in the rural villages of the ER-P less than 50% (estimated to be 45.5%) in the ER-P can be considered rural, whether living in villages that rely on the forests to some extent, those that rely on agriculture, horticulture and livestock, and those that are residing in lowland coastal areas. For non-iTaukei women it is estimated that less than 35% (estimated to be 34.2%) live in the rural areas of the ER-P, but the overwhelming majority reside in areas dependent on agriculture, horticulture and livestock rather than either upland tree forests or coastal mangrove forests. Nevertheless, an yet to be calculated percentage of non-iTaukei women live in villages contiguous with either natural forest or more likely production forests, but as argued in this Study a significant number of non-iTaukei women also access natural resources, which include forests for at least some of their livelihoods.

### **1.7                    *The Emission Reduction Program sub-components and gender issues***

Component 1 has three subcomponents – Integrated District Land Use Planning to Promote More Sustainable Long-Term Integrated Landscape Management; Strengthening Forest Governance and Law Enforcement; and, Forest Information System – that are designed to improve control on the expansion of agricultural land, reduce the incidence of illegal logging, improved land use planning and infrastructure development, forest governance to contribute to the protection and maintenance of biodiversity, and the revision of forest policy and regulations pertaining to access to and use of forests.

From a conservationist perspective that would result in the reduction of carbon emissions these sub-components look to be very plausible. However, there are possible social and gender issues that need to be addressed such as the impacts of land use change and restrictions on access to forests and their resources on the livelihoods of women, especially poor and vulnerable women irrespective of their ethnicity. iTaukei women are likely to be negatively impacted from restrictions on access to and use of natural forest resources while non-iTaukei women are more likely to be impacted if the land they lease becomes subject to ER-P interventions that restrict livelihood opportunities. In general women living in the ER-P area may also be negatively impacted if they cannot convert at least degraded forest land and plantation forestry land that is non-performing to agricultural land. Household food security is an issue that all women have to consider irrespective as to their ethnicity. Mitigation measures that need to be put in place include the WB's OP4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement.

Finally, if women cannot also make inputs into any forest information system there is a possibility that information is not overly transparent or accurate. Any gender-responsive approach to the principles of sustainable natural resource management really does have to integrate gendered perspectives because neither men at the village level nor policy and technical experts have a monopoly on knowledge. For instance, women generally know far more about NTFPs than men, irrespective as to the latter's level of knowledge and they know to what extent they are being sustainably or otherwise harvested because they do most of the harvesting of NTFPs. They might work with expert researchers, but a forest information system (including if mangroves were to be included) without women's inputs is a very incomplete system.

Component 2 has five sub-components – Sustainable Natural Forest Management; Afforestation and Reforestation for Timber and Biomass Plantations; Afforestation and Reforestation for Restoration of Ecosystem Services; Promotion of Climate-Smart Agriculture and Sustainable Livelihoods; and, Promotion of Forest Protection to Conserve Existing Natural Forest Carbon Stocks. Generally, these sub-components are positive because of improved landscape management, habitat improvements, focus on the enrichment of existing plantations, and improved protection of natural forests. The interventions proposed within these sub-components, for instance, the cultivation of high-value kava through climate-smart agriculture that avoids deforestation, could be quite positive if supported by both iTaukei women and men. However, there are some possible negative impacts.



The possible impacts on livelihoods on women are related to afforestation and reforestation, measures to conserve existing carbon stocks, and the over-use of herbicides and pesticides for climate-smart agriculture. The question to be asked in the context of afforestation and reforestation is - are women going to be expected to provide all or most of the labor for such activities, and if not; are the activities of women such as nurturing of seedlings and saplings going to be devalued to a greater extent than actual physical afforestation and reforestation generally undertaken by men? Measures to conserve existing carbon stocks might restrict women's access to the forests even if this access is based on NTFP harvesting and of equal importance for livestock they might be grazing in or near the forests. This is a livelihood impact that cannot be ignored. In relation to the use of herbicides and pesticides women (and village men) might not be familiar with how not to over-use such chemicals and some chemicals such as Roundup or Gramoxone or Paraquat while being effective if mishandled are very dangerous to not only users, but also as they enter the food chain. Women nursing children and pregnant women? are also greatly at risk, but most iTaukei women (or men or non-iTaukei women and men) are not aware of these risks even though the GOF has tried to highlight the danger of over-using or mis-using such chemicals. These negative impacts on women cannot be ignored and mitigation measures such as the WB's OP4.09 on Pest Management have to be put in place to ensure women are safeguarded.

Component 3 has activities relating to program and financial management, monitoring and evaluation of safeguard monitoring, MRV and questions concerning who will finance communication and awareness raising of the ER-P and REDD+. For women to benefit from the ER-P it is necessary to ensure that they are represented at each level of ER-P implementation and receive financial support for doing so. Fiji is very fortunate in that its Conservator of Forests in the Ministry of Forestry is a woman with a good understanding of gender and forestry issues but she cannot implement all these activities on her own. Based on a "ballpark" figure of 30% of all positions being allocated to women there is unlikely to be any problem ensuring that iTaukei women are represented but it is more problematic as to whether non-iTaukei women will be represented. At the very least they should be represented in districts and provinces where the ER-P will impact upon non-iTaukei women.

## **1.8 Conclusion**

In this Section the focus is being on how the ER-P components and its specific subcomponents will be effectively targeted at women irrespective as to their ethnicity. It has been noted that a significantly greater number of iTaukei women will be targeted because for the most part these are more rural iTaukei women in most of the provinces and they are more likely to live in villages closer to and dependent on the forests than non-iTaukei women. But by introducing the currently designed ER-PD the GAP Study Team has attempted to ensure that both indigenous and non-indigenous women benefit from the GAP. This will be reflected in the GAP that has been designed and included in Section 3 of this Study.

## 2 Gender in Fiji and the Gender Action Plan

### 2.1 *Introduction*

This Section is not designed to get bogged down with arcane debates concerning gender relations in Fijian society although it is acknowledged such debates are necessary for more generalized analyses of gender, but rather to relate what the GAP Study Team see as relevant gender issues as they intersect with ethnicity and whether or not the ER-P will be stymied by existing gender relations. It briefly states theoretical issues derived from anthropological and feminist studies on patriarchy and attempts to relate them to the exigencies of Fijian society on a contemporary basis. International instruments relating to gender and indigenous peoples that Fiji is also a signatory are also highlighted to ensure that it can be seen that the GOF has the “political will” to seriously consider gender responsive approaches, not only in the preparation of the ER-P, but also in its implementation. The underlying argument is that Fiji can address at least some of the gender inequities that exist in Fijian society, but that centuries of a Fijian form of “patriarchy” is not transformed overnight and that the ER-P may make a modest contribution.

### 2.2 *Patriarchy and Fijian society*

The iTaukei kinship system in Fiji is best described as a patrilineality or agnatic kinship system in which an individual and family membership derives from, and is recorded through his or her father’s lineage. It generally involves the inheritance of property, rights, names or titles by persons related through male kin. The non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian minority also has a truncated patrilineal kinship system for the most part that has been influenced from what area of India male indentured labourers were first sourced back in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century. However, there are some significant differences with patrilocal residence or patrilocality or what social anthropologists sometimes refer to as virilocal residence or virilocality that refers to the social system whereby a married couple resides with or near the husband’s parents. Although the concept of location may extend to a larger area such as a village, town or in the context of Fiji the clan or mataqali. Social anthropologists describe a “modern patriarchy” as meaning where men hold most of the positions of power that they use to influence a range of social and political outcomes in their favor often to the disadvantage of women whether it be at the household level, community level, national level or in the workplace.

More extreme depictions of patriarchal societies describe women as having no voice, space and property rights and where women’s reproductive and productive labour are used to enhance the status of men. Thus, it is not possible for women to affect any meaningful forms of social and economic change that could possibly benefit women. Feminist critiques of patriarchal societies describe them as societies with general structures in which men have power over women: society being the entirety of the social relations of a community. The patriarchal society consists of a male dominated power structure throughout organized society and in individual relationships. Power is related to privilege, and men not only have more power than women, but also have levels of privilege to which women are not entitled. However, feminist critiques do acknowledge it is possible for women to affect change because their patriarchy is rooted in structure and culture.

In the context of Fiji, where does this leave both iTaukei and non-iTaukei women? The argument utilized in this Study will be that yes, of course Fiji has elements of patriarchy that impact upon gender relations that have evolved over 3,000 years in the case of the iTaukei or 5,000 years in the case of Indian “cultures” that have impacted upon the non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women. However, among iTaukei women, as will be demonstrated in this Study while rural women for the most part are not active in the public domain unless “invited” to be so by men indirectly via informal linkages in the community and at the household level do wield some influence over men. The same might be argued for non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women, but where iTaukei and non-iTaukei women differ is in relation to the autonomy of females. iTaukei women are “freer” to travel and work away from their marital home than non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women and they are also freer to run their own organizations, even if they have less status and power than those participated in by men.

Thus, it is quite misleading to depict Fijian society as a patriarchy where women are unable to influence outcomes.

Fiji is a signatory to the Beijing Declaration for Action and Gender Equality as reflected in the National Women's Plan of Action (NWPA), the Road Map for Democracy and Sustainable Socio-Economic Development 2011-14 and the 2015 National Gender Action Plan. International conventions on Gender that the GOF has signed up to or could if it wished to do so are identified in the following **Table 2.1**:

**Table 2.1 International Conventions and National Policies with a Gender Dimension**

<b>Commitment</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Gender Related Guidance on Convention or National policy</b>
Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW 1979, UN)	1995	Articles address gender equity and non-discrimination in areas such as education employment marriage health finances and decision making CEDAW establishes international endorsed norms and standards for women's human right
Convention on the Rights of the Child	1993	Addresses gender equality directly by recognizing that girls are often discriminated against more than boys. Sets standards against harmful practices such as denial of girls' rights to education early marriage and female genital mutilation
Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Signed 2010	The convention recognizes that women and girls are subject to multiple discriminations including in health education access to services and mobility,
ILO Equal Remuneration Convention (No. 100)	2002	Convention is to ensure equal remuneration for male and female workers for work of equal value. Provides definitions and explanations on what constitutes equal work and gender discrimination
ILO Discrimination in Employment and Occupation Conventions (No.111)	2002	Convention prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex including discrimination based on maternity and family responsibility. Convention also extend to prohibition of sexual harassment in the workplace
National Gender Policy <sup>4</sup>	March 2014	The overall goal of this policy is to promote gender equity, equality, social justice and sustainable development in the Republic of Fiji; Improve the quality of life of men, women, boys and girls, at all levels of society through the promotion of gender equity and equality; Reinforce the inextricable links between gender equality and sustainable development goals in national development; Promote active and visible gender mainstreaming in all sectors and within civil society to ensure agency for gender equity and equality in all spheres of national life; and, Remove all forms of gender inequality and gender discrimination in Fiji.
Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations	2015	The GOF has embraced the SDGs that followed the Millennium Development Goals and there seven SDGs that are linked to Fiji's ER-P as follows: SDG 1: End to Poverty; SDG2: Zero Hunger; SDG3: Gender Equality; SDG 10: Reduced Inequalities; SDG 13: Climate Action; SDG15: Life and Land; and, SDG17: Partnerships for the Goals.

Gender Responsive policies as reflected in originally the Millennium Development Goals and more recently the Sustainable Development Goals have been taken on board by the GOF. However, there were originally no specific references to gender and forestry issues but only gender and agricultural issues. It is only as recent

<sup>4</sup> Fiji National Gender Policy, Ministry of Social Welfare Women and Poverty Alleviation (2014).

as early 2018 have there have been moves afoot to ensure gender responsive actions (building upon existing forestry-related women's networks, capacity building for technical training and gender mainstreaming and more effective coordination between the Ministry of Forestry and other ministries). It is also important to note here that as of October 2018 the WB's Gender and Development Policy (OP/BP 4.20) now specifically refers to GENDER MAINSTREAMING rather than just GENDER RESPONSIVENESS, the difference being that mainstreaming means exactly that, whereas responsiveness meant largely being as sensitive as possible to gender issues. The ER-P will need to reflect this newer approach and the GAP will incorporate the Gender Mainstreaming Approach as required by the WB. Fiji is moving in the right direction, but probably not as quickly as it possibly could.

But in spite of this the Gender Inequality Index of the UNDP reflects gender-based inequalities in three dimensions: reproductive health, empowerment, and economic activity. Fiji scores 0.418 on the 2014 index and ranks 87 of 188 countries, better for example than Samoa (97) and Tonga (148) and better than the indigenous Aboriginal women in Australia (122). According to the World Economic Forum (2015) Fiji scores 0.65 in the Gender Gap Index and ranks 121 of 145 countries. Its ranking has been declining since 2009. In terms of the sub-indexes, Fiji ranks the lowest (129) in women's economic participation and opportunity. Only 42% of women are engaged in the formal labor force compared to 82% of men. Yet here it is also important to understand the informal sector and during SESA consultations it has been found women are actively engaged in the informal sector, especially in rural areas. What is seen in larger cities such as Nadi, Suva, Lautoka and Lambasa is not necessarily a reflection of the economic reality for all women and their families. However, for women participating in the labor force Fiji is the only South Pacific Island state that provides for paid maternity leave for women (up to 90 days).

Women's wages are only 75% of men's in the same sector although Fijian women with higher educational qualifications fare considerably better (this excludes most women currently residing in villages that are dependent on the forests to some extent). But women do have very high unemployment rates and constitute 75% of unpaid home workers. Women also work up to 30% longer most days although men do not consider domestic work to be work per se but rather the duty of women. Nevertheless, the legal marital property regime in Fiji does recognize the non-monetary contribution of women to the household. Women as iTaukei members have equal right to the ownership of customary land and also to receive leasehold and logging royalties alongside men. Although as the Section on Land Tenure in the SESA indicates women often have little or no control over such customary land and for non-iTaukei women whose household is using leased land from the iTaukei it is their husband, father, uncle or older brother who controls the lease: such leases are not a joint lease-holding between marital spouses.

In most of the iTaukei communities, women are involved in collecting NTFPs (herbal medicinal plants, ornamental plants and forest food such as wild ferns). They are also involved in selling fruits, vegetables and root crops as mentioned above. Men typically are involved in animal husbandry (although women are also involved with small livestock such as poultry), staple root crop cultivation, vegetable gardening, fishing, collecting firewood, hunting wild pigs, bats and pigeons and sugar-cane farming in districts where sugar is cultivated on Viti Levu and Vanua Levu. In recent times, given the patrilineal nature of the Fijian kinship system, post-marital residence where newly married women typically go and reside in their husband's village, according to the findings of the SESA these women (referred to as "expatriates") appear to be more innovative than older women who have resided for longer periods in the village. It is these "expatriate" women that have embraced the cultivation of high-value kava far more enthusiastically than older women. But it may well be that older women still place significant value on natural resource conservation.

A further issue that will need to be resolved is that women from other Mataqali land-owning groups have rights to rental payments for leasing land and royalty payments from their villages of birth and for the payment of carbon benefits that are result-based ostensibly the same procedures may be subject to a degree of ambiguity. As the Section on Land Tenure in the SESA further demonstrates the linkage between ownership, access and control of land and possible benefit sharing arrangements appears to put many women at a distinct disadvantage *vis-à-vis* men and the ER-P will need to address this structural issue.

However, in reality the gender division of labor is not really pronounced except in the areas of hunting in the forests and logging. Men claim they undertake the physically more demanding activities, but during village level visits the SESA Team observed that women are also sometimes involved with physically more demanding tasks and for activities such as fishing – with the exception of fishing in coastal mangrove communities – women are more likely to spend time fishing than men. It could be argued that in many respects most of the gender-productive roles outside of the domestic sphere are quite complementary.

Women are largely rendered invisible with most public decision-making processes even if they are invited to be physically present. This is even a more significant issue for the estimated 12.5% of village households headed by women (latter live on average six years longer than men). There are of course exceptions to the rule as there are local Village Women's Associations in many villages that do focus on women's reproductive health, schooling for their children and economic empowerment. However, in general women in the ER-P villages are at a disadvantage on both structural and cultural grounds.

During the SESA facilitators had to work very hard to ensure women were also consulted about the REDD+ Program and women often had a more realistic approach to how possible carbon financial benefits should be utilized (men were more likely to look at individual payments whereas women were more likely to stress payments that would enhance the collective welfare of the village community). Nevertheless, during joint consultations at the village level the SESA Team also found that men after a good deal of focused discussions on gender issues agreed that REDD+ without the active participation of women would be less than effective. It is acknowledged that women generally have a great knowledge of the forests and their resources, especially NTFPs.

To summarize the substantive gender issues are as follows: 1) Women's participation in the management of forests and forest resources is very limited despite their skills, knowledge, and involvement in forestry; 2) There are no proper support mechanisms to enable women's access to credit and markets that would help to facilitate their participation in community-based forest enterprises that would enhance their livelihoods; and, 3) The Ministry of Forestry is still wrestling with approaches that would ensure women's leadership in policy-making bodies and ensure adequate human and financial resources for more systemic approaches to gender-responsive activities.

### **2.3                      *Women and land rights***

#### **2.3.1                    *Introduction***

Issues associated with women and land rights, especially for the iTaukei women, but also to some extent for non-iTaukei women are actually quite varied and complicated and it is necessary to avoid over-generalization. It is necessary to understand how access is gained to land and how it is used is not simply the system of land ownership although when the focus is on customary land ownership it really is quite complicated. Simply stating that the iTaukei own most of the land in Fiji so what are the extant issues is not especially helpful. While it is necessary to highlight the relevant acts and policies that govern the ownership, access to and use of land and how these acts and policies may impact both positively and negatively on both iTaukei and non-indigenous women is a step in the right direction. However, it is also necessary to understand indigenous practices from the past even if they are no longer utilized or only partly utilized because it is important to understand how socio-cultural practices embedded in the past have an influence on the way men and women think on a contemporary basis.

#### **2.3.2                    *Access to and use of land***

Virtually all iTaukei women and men belong to a Tokatoka (extended family) and have a right to share in the lands belonging either to the Tokatoka or the Mataqali (clan) even when they have moved away from the village as is largely the case with women on marriage because of the patrilineal kinship system that is structured on post-marital patrilocal residence. Of course, there are exceptions to the rule and patrilineality can be quite flexible resulting in a very small number of instances where a form of matrilineal post-marital

residence occurs. Many iTaukei continue to have plots of land that they use for their own household consumption when they are wage laborers either nearby, or when they plan to return when they retire. Non-iTaukei rural households either own freehold land (very small number) or more often lease or rent land for both livelihood and residential purposes. Now how this impacts upon both iTaukei and non-iTaukei women will be explained below, but it is sufficient to note at this juncture that land ownership *per se* for iTaukei women does not necessarily confer on them the effective use of this land or the possibility of continuing to be beneficiaries from the land they are customary owners of. As for non-iTaukei women they ostensibly have even less rights than men over leased or rented land because it is the husband who the lease or rental agreement is made out in.

In Fiji land is managed through three complementary systems: iTaukei, or native land held under custom and usage, ; Crown land or state land; and Freehold land. The key difference between iTaukei land and other land types is its inalienability. iTaukei land cannot be sold, transferred, mortgaged or otherwise encumbered. Land under this category can be leased long term for a maximum of 99 years for commercial purposes. Similarly, agriculture leases have maximum tenure of 50 years.

About 84% of land in Fiji is owned by iTaukei through their Mataqali and is termed native or iTaukei land. There are a small number of instances where land is owned by the Tokatoka or Yavusa in the provinces of Ba and Nadroga and ownership by individuals or descendants of individuals, but typically this land was either land donated or given in the form of a dowry (known as the "*Covicovi ni Draudrau*" or "*Covicovi ni Lolou*" when members of a woman's mataqali would donate land on her behalf in recognition of her children's special links (*vasu*) to her mataqali) Of the remainder, about 8% is freehold and 2% is government owned. Native land is communally owned and cannot be bought or sold except to the state for public purpose. The iTaukei Land Trust Board (TLTB) is a statutory body with responsibility to administer, develop and manage this land on behalf of its owners, and for their benefit, according to the Native Land Trust Board Act. The TLTB identifies the land required for use by iTaukei communities and makes the remainder available for leasing through a government backed lease. The TLTB, not the actual owners, issues legally binding lease (or land use agreement), as to whether the land can be used for agricultural, commercial, industrial or other purposes.

All people residing on native land are either landowners or tenants who have the permission of the landowning clan. Residents on native land have either formalized status through legal lease arrangements with the TLTB or have informal (*vakavanua*) agreements with the landowning Mataqali.

### **2.3.3            *Relevant Laws, Acts and policies relating to land ownership***

The Agricultural Landlord and Tenant Act (ALTA) governs all agricultural leases of more than 1 ha and the relations between landlords and agricultural tenants. Minimum 30-year and maximum 99-year leases are allowed with no right of renewal. In practice, most leases are for 30 years. In the event of non-renewal, the tenant must vacate the land after a set grace period. The maximum annual rental is 6% of the unimproved capital value. In theory, the rental rate is reviewed every five years. The tenant can claim compensation for all development and improvements of the property with claims determined by the Agricultural Tribunal. Tenants can, however, only be compensated for improvements if the TLTB has granted prior approval to these improvements. In practice, there is a fixed schedule of lease rental rates under the ALTA, which has not been updated since 1997. The TLTB, however, has introduced a lump sum payment to induce landowners to lease their land for an additional 30-year period.

The ALTA was supplemented by the 2009 Land Use Decree No.36 (2010) in recognition that the requirement for tenants to vacate land once the fixed lease and grace period had expired causes both social and economic hardship. Government therefore amended the land laws to increase the flexibility of leases and to facilitate leasing of lands, which are currently idle or unutilized, under terms and conditions intended to be attractive to both the landowners and tenants. The Decree provides for longer tenure leases (up to 99 years) for agricultural and commercial development. Reserve land is not leased, but reserved by Mataqali or government for future use.

In Fiji all land is constitutionally the property of the state, but exclusive use rights are given to individuals under a contractual arrangement with the state. These use rights are transferable with few limitations, and

the contract is sufficiently long-term (for example, renewable 50 years), so for most of the contract's duration there is very little difference between possession of use rights and full property rights.

#### a) Constitutional Provisions of Fiji

The 2013 Constitution of the Republic of Fiji has four provisions – Sections 27, 28, 29 and 30 – that relate to land issues. *Section 27* deals with freedom from compulsory or arbitrary acquisition of property; *Section 28* the rights of ownership of the iTaukei, Rotuman and Banaban lands; *Section 29* protection of ownership and interests in land; and *Section 30* rights of landowners to fair share of royalties for extraction of minerals. These constitutional provisions are a significant improvement on earlier constitutional provisions that were used in the turbulent years of the 1980s and 1990s to create political unrest and divisions between indigenous and non-indigenous people in Fiji especially in relation to land issues. The outcome of the November 2018 election more than likely indicates that both iTaukei and non-iTaukei generally accept that the 2013 Constitution has been an important catalyst to the lessening of political tensions and social unrest.

#### b) Basic Principles in the iTaukei Lands Trust Act

An Act relating to the control and administration of iTaukei Land was promulgated in 1940 during the time of the British colonial administration. It was based on the “Reserves Policy” of the Council of Chiefs who argued in both 1933 and 1936 that *“it would be in the best interest if Native lands at present lying idle were put to use, that the amount of land needed for the proper development of the native owners be determined....that all lands not so required be handed over to the government to lease on our behalf.”* Section 4 of this Act vests control of all native land in the TLTB to be administered on behalf of the iTaukei; Section 5 clearly specifies that land is inalienable; Section 16 drawing on provisions of the Crown Acquisition of Lands Act, the Forest Act, the Petroleum (Exploration and Exploitation) Act, and the Mining Act (all with subsequent updates post-independence in 1970); Section 15 establishing the legal basis for the TLTB to set aside any portion of iTaukei land as a iTaukei reserve; Section 17 enables the TLTB with consent of the iTaukei owners to exclude either permanently or for a specified period any land from any iTaukei reserve; and Section 18 enables the Minister for iTaukei Affairs (a very important ministry and currently headed by PM Josia Voreqe (*aka* Frank) Bainimarama) to allocate more land to a mataqali that can demonstrate it cannot sustain the livelihoods of its existing clan members within the existing mataqali.

#### c) Community Forest Management and Forest Land Allocation

Forest land allocation is not an issue in Fiji because of customary land rights and the state has never been in a position to allocate forestry land. This forestry land belongs to those Mataqali and only the Mataqali can allocate forest land to non-Mataqali members. To date there are few instances of these communities allocating forest land to other users although at present there are a number of proposals to allocate forest land in the form of concessions to concessionaires who agree to sustainably log forests in accordance with Fiji’s own laws on sustainable logging. But it is not the state that would be allocating this forest land, but the Mataqali albeit with the TLTB facilitating such an allocation.

Despite the customary land rights of the iTaukei communities, community forestry management according to recent studies and consultations for the SESA and this GAP suggest that the processes are not socially inclusive with women being relegated to lesser and insignificant roles by the male leadership in many villages. However, if the five most important uses of the forests are considered (fishing, planting, foraging or gathering, hunting and timber extraction) individual households manage their own subsistence activities to meet household food consumption needs and where there are surpluses also to exchange with others for a range of goods and services although more recently seeking to be paid cash via trading intermediaries.

Timber extraction for commercial purposes as against for individual household or community cultural needs are generally managed by the community leadership who interface with commercial logging entities. Decisions made in this sphere are not subject to any real input by the whole of the community even though the Mataqali with ownership of the forest resources is supposed to receive royalties paid and distributed to all members on an equal basis. Commercial logging of forests in Fiji began in 1924 (although logging commenced in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century during the early colonial epoch) by Fletcher Timber and logging of indigenous species ended in 1998 when the Amur Dayal Logging Company ceased operation. These companies logged

24/7 during the dry season and constructed roads to upland villages where in the past they did not exist (one of the putative advantages according to logging companies involved: the other was waged employment for village males who were basically living outside the monetarized economy of urban Fiji and commercial sugar cane production).

Although there were significant disadvantages as explained by older villagers (bulldozers or even draft animals used to drag the felled logs to local sawmills or logging trucks destroyed much of the vegetation in the forest where logging was taking place and generally landslides during the wet season became more frequent). Longer term, as explained below, the social impacts were in some instances quite negative and contributing in no small part to a demise in the social cohesiveness of traditional village society. However, logging of non-indigenous species began in 1983 with the commencement of logging operations by Fiji Pine Limited, but of course by this time the archetypal village ceased to largely exist as a traditional social unit even if physically there appeared to be few differences: the immediate landscapes of villages remained the same but sociologically they were in transition, even if not depicted as such in stereotyped images of Fijian rural villages.

Subsistence logging by way of contrast for use in foundation and wall posts for houses, floors for individual houses, and community purposes often involved all males in the village working together and trying to choose trees in such a manner that NTFPs would not be destroyed, watersheds would not be compromised, and landslides would be averted. Unfortunately, it appears that in many villages this traditional approach to forest resource management has been undermined to a significant extent. Consultations with many villagers suggest that the cumulative impact of commercial logging and more recently even the more traditional subsistence logging methods have resulted in the need to travel further into the forests to look for wild vegetables, taro, firewood and timber. It has also been observed that there are fewer medicinal and other useful plants that were once available much closer to the village settlements and this impacts more so on women than men. Also, in the water bodies (rivers and streams) prawns, eels and fish are in significantly shorter supply as a result of increased flash floods caused by logging and subsequent deforestation.

Based on village-level consultations undertaken in July and August 2018 it appears that the social costs of logging on the cohesiveness of local communities has been quite high. While older people argue commercial logging brought short-term monetary benefits there was no program to reforest their forest land (or sustainably log the forest). Additionally, the revenue received from logging was not for the most part reinvested in sustainable livelihood activities either on a household or community basis. In many households there was an increase in alcoholism, over-use of kava, domestic violence, and unwillingness to focus on sustainable forms for forest management. There have been general observations that the spiritual importance of the forests has dissipated to a significant extent with the advent of monetary benefits via the payment of logging royalties, even when after 2010 people were to be paid on an equal per capita basis. Finally, with deforestation came degradation as many households turned to convert forest land into agricultural land for the cultivation of crops including kava, taro and cassava.

#### d) Customary Forest Rights

Land and resources are owned by the entire community. They can be used by all community members who are treated equally in terms of the use of the community land. No person may sell or transfer forest land to outsiders. The supreme owners of the land and resources are invisible supernatural beings. All land users must respect these beings who govern the land and all it contains. Those who pollute the land by breaking customary rules are penalized and are required to apologize to those beings to avoid collective punishment of the entire community.

#### e) Public Sector Resources to Promote Land Security

Cadastral surveys cover most of the commercialized urban and peri-urban areas in the coastal plain. Historically surveys have not been vigorously pursued in most other regions or in upland areas. The verification of boundaries and the resultant improvement in ownership security is thus totally dependent on public sector land surveying, which is a function of public budgets. The result has been a compromise between the traditional practices of allowing citizens to bring unoccupied forest land under cultivation or continue to



collect NTFPs as “private property” and the requirements of the land titling system based on cadastral surveys.

To consider the role of property rights in general and land rights in particular, it is important to place these rights in the context of the overall institutional structure of the society and economy. There is the potential for a lack of congruence within state institutions although the formal legal system may provide for alienability, the transfer of land to persons including the transfer and “alienation” of land from one community to another this may represent a deviation from some cultural norms. Similarly, although the constitution makes provisions for private property rights and the formal laws establishing such rights, the corresponding registration and enforcement mechanisms may be weak or even largely absent away from the urban areas.

#### 2.3.4 *Problematic status of iTaukei women*

According to the TLTB there are a range of customary practices that were/are utilized when iTaukei land is alienated and these relate to practices that are designed to protect women in the iTaukei patrilineal kinship system, especially in relation to post-marital residence. The “*Covicovi ni Draudrau*” or “*Covicovi ni Lolou*” system (known in Ba Province as “*Lewe ni Kite*” or Nadroga as “*Lewe no Kato*” has been mentioned above and has been translated as a dowry payment. Anthropologists would accept this as a form of dowry because it involves a transfer of property even though strictly speaking in anthropology a dowry involves a transfer of “parental property”. The mataqali in this instance becomes “fictive parents” unless the transfer is directly by the Tokatoka, but as argued above most customary land is controlled by the mataqali not the Tokatoka which is a sub-clan of the mataqali. The lands affected would then be registered in the name of the woman and her agnate descendants or in the name of the mataqali she has married into. The issue here for indigenous women is where lands affected are registered in her name and agnate descendants at least in terms of ownership control she would maintain a semblance of formal control over her land, but if registered in the name of the mataqali her formal control over this land is more problematic.

There are/were other practices known as “*Ai Seres ni Wa ni Kuna*” or “To Untie the Strangling Cord” (in the past where a woman was due to be strangled to death after the death of her husband her relatives from her mataqali would donate land to save her from death and the land would now be registered with her dead husband’s mataqali) and “*Al mudu ni Liga*” or Chopping of the Little Finger” (land donation associated with the death of a husband where the grieving wife chops of a little finger. The dead husband’s family would donate land in appreciation to her family for looking after him and this donated land becomes the property of her mataqali). Thus, in one instance women traditionally benefited from this practice and in other instances she did not.

There is another practice known as “*Tatau ni Mate*” or “Parting Words Before Death” (that involved or involves the case of an elderly person who has no children and is looked after during his old age by a family of another mataqali. As a token of his appreciation he might give away a plot of land as heritage to the family looking after him. The land affected would now be registered in the name of the care giving family or their mataqali). There is no ethnographic evidence that the same applied to elderly women but this does not mean it did or does not exist, it is just doing fieldwork the GAP Research Team found no evidence of this practice targeted at elderly women, there being it should be noted demographically more elderly women than men because life expectancy among women even in rural Fiji is six years longer than for rural men.

While these traditional practices might have provided more than just a semblance of “protection” for women as customary landowners the question has to be asked do these practices persist on a contemporary basis. Unfortunately, the GAP Research Team could find no evidence from the villages it undertook consultations although some older participants could describe such practices and generally though for the most part, they were very good traditional practices. However, the most tentative conclusion we are prepared to make here is that traditional practices are not abandoned overnight and we have to see these practices in the context of nearly 3,000 years of indigenous history in Fiji. To do otherwise requires a more sophisticated anthropological analysis than is possible for the analysis undertaken for this GAP.

Despite Fiji's laws and policies that ensure indigenous land rights are protected there are a number of issues also relevant to the ER-P which need to be understood. One of the major issues is that there are conflicts among mataqalis over land boundaries that are often buried in official narratives because it is assumed or rather preferred that such conflicts are resolved locally. However, based on our consultations this does not always appear possible. For instance, traditionally mataqali demarcated its land from other mataqali based on geographical markers whether they be mountains, watershed, rivers and streams, rocky outcrops or even placement of a clump of rocks along agreed upon boundaries. But with changes to the landscape as a result of deforestation and degradation exacerbated by major climatic events such as Cyclone Winstone in 2016 some of the traditional boundary markers have disappeared. Although it is not simply climate change that has contributed to this, but also public and private infrastructure projects, most notably transport connectivity projects, hydropower projects, water storage projects and downstream agricultural development projects and resort development projects. Soil erosion and flash flooding has been the end result and traditional markers accepted by different mataqali have also disappeared.

The TLTB on behalf of the customary landowners have been undertaking cadastral surveys, but these have not always lessened conflicts among and between mataqali. One of the major issues is that these surveys do not rely on indigenous conceptualizations as to what demarcates one mataqali from another. Markers such as stones and rocks that have disappeared or stream and river beds that have either dried up or changed course are no longer considered to be "legitimate" boundaries. While many land use planners have lauded these cadastral surveys because they consider them to be a rational response that ensures conflicts are avoided or at least minimized this is not necessarily the view of indigenous persons who have been impacted. Some older men said that during the cadastral surveys they were consulted by the TLTB, but no women could ever recall being consulted by the TLTB. The latter argued that this was unnecessary anyway because married women could talk to their husbands or there are/were informal mechanisms at the village level whereby women could offer their opinions.

The TLTB also do not take into account that historically stronger mataqali acquired more land than weaker mataqali and thereby enhanced their capacity to establish a lien over natural resources, not simply the forests, but also the streams and rivers where aquatic products were more readily available. These stronger mataqali were also able to fell trees at a greater rate because they had more forest land available than the weaker mataqali whose land they possessed. It is difficult to quantify how these disputes aka conflicts benefited some mataqalis and not others but in the ER-P Accounting Area there are some mataqali with customary landholdings in excess of 15,000 hectares (33,750 acres: land area in Fiji typically expressed in acres rather than hectares), but only perhaps less than 100 households, but there are other mataqali with the same number of households but customary landholdings of approximately 1,000 hectares (2,250 acres). Understandably the TLTB generally argued that while Fiji's history and society has shaped the nature of land tenure it is/was pointless revisiting conflicts of the past unless they could be resolved at present. This approach is not always supported by "wronged" iTaukei irrespective of gender.

The gendered nature of the points made above might appear to be somewhat opaque, but iTaukei women argued that in relation to traditional markers they often had a much better knowledge than men even though the latter were the ones that squabbled with non-clanspersons because of women's role in traveling through mataqali land in search of NTFPs (they accept that men would hunt deep in the forests, but this was only on an intermittent basis). iTaukei women also feel slighted that they were not consulted during the cadastral surveys and do not accept that the technical knowledge of the surveyors was or is superior to theirs'. However, men from the same village argued that their wives and younger women are not technical experts and to suggest otherwise was an oxymoron. iTaukei women's concerns are expressed in terms of access to forest land to collect NTFPs or to graze their livestock in forest areas contiguous to their residential houses and to continue catching fish, eels and prawns in the streams that they were used to having access to. The bottom line is in the past iTaukei women in the villages for the most part have not been publicly consulted. If they raise this issue with the GAP Study Team or even respond to the issue, this appears to indicate they are concerned about the activities associated with "re-engineering" of customary land.

In this Section it has been impossible to cover any but the very important issues relating to women and land rights in any detail; but the narrative provided and the underlying analysis attempted indicates that the land rights of indigenous women are nowhere near as secure as existing laws and policies suggest they should be. This also means that iTaukei women are likely to encounter some major problems if and when carbon benefits are to be paid to participating mataqali. This is one of the issues that may result in the exclusion of many iTaukei women unless this GAP is taken seriously by major stakeholders: in other words there is significant buy-in by all major stakeholders.

### 3 The Proposed Gender Action Plan

#### 3.1 *Objectives of the Gender Action Plan*

The objective of the GAP is to ensure that the gender analysis of the ER-P design, implementation, evaluation and benefit sharing are undertaken using culturally sensitive and gender responsive approaches. The GAP will also include the proposed budget and arrangements for implementation of the GAP and its monitoring. Another major objective is to ensure that the GAP includes actions that are realistically possible in the context of the ER-P Accounting Area in Fiji and that this is reflected in stakeholder buy-in. The major activity that will indicate the latter is the Validation Workshop that was held on the 9<sup>th</sup> of May, 2019 in Suva and attended by as many stakeholder representatives as possible.

#### 3.2 *The Gender Action Plan*

The GAP has been prepared based on the analysis of gender issues that are considered relevant to the ER-P and the twelve actions identified are those that are considered will best facilitate an enabling environment in which both indigenous and non-indigenous women living in the ER-P Accounting Area can benefit from the ER-P. The summary of the GAP Activities is included in the following matrix Table 3.1 that identifies the Actions, Interventions, ERPAs (Emission Reduction Purchase Agreement) required by the WB before the ER-P can be implemented); with Targeted Interventions, Identification of the Stakeholders, Estimated Costs, and Monitoring Indicators. The GAP has been designed in part based on the existing ER-PD, but also actions have been identified in the SESA that have not been included in the existing ER-PD, notably the inclusion of coastal mangrove villages where, as stated elsewhere in this Report more than 35 % of indigenous women reside.

The targeted interventions are all directly or indirectly targeted at women and require the active participation of village women – whether indigenous or non-indigenous – in processes that hitherto they have not been involved in for the most part. The most significant intervention will be Action 1 – Agreement on Participatory Approaches to ER-P Implementation – because without this intervention all other interventions are unlikely to benefit women. It is important to stress this point because while there have been some successful examples of the active participation of women in earlier REDD+ activities in Fiji. The analysis undertaken for this GAP indicates to a significantly large extent women are excluded for both structural and cultural reasons from equal participation in the public domain decision-making processes. However, the purpose of this GAP is not only to ensure the more active participation of women in the ER-P, but also to, of equal importance, facilitate their greater empowerment so that it also benefits them in the broader context of more equitable gender relations.

The estimated costs are simply that. At this juncture the cost norms have not been established nor have they been based on the estimated 155 villages in 20 districts of 11 provinces, but only 60 “sites” and it is suggested that if the National REDD+ Program is serious about ensuring women benefit from the ER-P that it considers making available a portion of the funds made available by the FCPF and these be utilized prior to the signing of the ERPA. It can be seen that Actions 1, 2 and 3 (to a limited extent) are estimated to cost approximately FJ\$855,260 prior to the signing of the ERPA. It is not obligatory for Fiji to undertake such actions prior to the signing of the ERPA, but it has been found in some other CF Participant Countries (Costa Rica, Ghana, Nepal and Vietnam) that implementing some actions prior to the signing of the ERPA through the use of existing FCPF grant funds has proved to be quite effective. The other Actions are Post-ERPA and would require either funds from the GOF or an advance from the CF or a combination of both. This is why it is considered necessary that Fiji requests an advance payment of 10-15% just like other successful CF applicants. At present the ER-PD does not contain provision for an advance.

Suggested monitoring and evaluation indicators have been identified, but it is also strongly suggested that the ER-P work with women living in the ER-P Accounting Area to consider what they themselves consider they want to monitor and evaluate. Typically, M&E processes for natural resource management projects require a combination of social and technical inputs to such processes but this GAP with its emphasis on both indigenous and non-indigenous women would be better served if village-level women contribute to a robust M&E system. The extant issue for the GAP is really how can it be demonstrated that women can benefit socially-culturally and politically-economically from the ER-P while also not simply retaining their cultural identity but reinvigorating this identity.

**Table 3.1 Summary of GAP Activities for Fiji's ER-P**

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
<b>Action 1</b> <b>Agreement on Participatory Approaches to ER-P Implementation</b>	<p><b>Targeted Interventions:</b> National REDD+ Program secures agreement with each of the 11 ER-P Provinces that where possible and practical a formal commitment will be made to the adoption of participatory approaches to ER-P implementation that will also be socially and gender inclusive, especially of marginalized indigenous women residing in Vanua and significantly dependent on either forested areas or coastal mangroves.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> Village women at the Vanua level, Gender Focal Points (to be created if not in existence and provided with logistical support by the ER-P) in Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of ITaukei Affairs, Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources, Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation, Divisional and Provincial Offices and CSOs or NGOs with knowledge or experience in previous REDD+ activities in Fiji or who have demonstrated they can replicate and upscale activities that ensure greater levels of women's participation in natural resource management projects or programs.</p> <p><b>Estimated Cost:</b> It is proposed that the National REDD+ Office facilitate a 2-day workshop in each of the Western and Central Division in Viti Levu and the Northern Division in Vanua Levu with one participant from each of the Suva-based ER-P entities, four representatives from each of the eleven ER-P provinces, and 300 women from representative villages (include those indigenous women in both upland and lowland coastal villages and women likely to be impacted upon by the ER-P) in the ER-P provinces. (Travel expenses: surface - land for all participants except those from Tavenui who will require both sea and land transport and air travel for six Suva based ER-P partners to Savasavu - FJ\$10,000; Accommodation and Meal Expenses for 350 participants (includes divisional and provincial participants) of approximately US\$15,000; and, Facilitation and Miscellaneous Expenses of FJ\$5,000</p>	Buy-in based on GAP is necessary from all implementing agencies but ERPA not contingent on this except where safeguard issues are triggered.	For the duration of the ER-P on an iterative basis the ER-P will need to monitor and evaluate whether the agreement on participatory approaches has actually been followed through at the Tokatoka, Matakali and Vanua Levels. Where patrilineality is flexible (the Yavusa) it will also have to be included in the M&E Processes.

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	<p>for a total of US\$30,000 plus contingencies of 5% (FJ\$1,500): US\$30,150 to be sourced from the existing FCPF-REDD+ grant from the WB to the GOF).</p> <p><b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) Targeted representatives participate in the workshop of whom 30% should be women who are identified as poor and vulnerable (includes women who head households with very high dependency ratio); 2) Understanding by Participants of Participatory Approaches of the ER-P and, 3) Modalities for local participation agreed upon.</p>		
<p><b>Action 2</b></p> <p><b>Facilitation of SERNA at Selected Localities in the ER-P Accounting Area</b></p>	<p><b>Targeted Interventions:</b> Identify at least one district in each of the eleven ER-P provinces where it would be practical based on existing processes of land management (both agricultural and forestry) to undertake a Socio-Economic and Environmental Resource Needs Assessment that targets local forest and mangrove dependent villages and especially women within these villages of these districts that will be impacted upon by the ER-P.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> The Ministry of ITaukei Affairs, TLTB, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources, Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation and Department of Environment at the Vanua, Yavusa, Matakali and Tokatoka level district who will work with all potentially impacted women to ensure a socially and environmentally inclusive Socio-Economic and REDD+ Needs Assessment (SERNA)<sup>5</sup>.</p> <p><b>Estimated Cost:</b> One facilitator's fees and expenses for 30 days at approximate FJ\$3,000; participation fees of designated ministry and departmental officials for 5 days at approximate FJ\$5,500; participation fees of villagers (for loss of income) based on 55 villagers over 16 years of age for 15 days of approximate FJ\$24,750 (includes meals and travel), miscellaneous expenses of approximate FJ\$1,500 and contingency of 5% of FJ\$1,738: FJ\$36,188 for each SERNA. Thus, total for twenty SERNA would be approximately FJ\$723,760. This is to be sourced from the existing grant to the GOF by the FCPF-REDD+ from the WB pre-ERPA and post-ERPA from the advance paid to the GOF by the Carbon Fund supported by the WB.</p>	<p><b>Pre-ERPA</b></p> <p>Villages to be identified will be undertaken at the Divisional Workshops based on an assessment at to which villages have the demonstrated "absorptive capacity" for women to be actively involved. This will be based on the ability and willingness of women to be actively involved in the ER-P.</p>	<p><b>Post-ERPA</b></p> <p>Villages to be identified will be contingent on meetings at the provincial, district, village cluster and individual village level with the most important criteria in the context of gender a demonstration that women are able and willing to participate in the SERNA.</p>

<sup>5</sup> The Socio-Economic and REDD+ Needs Assessment (SERNA) is a necessary step in the process to secure site-specific socio-economic data and undertake a REDD+ Needs Assessment as not only a prelude to more collaborative forms of management but to construct a robust database to measure the impact of the ER-P at the local level.

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	<b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) SERNA involving all women in the villages identified during the Divisional Workshops; 2) Women involved in deforestation activities targeted to see what interventions could reduce such activities; and, 3) Agreements to establish forest management entities in 20 sites within 12 months.		
<b>Action 3</b> <b>Establishment of Local Forest and Mangrove Management Entity</b>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> On the assumption that there is an agreement based on the SERNA reached between forest managers and forest users a local forest management entity will be established to ensure that the objectives of the ER-P are achieved. As part of this process benefit sharing plans will be prepared to take advantage of carbon payments based on the MRV process that local women members of the management entity will also participate in. It is anticipated that such payments will be made for a range of ER-P related activities including forest protection activities, targeting households, groups or villages contributing to deforestation and degradation to a greater extent than other households, groups or villages, and resolving issues such as poorly demarcated boundaries, but also taking into account traditional customary approaches to boundary demarcation by customary landowners.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> Tokatoka, Mataqali, Yavusa, and Vanua working with the Ministry of Forestry for upland villages and Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources for lowland coastal villages aided by the TLTB. If possible, a civil society organization could assist with developing this entity but it would need to demonstrate very clearly from past performance that it understands gender and forestry and mangrove management issues and it is able and willing to work with other stakeholders to ensure the highest possible degree of gender responsiveness.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> For Pre-ERPA entities there should be additional cost of approximately FJ\$5,000 on a per annum basis with Year 1 being funded by the FCPF-REDD+ WB fund. However, for Post-ERPA entities they will initially be funded by the Advance Grant that the GOF has requested from the Carbon Fund. Thus, realistically the estimated cost over the first 12 months based on twenty SERNA village sites would be FJ\$100,000 and Post-ERPA for the other forty villages the approximate cost would be FJ\$200,000. Total cost FJ\$300,000.</p>	<b>Pre-ERPA</b>  It may not be possible to achieve the outcomes of this activity prior to the ERPA for all 60 sites selected but ideally at least 20 should be completed.	<b>Post-ERPA</b>  Dependent on the outcome of the Pre-ERPA forest management entities within 12 months of the ERPA being signed there should be at least 3 of these entities in each of the 11 ER-P Provinces

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	<b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) Number of Benefit Sharing Plans initiated by local village women signed; 2) Effectiveness of measures such as boundary demarcation; and, 3) Percentage of women involved in ER-P activities including forest and mangrove protection work and MRV activities.		
<b>Action 4</b> <b>Facilitation of Participatory Planning Processes</b>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> It has been found during consultations with indigenous village women that older women lamented the loss of traditional knowledge relating to land and forest among younger women and would like to ensure that indigenous knowledge acquired over many centuries is not lost among the younger generation of indigenous women. At the provincial level Integrated Land Use Plans will be developed and at the village level Community Management Plans will be developed. Thus, the Participatory Planning Processes (PPP) represents an opportunity to take into account these concerns and be integrated with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) objectives and action plans.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> Women at the Tokatoka, Mataqali, Yavusa and Vanua level, Ministry of Forestry, Land Use Division in Ministry of Agriculture, TLTB, Provincial Councils, District REDD+, NGOs and CSOs.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> FJ\$2,691,1110 will be allocated for the ILUPs at the district level and FJ\$106,444 at the village level for Community Management Plans. An Indigenous Person's Development Specialist with a local knowledge of indigenous women in the ER-P Provinces should be appointed to each of the three divisions for a period of 12 months each on an intermittent basis during the ER-P implementation. It is estimated that each of these facilitators will require lump sum payments of FJ\$8,000 per month or FJ\$96,000 over the 12-month period. Thus, 3 facilitators require FJ\$288,000 (plus 5% contingency for a total of FJ\$302,400).</p> <p><b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) Number of ILUPs and CMPs that involved the active participation of women; 2) Qualitative assessment of revival and transmission of indigenous knowledge to younger indigenous women; and, 3) Evidence of integration of this indigenous knowledge with NBSAP objectives and action plans.</p>	It should be possible to commence activities prior to the signing of the ERPA using FCPF Grant Funds in 20 sites as per Action 3	Based on past experience with forms of LUP it is anticipated that a minimum of 3 years post ERPA signing.



Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
<b>Action 5</b>  <b>Identification of Climate-Smart Agricultural Interventions</b>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> It is necessary to identify climate-smart agricultural interventions that not only ensure a greater degree of food security, but also the possibility of generating income that cannot be generated at present while also simultaneously reducing the pressure to clear existing forest cover for agricultural cropping. The intention is also to reduce on a voluntary basis the forms of shifting cultivation that are still undertaken in upland areas<sup>6</sup>. However, it is also necessary to identify with women what are “climate-smart” interventions as these are often vaguely defined and are of a more generic nature.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> All women who agree to participate in the ER-P should be involved but where women do not agree to be involved initially for whatever reason they should have the option to participate if at a later date they think the ER-P interventions could work for them. However, initially with grant financing the ER-P needs to identify those households that contribute for whatever reason to deforestation for agricultural cropping purposes and work with them. The Crop Extension Division of the Ministry of Agriculture will work with village women. It also necessary to identify a specialist with a demonstrated working knowledge of climate-smart agricultural interventions in both upland and lowland coastal areas of the South Pacific and preferably in Fiji.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> Approximately FJ\$6,000 per village is likely to be required as an upfront investment that would serve as a revolving fund to target all women in the village. A specialist would need to be mobilized at an estimated cost of FJ\$12,000 per person month worked for up to 6 months and thus FJ\$72,000. The advance payment from the ER-P could be utilized for such purposes although at six of the villages if they have agreed to be part of a forest management entity could draw on the existing FCPF-REDD+ grant to fund such activities. Post ERPA and once advance payment is made the ER-P would cover these costs. Initial total</p>	<p><b>Pre-ERPA</b></p> <p>Villages to be identified will be undertaken at the Divisional Workshops based on an assessment as to which villages have the demonstrated “absorptive capacity” for women to be actively involved. This will be based on the ability and willingness of women to be actively involved in the ER-P. But post SERNA also based on agreement to participate in the local forest management entity.</p>	<p><b>Post-ERPA</b></p> <p>Villages to be identified will be contingent on meetings at the provincial, district, Tokatoka, Mataqali, Yavusa, and Vanua Level with the most important criteria in the context of gender a demonstration that women are able and willing to participate in the SERNA.</p>

<sup>6</sup> It is acknowledged by the authors of this report that shifting cultivation *per se* did not necessarily contribute to serious forest land degradation and that, in fact traditionally many villages in the upland areas of the ER-P Accounting Area were very mindful of the importance of conserving natural resources. But unfortunately, the environment is not quite as pristine today, although any attempt by the ER-P to restrict shifting cultivation would trigger the ER-P social safeguard OP4.12 on involuntary resettlement as per the Environmental and Social Management Framework prepared for the ER-P.

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	<p>of FJ\$192,000 plus 5% contingency of FJ\$9,600. Thus, FJ\$201,600.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) Impact of grants on livelihoods of women involved in non-sustainable forest activities; 2) Percentage of women electing to practice climate-smart agricultural and forestry activities; and, 3) Replication and upscaling in villages over the initial 12 months of the Action Plan (excluding pre-ERPA phase).</p>		
<p><b>Action 6</b></p> <p><b>Strengthening Village's Legal Rights to Use and Benefit from Forest and Mangrove Land</b></p>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> Under Fiji's Forest Law of 1978 where nature or forest reserves have been declared without a special licence indigenous woman (and men) are not permitted to enter such forests to harvest NTFPs, fell trees, graze livestock or hunt and fish. Under Fiji's Environmental Management Act (EMA) of 2005 women residing in coastal mangrove villages are not accorded any management role and are not able to voice opposition to coastal developments such as resort or housing development. The Forest Bill of 2016 which has not been accorded legal status attenuate to some extent the 1978 Law, but there have not been any successful plans to update the EMA. It is proposed that both a new Forest Law and EMA be updated to ensure access to forests and management of the mangroves<sup>7</sup>.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> Women living in the villages at the sub-Vanua level, Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Lands and Mineral Reserves, and Department of Environment.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> There are no initial costs involved because this is a longer-term intervention although as part of the SERNA it will be necessary to whether restricted access to nature or forest reserves or coastal developments are impacting negatively on the livelihoods of indigenous women.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) Quantitative assessment of different types of land tenure (different leases etc.) in ER-P villages and 2) Recognition of recommendations made by ER-P for strengthening female villager's rights to use and benefit from land,</p>	<p><b>Pre-ERPA</b></p> <p>Process begins during the SERNA in the targeted villages but ERPA not contingent on any change to legislation.</p>	<p><b>Post-ERPA</b></p> <p>Penultimately during the implementation of the ER-P the Forest Law should be updated to ensure women have access to nature or forest reserves to at least collect NTFPs and where livestock owned by women are not destroying forest cover women should not be penalized. In relation to mangrove management the EMA should be updated so women can also decide on whether they support coastal developments.</p>

<sup>7</sup> Whether or not this is realistic remains to be seen because Fiji moves very slowly in relation to such issues but since the November 2018 elections there has been a sense of urgency that did not exist before and at the Validation Workshop participants voiced the opinion that both laws really do need to be updated.

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	it should be incumbent on the ER-P to ensure women are included.		
<b>Action 7</b> <b>Enhanced Gender Responsiveness in ER-P Management Activities</b>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> The ER-P PMU at the national and provincial levels will need to ensure that gender inclusive actions that will benefit women based on the GAP are actually implemented. It will also be necessary to ensure that the suite of safeguards (Resettlement Policy Framework, Environmental and Social Management Plan and Process Framework) are implemented in ways that also safeguard specific gender interests of both indigenous women and where relevant also non-indigenous women. To this end each of the PMUs should have a target of 30% of their staff being indigenous females with at least 10% of the female staff being from ethnic minority backgrounds.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> All female beneficiaries/participants of the ER-P in general but specifically women who are working in each of the ER-P PMUs.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> The average monthly salary for managerial positions in PMUs is FJ\$2,250 (excluding allowances), but ERPA there would be no payments made because the ER-P PMUs are yet to be established. But assuming at the national level there will be at least three female staff appointed and in each of the four Divisional PMUs one female staff appointed over 12 months following the signing of the ERPA the total estimated cost would be FJ\$162,000.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) Percentage of women appointed to managerial positions in the ER-PMUs; 2) Assessment of GAP outcomes in the first 12 months post-ERPA; and, 3) Resolution of safeguard grievances lodged by village women relating to the ER-P.</p>	<b>Pre-ERPA</b>  No action because the ERPA yet to be signed.	<b>Post-ERPA</b>  Initial 12 months any necessary site-specific Resettlement Plans and Ethnic Minority Development Plans that are prepared demonstrate the necessary degree of gender responsiveness and reflect the provisions of the ER-P Gender Action Plan.
<b>Action 8</b> <b>Need to involve Women in Policy Processes and Decisions</b>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> Need to improve ways how women are involved in policy processes and decisions related to climate mitigation measures associated with sustainable management of forests and mangroves; and how to support women movements as they work with emerging and evolving policy in projects. For example, significantly more gender responsive measures to interventions associated with the ER-P.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> The ER-P at the national level working with the key GOF ministries, Divisional and Provincial agencies associated with the ER-P, and</p>	No Action Prior to the Signing of the ERPA	Initial 12 months the ER-P needs to embark on a series of iterative actions, including applied research by independent local researchers

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	<p>organizations with a long history of advocacy for indigenous women in Fiji such as Soqosoqo Vakamarama.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> Approximately US\$36,000 to cover researchers' expenses and meetings among key stakeholders both at the national level and in the three Divisions.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Indicators:</b> 1) Development of Stakeholder Engagement Plan that demonstrates how village women can be involved in ER-P activities associated with climate mitigation and forest devolution; 2) Evaluation of initial participation of village women in ER-P activities (% from different ethnic groups and poor households; and, 3) Specific clauses in a new Forest Law (currently the status is that of "Bill" only i.e. it has no legal effect) that effectively embody gender equality.</p>		with a demonstrated capacity to understand gender and natural resource management issues.
<p><b>Action 9</b></p> <p><b>Women must be Involved in Discussions on Climate Variability</b></p>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> Women are heavily involved in agriculture and need to find ways on how they should be involved in discussion on what are the gender impacts of climate variability (as opposed to climate smart crops)</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> Women in selected villages ensuring that poor and vulnerable indigenous women are targeted. It is likely that the Ministry of Women, Social Welfare and Poverty Alleviation should facilitate these discussions but it will be necessary to ensure that this Ministry understands extant issues associated with climate change.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> Based on 20 villages and stakeholder involvement (also includes village women who give up their time) the costs should be absorbed under Action 3 because they are related.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Activities:</b> 1) Village women's specific understanding of climate variability; 2) Capacity of government stakeholders involved to understand climate variability; and, 3) Data disaggregated by district and province.</p>	No Action Prior to the Signing of the ERPA	Initial 12 months consultations need to be facilitated among women from different ethnic groups in each of the 20 ER-P Provinces
<p><b>Action 10</b></p> <p><b>Women's Involvement in Markets and how can Access to Markets be Improved</b></p>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> Action to find out how to overcome the constraints (and what are the constraints) for women's involvement in markets and how can access to market be improved. It is important for indigenous women in the rural areas of Fiji to understand what the market demands, and to develop coping strategies to deal with the changing nature of market demands.</p>	No Action Prior to the Signing of the ERPA	Activities to be undertaken that involve women from the villages, trading intermediaries and wholesalers

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	<p><b>Stakeholders:</b> Village women either currently involved in trading activities, especially of NTFPs, and women who are seeking to be involved, trading intermediaries and wholesalers and retailers.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> As this will involve some intra-district intra-provincial and inter-island visits it is estimated for all of the 20 ER-P provinces upwards of FJ\$100,000 needs to be allocated. This could be sourced from the advance payment sought by the GOF, but could be deducted from the payment of carbon credits during implementation of the ER-P.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Activities:</b> 1) Number of intra-districts, intra-provincial and intra-island visits undertaken by village women; 2) Increase in quantities of NTFPs sold to trading intermediaries; and, 3) Price increase/decrease as a result of closer linkages with the market.</p>		and retailers in district, provincial and intra-island visits.
<p><b>Action 11</b></p> <p><b>Need to Improve Women's Management of NTFPs</b></p>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> Find ways to improve management of NTFPs with women "collectors" having more of a say. What kinds of products harvested and overall access arrangements and do different proportions of men and women in user groups influence how forests and mangroves are managed?</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> Village women (and men) who are either directly or indirectly involved with the "collecting" of NTFPs.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> To be absorbed under Action 3 because it is planned that the ensuing BSPs will include the more sustainable management of NTFPs.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Activities:</b> 1) Women perceive they have "greater voice" than in the past; 2) Kinds of NTFPs harvested and improvements to overall access arrangements; and, 3) Improved management of NTFPs than prior to this Action.</p>	No Action Prior to the Signing of the ERPA	As part of BSP that will be developed in the first 12 months in 20 villages in each of 20 ER-P provinces.
<p><b>Action 12</b></p> <p><b>Summarising Progress on Gender Issues – Taking Stock of the Situation</b></p>	<p><b>Targeted Activities:</b> Action to support a summary of the issues facing women and previous work in the ER-P provinces. What gender related topics and themes have been of interest in the past decade and what new investments are needed to keep abreast with new demands in the management of the forests and mangroves in the ER-P.</p> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b> All ER-P stakeholders from individual indigenous women from the Tokatoka through to ministries at the national level and research institutes with a mandate to develop knowledge</p>	No Action Prior to the Signing of the ERPA	Independent research commissioned by the ER-P to provide an evidence-driven analysis of past, present and future issues

Action	Interventions	Pre-ERPA	Post-ERPA
	<p>products germane to indigenous women in the field of natural resource management in Fiji.</p> <p><b>Estimated Costs:</b> Lump sum of FJ\$30,000 to undertake and publish the independent research.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Activities:</b> 1) Similarities and differences in gender and forestry and mangrove issues facing women; 2) Extant causes of changes in these issues and outcomes for women; 3) Changes necessary that reflect new demands in the forest and mangrove sectors.</p>		
<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST FOR ACTIONS</b>		<b>FJ\$1,885,900 (US\$869,828)</b>	

### 3.3 *Integrating the GAP into the Emission Reduction Program*

It is not anticipated that the ER-P will make significant inroads to rural poverty, which the SESA and the GAP suggests do exist and are likely to get worse if villagers simply rely on land-based livelihood activities that the SESA clearly also suggests they no longer are. Rather the emphasis has to be on what incremental and modest reduction in poverty can the ER-P contribute. The SESA is relying on a multi-dimensional approach to poverty reduction and one that also facilitates the greater empowerment of women and other marginalized groups, whether the owners of forests and other land or among those groups that are leasing land. The gender analysis undertaken as part of the SESA and building upon a WB supported study in 2017 clearly demonstrates that irrespective as to whether women are “joint” customary owners of land they are less likely to control access to and use of forest and mangrove resources than men. It is strongly recommended by the SESA that the GAP developed for the ER-P build upon the strengths of the WB supported study otherwise women will not benefit from, to the extent they should from the ER-P.

The SESA has identified what should be the positive impacts of the ER-P. These positive impacts include a more sustainable approach to forest and mangrove management that does not exclude people from either the forests or the mangroves, which of course is in marked contrast to a strictly conservation approach to a program such as this. Managing the forests and mangroves is qualitatively different to conserving the forests and mangroves. Climate-smart agricultural interventions in areas surrounding existing forests or areas that villagers are contemplating clearing for agricultural cropping is a very good example of what is possible.

The SESA has also identified possible negative impacts even though in general the SESA argues all or most impacts should be positive because reducing carbon emissions is environmentally a very sound objective. But it is not the environmental impacts *per se*, rather it is the social impacts especially those associated with possible restricted access to natural resources from the forests and mangroves in the proposed ER-P Accounting Area. The SESA concludes in its recommendations by arguing that unfortunately many local villagers that are likely to be the putative beneficiaries of the ER-P still do not understand much if anything at all about the objectives of the National REDD+ Program let alone the specific objectives of the ER-P. Therefore, as a concluding comment the SESA strongly recommends that more effort be made to disseminate information about REDD+ and the proposed ER-P and there be a continued emphasis on the non-carbon benefits. The Annex Table 5.5 shows the summary of proposed ER-P interventions, the positive and negative potential mitigations from the SESA and ESMF and integrates them with the proposed GAP actions.

As mentioned in 3.1 above the Validation Workshop as required by the agreed ToR was held on the 9<sup>th</sup> of May in Suva. (See Section 5.5 for further details of the Validation Workshop.) It had been planned that a maximum of 30 stakeholder representatives would participate but in the end over 40 participants, 80% of them being women, were in attendance. The Validation Workshop provided comments and feedback was received from the participants. Basically, most participants agreed with the GAP and were especially pleased that cost estimates had been provided along with a brief summary of the proposed interventions, stakeholders who would, should or could be involved in the implementation of the GAP, the timelines proposed and the suggested monitoring indicators. Thus, the GAP deals with each of these issues one-by-one.

The proposed actions were considered to be useful and relevant although a representative from the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Reduction queried the actions proposed by arguing that while from a gender responsive perspective they were very good she was worried that they were not specific enough. For instance, she argued of making reference to markets as per Action 9 why did the GAP not provide examples of specific activities such as a Value Chain Analysis for NTFPs. Clearly a reasonable comment, but it was suggested by the Workshop that the GAP had to first state the necessity of overcoming constraints for the involvement of women in the markets and that Value Chain Analysis would or could be part of the investigation. It was also noted that the GAP is quite explicit in identifying the necessity of ensuring local women are involved in any investigation. This same representative argued that the GAP was advocating that the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Reduction play a more active role in the implementation of the GAP rather than acting as an enabling institution for other ministries, including key ministries such as Forestry to play a more important role in gender mainstreaming of GAP activities. This point is noted and the Workshop was told this Ministry would provide as much support as it could for other ministries, but of course within the funding constraints it faced. It was suggested by the GAP Team that the GAP has been designed to overcome such constraints.

Another point that was raised related to whether or not collaborative approaches to forest and mangrove management would work in the context of Fiji because most of the forest land and land surrounding the coastal mangroves is customary land and belongs to the indigenous iTaukei anyway. The last point was noted, but it appears some of the participants were confusing or conflating co-management with collaborative management. The point was made that indigenous iTaukei people are the customary landowners of most of the forest land and the issue is not one of co-management as the land belongs to them, but that collaborative management was being suggested for ER-P activities that ideally would lead to greater forms of sustainable forest and mangrove management. It was argued if a country such as Vietnam that is effectively a one-party state can accept the principle of collaborative management then why not could a more pluralistic society like Fiji not also accept such a principle. The conclusion on the day was that participants would go away and think about this principle, which it is argued here is quite a reasonable response. We cannot expect participants to embrace such principles without giving them some thought and reflecting on their efficacy.

Several participants questioned why a GAP was necessary arguing that in Fiji women and men accepted roles in traditional iTaukei society and there was little point emphasizing the dynamics of gender difference. They argued that indigenous women do not conceptualize separate spheres for women and men at the village level, that indeed this separation is more the result of gendered images of traditional iTaukei society by non-Fijians who do not understand the link between gender and tradition in Fiji. Instead they argued that the GAP should focus on actions that would benefit women and men in the traditional contexts of gender hierarchy and to suggest that the ER-P should or could empower indigenous women would not be well received at the village level. Even though evidence from the villages contradicted this argument to some extent and it was pointed out that the GAP was not designed to exclude men to simply benefit women they were unconvinced with this argument. Therefore, it is concluded the ER-P is going to have to work very hard to convince such participants that there are cogent reasons why the GAP needs to be gender responsive.

These same participants also questioned why the GAP should also identify non-iTaukei women because they argued the ToR was designed to focus on gender and forestry issues relevant to iTaukei women. It was explained that the ER-P Accounting Area also includes non-iTaukei villages and women living in these villages may also be impacted upon by the ER-P. For instance, it was pointed out that non-iTaukei women living contiguously with forests also harvest NTFPs, but if this only impacts upon a small number of non-iTaukei women they are also living and working on land leased from iTaukei communities and if the latter try and impose ER-P related activities such as afforestation on these leaseholders then non-iTaukei women will be affected. It also needs to be noted that there are links between indigenous and non-indigenous women such as during the six months of sugarcane harvesting or even in local markets. It was accepted by the majority of participants that the GAP should also make provision for non-iTaukei women to actively participate where it is considered relevant.

The GAP is also strongly influenced by the need to include actions associated with the coastal mangroves in the ER-P not least of all because 35-40% of iTaukei women depend to a very large extent on these mangroves. A spurious argument was mounted that while the importance of mangroves is recognized there could be no focus on mangroves until Phase Two because it was too late to include them in the ER-PD to be submitted to the Carbon Fund at the end of June 2019. It was argued during the forest Reference Emission Level<sup>[1]</sup> (REL) study that it was not possible to quantify the impact of including mangroves in calculations to assess the reduction in carbon emissions. This argument was debunked on the grounds that the technical arguments were based on assumptions that there was not enough information relating to the sequestration of coastal mangroves in Fiji. It was also learned that the Fiji REDD+ Steering Committee had always opposed the exclusion of the coastal mangroves from the ER-P not because of their importance to iTaukei women, but because of the cumulative impact their inclusion would have on reducing carbon emissions. However, at the time of preparing this Report no firm decision had been made to include the coastal mangroves in the ER-P – at least for what is referred to as Phase 1 – but it was explained at the Validation Workshop they would be included in the GAP even if their inclusion were to be delayed to a Phase 2.

Generally, there were no contrary comments where the GAP identified stakeholders who should participate in the implementation of the GAP with the exception of the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation as argued above. It was accepted by most participants that with most of the actions the village women are to be targeted not simply as passive participants but actively engaged ER-P stakeholders. It was accepted that this would vary from village-to-village, province-to-province and division-to-division based on a variety of social and environmental differences, but also ethnicity. But most stakeholders also expressed a concern as to whether the activities could or would be upscaled and replicated. They are aware of current REDD+ projects, but they also questioned as to why these projects had generally not moved beyond the pilot stage despite in some instances, projects being implemented nearly a decade ago. As most participants quickly understood this GAP is specifically linked to the implementation of the ER-P, they want to see a GAP that goes beyond the end of this ER-P in 2024. The GAP Study Team argued that principles of this GAP are not time-bound, but in the context of the ER-P it is necessary to prepare a timeline that is consistent with the financing program supported by the WB.

In relation to the estimated costs most participants stated they would have to study them more closely, but were pleased that a “ball-park” estimate had been made. No-one seemed to think the suggested budget was unreasonably high and in fact some suggested that the budget is too low, but it was generally agreed this should be the subject of more discussion with a better understanding of applicable cost norms for Fiji. There was some discussion as to whether funds remaining in the FCPF-REDD+ program from the WB could be used for such purposes and the GAP Study Team pointed out that for both Vietnam and the Lao PDR most of the funds were being used for pre-ERPA activities although in the Lao PDR there is a more specific commitment to using some of these funds for the GAP that has been prepared. The extant point that most of the participants made though was that without a specific budget actions associated with the GAP would probably not be implemented and this will form a very strong recommendation of this GAP.



Monitoring indicators did not elicit much response from the participants although some participants argued it was very important to differentiate between quantitative and qualitative monitoring indicators and between outputs and outcomes. Some of the actions included both types of indicators but the GAP Team is awaiting feedback from the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation because it is currently involved in developing similar monitoring processes with offshore fisherfolk and the Ministry of Fisheries. However, all participants agreed it was more important to capture the views of rural women who will be targeted in this ER-P and of equal importance to encourage these women to develop their own participatory M&E system for the ER-P.

In conclusion the Validation Workshop was a very useful and necessary process because even though the National REDD+ Program had not been ignoring gender issues as it had significant guidance from the WB's Senior Social Development Specialist, it had not systemically integrated gender issues into its program. The ER-PD that has been developed noted clearly that the GAP would identify specific actions and the resultant outcome of the Validation Workshop it is argued the stage has been set for a GAP that is implementable even if it requires further updates.

The GAP Study Team has analysed extant gender issues that include those that are specific to Fijian society to develop a practical GAP that both benefits iTaukei and non-iTaukei women, there has been or will be buy-in from all stakeholders, and addresses the objectives of the ER-P designed for Fiji. The Validation Workshop for the most part has endorsed the GAP that has been designed although it will require some updates before it is finally accepted. This is not a major problem as Fiji can be formally accepted into the Carbon Fund without the GAP being fully completed. Rather it is the WB that requires a finalized GAP as part of the ERPA, but to clarify any confusion, the GAP is not a safeguard instrument unlike safeguard instruments relating to indigenous peoples, the environment, and involuntary resettlement. It is instead linked to the WB policy on Gender and Development whereby gender is a cross-cutting issue for all safeguards and it is necessary to demonstrate how these safeguards are also gender responsive.

However, it is also very important to recognize that this GAP has not been commissioned directly by the WB, but by the project for FCPF-Capacity Building on REDD+ for Forest-Dependent Indigenous Peoples in the EAP and SAR Regions. In the context of Fiji, Tebtebba, which undertakes policy research and education on indigenous peoples, has funded the GAP Study Team to mainstream gender into Fiji's REDD+ and ER-P. Therefore, it is important to recognize that the research undertaken for this Study also reflects the concerns of Tebtebba, which the GAP Study Team has undertaken the analysis of indigenous related gender issues in Fiji and made recommendations via the GAP Action Plan because it is the GAP that provides the agreed upon road-map for indigenous women (and also the ethnic minority Fijian-Indian women) to benefit from the ER-P

The analysis of iTaukei women in Fiji who are dependent to a greater or lesser extent on natural resources (defined in this study as upland women who are forest-dependent and lowland coastal women who are mangrove dependent) makes it quite clear that even though these women are customary landowners and should be able to socially and economically function on an equal footing with men iTaukei customary landowners this is a very simplistic generalization. Unfortunately, a range of indigenous peoples both men and women at all levels from the village family units to senior policy-makers have embraced the standard conventional view of gender relations among the iTaukei people and find it difficult to accept that specific actions based on a clearly defined strategy are necessary to ensure that iTaukei women can also benefit from the ER-P.

The analysis recognizes the family, communal and religious obligations of all iTaukei communities that men and women are obliged to uphold but it goes beyond traditional "ethnographic" depictions of rural iTaukei society to understand why there is a considerable degree of social exclusion based not simply on decision-making in the public domain, but access to and control especially of customary land. Of course, the analysis is sufficiently nuanced to ensure that there are exceptions to the norm and in some mataqali iTaukei women fare much better than in other mataqali. If anything, the analysis is based on resisting simplistic generalizations, including those that iTaukei women experience high levels of gender inequality based on structural and cultural characteristics of rural iTaukei society. The point has also been made that among non-iTaukei women communal obligations are considerably less important, but iTaukei women have some measure of social and economic protection that non-iTaukei women lack.

While the concern of the study has been to focus on gender issues germane to iTaukei women it also concluded that indigenous women cannot analytically be treated in isolation from the women who are non-iTaukei, specifically the Fijian-Indian ethnic minority or Fijian citizens of Indian ethnicity, who unfortunately have not been included in the existing ER-PD despite the fact that the ER-P has been or will be designed to cover areas in Fiji where non-iTaukei women are also living. The analysis undertaken suggests for the most part that iTaukei women living in rural areas are socially and economically "better off" than Fijian-Indian women in terms of land ownership, educational and health outcomes, housing and income generation opportunities. But like iTaukei women the Fijian-Indian women do not really enjoy equitable gender relations, and in fact in

many instances are worse off than iTaukei women. The study has also focused on important issues such as rural poverty and argued no matter what methodological tools are used there are significant pockets of poverty ranging from 28% of iTaukei female-headed households that are unemployed (40% of non-iTaukei) to 50% of iTaukei women that live in households without electricity (81% of non-iTaukei households) although as argued in the analysis of poverty analysing poverty in Fiji is complicated because theoretically iTaukei women are “resource rich” but “cash poor” whereas non-iTaukei women are “cash rich” but “resource poor”.

The analysis has attempted to identify the socioeconomic dynamics that establish these linkages between indigenous and non-indigenous women and demonstrate why a socially inclusive GAP also has to include non-indigenous women. It has also been argued that for the GAP to be acceptable to the WB it also has to include all women irrespective as to their ethnicity but this is less important in the context of this analysis than the actual linkages between indigenous and non-indigenous women. Some of the important linkages are those that exist where there are villages contiguous with one another because they also share the same natural resource base and in some areas of the ER-P where iTaukei women spend up to six months of the year as contract harvesters of sugarcane on land leased by non-iTaukei households.

The interventions currently included in the ER-PD have been critically analysed and it is concluded that by ignoring women who are dependent on coastal mangroves the subsequent ER-P assuming Fiji is successfully admitted into the Carbon Fund the ER-P is ignoring 35-40% of iTaukei women. This “oversight” it is claimed will be rectified in a Phase Two of the ER-P but the GAP Study Team along with most participants at the Validation Workshop and even most of the National REDD+ Steering Committee are befuddled as to why coastal mangroves have been included from the proposed ER-P Accounting Area. Unless coastal mangroves are included in the ER-PD that is submitted to the Carbon Fund in less than six weeks the ER-P will have significant less beneficial outcomes for iTaukei women than it should have. In fact, in reality excluding coastal mangroves from the ER-P effectively means that only 60-65% of iTaukei women are excluded. If we add non-iTaukei women, who make up 45% of the rural population in the ER-P Accounting Area some 50% of rural women are excluded. The question then is how can this be a gender inclusive ER-P when half the female population is being excluded? Despite the ER-PD excluding the coastal mangroves from the ER-P Accounting Area it is strongly argued that it is not too late to include the coastal mangroves and ensure as much of the female population as possible is included. It should be also noted that the National REDD+ Steering Committee was strongly supportive of the mangroves being included. The problem was that the entity contracted to undertake the forest inventory study excluded coastal mangroves. This entity had little or no understanding of indigenous women’s issues.


Finally, and in conclusion the analysis undertaken by the GAP Study Team is seeking to assure all stakeholders that both indigenous and non-indigenous women are not living in a timeless vacuum. That the times are a changing should be obvious and especially among younger women. While some younger women are content with never experiencing life out of the village because they are uncertain as to what the future holds; there are other young women who want to leave the village either on a temporary or permanent basis. These younger women have little or no interest in sustainable forest or mangrove management although none of them want to see their households experience difficulties with access to and use of natural resources but they do not see a future in the village. Thus, it needs to be recognized that the gender analysis needs to be informed as to what the future holds rather than simply dwelling on the past or the present. However, in making this statement it also needs to be recognized that iTaukei women as the indigenous women do have a stake in conserving their forests and mangroves because the issue is not simply about reducing carbon emissions but their soul, their cultural identity, their oral traditions are all inextricably linked with both the forests and the mangroves.

## 5 Annexes

### 5.1 Women and Consultations

#### 5.1.1 Introduction

In this Section the GAP Research Team provide details of the consultations it had as part of the preparation of this Report and the GAP in a variety of villages – more remote upland villages in Viti Levu and Vanua Levu more dependent on forest resources for their livelihoods than other villages in the ER-P that are occupied almost exclusively by iTaukei persons, villages at a lower elevations less dependent on forest resources that are occupied by both iTaukei and non-iTaukei persons, and coastal mangrove villages occupied to a very large extent by iTaukei persons – in all of the ER-P Divisions (Central, Western and Northern) and all of the eleven provinces in the ER-P Accounting Area. Twenty-one FGDs and a similar number of NRTs were facilitated by the GAP Study Team during April and early May 2019 and prior to this during July and August 2018 a further nine FGDs and similar number of NRTs were facilitated prior to the 2019 FGDs and NRTs, but many of the similar gender and ethnicity issues were raised and consultations revolving around these issues were undertaken. In total, as per the introductory comments in Section 1 some 352 women including 73 non-iTaukei women participated in these 21 FGDs and NRTs, at least 2 key women informants in each village were interviewed (and 50 men), 20 district representatives, 11 provincial representatives and stakeholders at the divisional, national and international level from both the public and private sector and CSOs and NGOs. However, in this Section the focus is on consultations (see Figures 5.1 and 5.2) that were facilitated with both iTaukei and non-iTaukei women living in the rural areas of the ER-P as per the aforementioned statement made in this introduction.



#### 5.1.2 Location and Dates of Consultations

The location, date, village type, activity type, numbers and ethnicity of participants in the consultations on which this GAP is based are included in the Table 5.1 below.

**Table 5.1 Location, Date, Village Type, Activity Type, Numbers and Ethnicity of Participants**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Village Type</b>	<b>Activity Type</b>	<b>Numbers</b>	<b>Ethnicity</b>
Nabukelevu Village Serua District Serua Province	22/07/2018 and 23/07/2018	Native Forest And Livestock Rearing	FGD and NRT	10 Females and 05 Males	iTaukei
Natila Village Bau District Tailevu Province	24/07/2018 And 25/07/2018	Coastal Mangrove With Horticulture	FGD and NRT	15 Females	iTaukei
Narara Village Saivou District Ra Province	26/07/2018	Grassland with Pine Plantation	FGD Only	18 Females	iTaukei
Naseyani Village Rakiraki District Ra Province	27/07/2018	Grassland And Agroforestry	FGD Only	15 Females	iTaukei
Naawaka Village Nadi District Ba Province	28/07/2018 And 29/07/2018	Sugarcane And Agroforestry	FGD And NRT	18 Females And 04 Males	Fijian Indian
Savudoro Village Suvusavu District Cakaudrove Province	10/08/2018 And 11/08/2018	Native Forest And Agricultural Cropping	FGD and NRT	15 Females	iTaukei
Korosi Village Navatu District Cakaudrove Province	11/08/2018 And 12/08/2-18	Deforested for Agricultural Cropping	FGD and NRT	20 Females And 06 Males	iTaukei
Qila Village Cakaudrove District Cakaudrove Province	13/08/2018	Deforested for Agricultural Cropping	FGD Only	15 Females	iTaukei
Somosomo Village Cakaudrove District Cakaudrove Province	14/08/2018 And 15/08/2018	Deforested for Agricultural Cropping	FGD and NRT	18 Females and 02 Males	iTaukei
Soqulu Village Cakaudrove District Cakaudrove Province	16/08/2018 And 17/08/218	Deforested for Agricultural Cropping	FGD And NRT	15 Females	iTaukei
Vatutu Village Nadi District Ba Province	12/04/2019	Sugar Cane and Smallholder Agroforestry	FGD Only	15 Females and 2 Males	Fijian Indian
Natalau Village Sabeto District Ba Province	13/04/2019 and 14/04/2019	Sugar Cane and Smallholder Agroforestry	FGD And NRT	20 Females	Fijian Indian
Lomolomo Village Vuda District Ba Province	16/04/2019 and 17/04/2019	Sugar Cane and Livestock	FGD And NRT	15 Females and 4 Males	Fijian Indian
Vuema Village Malomalo District	18/04/2019	Forest, Grassland, Livestock and	FGD Only	25 Females	iTaukei

Location	Date	Village Type	Activity Type	Numbers	Ethnicity
Nadgora-Navosa Province		Agricultural Cropping			
Vatulovona Village Wailou District Macuta Province	20/04/2019 and 21/04/2019	Mangroves, Plantation Forestry and Livestock	FGD And NRT	18 Females and 05 Males	iTaukei
Mataniwai Village Labasa District Macuta Province	22/04/2019 and 23/04/2018	Sugar Cane, Plantation Forestry and Livestock	FGD And NRT	20 Females	Fijian Indian
Nacula Village Seqai District Macuta Province	24/04/2019	Plantation Forestry and Livestock	FGD Only	15 Females	iTaukei
Galoa Village Lekutu District Bua Province	25/04/2019 and 26/04/2019	Forest, Livestock and Horticulture	FGD And NRT	10 Females and 08 Males	iTaukei
Natokalau Village Kubulau District Bua Province	27/04/2019 and 28/04/2019	Natural Forest, Plantation Forestry and Livestock	FGD And NRT	15 Females	iTaukei
Waivou Village Burebagsa District Rewa Province	30/04/2019 and 01/05/2019	Mangroves and Market Gardening	FGD And NRT	25 Females and 10 Males	iTaukei
Kavula Village Nayavatoka District Ra Province	02/05/2019 and 03/05/2010	Mangroves, Plantation Forestry and Horticulture	FGD And NRT	15 Females and 05 Males	iTaukei

It can be noted during the first round of consultations in July and August 2018 only one non-iTaukei village was included, which was not the preference of the GAP Study Team that was working on the SESA at the time. However, it can be noted that originally the SESA Team from the University of South Pacific did undertake consultations in several non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian villages in Ba Province that also focused on some of the extant gender and forestry issues as they impact upon this latter group of women.

### **5.1.3 Issues Raised and Discussed**

The GAP Study Team as per the comments made in the Introductory Section to this Report sought to raise issues with local women but also to encourage local women to raise what they considered were relevant issues. Hence, the issues identified here are an amalgam of what the Study Team suggested and what local women suggested. It can be noted here that the GAP Study Team tried to raise issues germane to REDD+ but found because in most villages' women had little or no idea of REDD+, and that some time would need to be spent explaining the objectives of REDD+. This as, argued throughout this Study, most certainly highlights the need for the subsequent ER-P to have a more effective outreach program than it has had to date.

- 1) The first issue that was raised with all groups including those consulted in 2018 was whether it was correct in the public domain the women have a lesser voice than men? This means in actuality that women are generally not in a position to influence any discussions, except by very indirect means, or openly oppose decisions that they disagree with. By-and-large all participants, irrespective of socio-economic status agreed that generally this is so, but most, especially iTaukei participants, went on to explain that

this is embedded in traditional iTaukei culture. However, a few women with links to the leadership of the Tokatoka, Mataqali and Vanua claimed this is not correct and that women can express themselves in public if “invited” by men of status. Most women indirectly questioned this claim although they did concede women do have some indirect influence over men, both at the household level and through informal networks, especially church groups. As an aside most iTaukei women belong to one Christian denomination or another and the participants acknowledge the influence of organized religion on and over their lives, but nearly all iTaukei participants acknowledge that traditional beliefs pertaining to authority, hierarchy and status also impact upon the way they think and behave.

Non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women argued the capacity of women to influence men very much depended on their status within local villages but in the Hindu Temples and Muslim Mosques they were generally accorded lesser status. Only in the Christian Churches (primarily Methodist) did these women consider themselves to have some limited influence. Both these women and iTaukei participants consider that in general iTaukei women have considerably more autonomy than non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women and this is grounded in both structure (fact that iTaukei women are also customary owners of land) and culture (traditional iTaukei notions of time-and-place are grounded in 3,000 years of Fiji’s history compared to over 5,000 years of Indian “history”). None of the participants claimed they were “cultural” experts on one another’s culture, but they are interested in why indigenous women in Fiji tend to have more autonomy than non-indigenous women.

- 2) The second issue that was raised related to issues of cultural identity, the importance of customary land, and whether on a contemporary basis everyone in Fiji actually understands the centrality of land to the iTaukei (this was not an issue for non-iTaukei women whose households are allowed to lease but not own customary land)? Many participants argued that iTaukei culture is inconceivable to understand without reference to the land: that the land is the cultural and spiritual repository of the iTaukei soul. In the public domain and with all official instruments such as the Constitution and the Native Land Law (and most participants appear to have a reasonable working knowledge of both) participants claimed the government and Fijian society do understand these issues but nowadays at the national level the “Soul of the iTaukei” is being undermined to some extent by government policies that are increasingly treating land as a tradable commodity even within the context of the leasing system (especially an issue for coastal iTaukei villages).

However, nearly all participants were those who have had some exposure to CSOs or NGOs are highly critical of those CSOs or NGOs with a conservationist bias who urge villagers to retain their traditional attachment to land without understanding the changing livelihood needs of village women (most participants want a better future for their children than they have had for themselves) and do not wish to be treated as people living in a time-warp. Nevertheless all participants were more critical of public and private narratives that have been commoditizing traditional culture to market stereotyped images of the Fijian people and their land (nothing annoys them more than phrases such as “Fijian Time” or images associated with the “Kava Tabula”) although increasingly there is an understanding that tourism is critical to Fiji’s economic development: the issue is will women share in these benefits?

- 3) The third issue that was raised related to the REDD+ Program and how the climate change initiatives in the ER-P area may affect them? All women irrespective of socio-economic status were very forthright in their understanding that climate change was a very important issue, especially those affected by Cyclone Winstone in 2016, which was particularly devastating and affected villages. Participants argued they are trying to be as resilient as possible, but fear the next extreme weather event (most of these participants believe from hereon in cyclones are going to become more severe). Participants cited issues such as raising sea levels, especially for those living in coastal areas, significantly higher temperatures during the dry season, especially in the Eastern and Northern Divisions, wet seasons that were increasingly difficult to cope with in terms of flooding and even impacts on agricultural crops. Even in upland villages participants argued that climate change has been brought about by deforestation and degradation and the most important impacts are an increase in soil erosion, flash flooding, poorer quality of water, and fewer eels, prawns and other small fish in the streams, rivers and other water bodies (also an issue in most

coastal mangrove villages where anecdotal evidence from participants suggest a 25% decline in mangrove marine products over the past decade).

However, few participants are really aware of REDD+ activities in Fiji. Most participants could relate that REDD+ is a GOF initiative to address deforestation and degradation, but they could not explain in any detail the essential elements of REDD+. The centrality of a reduction in carbon emissions and the role of women living in rural areas would play, either had not been explained to them or was “lost in translation”. A major point made was that many of the REDD+ documents have not been prepared in an idiom that is readily understandable and that REDD+ in Fiji should have asked local women to assist them to design information brochures, TV and social media programs, and outreach activities. It is not that REDD+ has not attempted to access some of the villages included in the consultations as participants pointed out, but that it did not effectively target most women living in the villages. Thus, as many participants pointed out “elite capture” is an important issue that cannot be ignored, especially women who considered themselves to be living in or near poverty and other participants also considered to come from socially and economically vulnerable households. The few male participants could identify the fact that perhaps local villages would receive some undefined benefits, but specific details relating to activities, interventions, implementation and benefits they also knew very little about.

- 4) The fourth major issue relates to how the ER-P would work for women? It was explained by the facilitators that their suggestions were extremely important because otherwise a GAP that might benefit them could not be effectively developed. All participants wanted to understand what the real objectives of the ER-P would be in Fiji. They could quite easily understand that the sustainable management of natural resources is very important, not only to their livelihoods, but for iTaukei women, also their cultural identity. They argued that even though they know ‘sustainability’ is not the same as ‘conservation’. Many women also argued that “...even though we are thought not to know much, we do have a wealth of traditional knowledge that many experts, including you as [facilitators] do not understand”. So, as a first step forward, most iTaukei women want our traditional knowledge on natural resources to be recognized. Men claim to have more knowledge of the “deep forest”, but “....as we go to the forests on a much more regular basis than men, and we rely on knowledge handed down to us, we know at least as much, if not more, than iTaukei men”. Although, none of the participants argued that it is productive to argue they know more than men, but rather that traditional knowledges are complementary not in opposition to one another. Non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women lack the traditional knowledge of iTaukei women, but they do have a good understanding of the impact of degraded forest land on agricultural and horticultural productivity because these are sectors they are more likely to be involved in than iTaukei women and if afforestation and reforestation were to impact upon them their specific knowledge they argue would be very useful. So, can the ER-P work to benefit both indigenous and non-indigenous women was the question often asked by participants?
- 5) The fifth major issue relates to aspects of the ER-P and these were focused on one-by-one to see if it were possible for participants to understand the extant issues. What immediately aroused the interest of the participants was: how would the ER-P assess whether there would be a reduction in carbon emissions? This is without considering the carbon or non-carbon benefits. Participants were extremely interested in how a reduction in carbon emissions would be calculated and what role they would or could play in such processes. When they were informed that a series of activities such as MRV were being designed to ensure effective monitoring and verification the almost universal response was that local women (and men) know more about forest reference levels than external experts, because they live in or near the forests and they were not especially happy about experts reporting on whether they were managing the forests sustainably or not. The primary reason is that for the most part the forests belong to the iTaukei people and not to “external experts”. However, they accepted that if they were to receive carbon benefits the money would not “fall from the sky” and there would need to be some form of external monitoring.

What also interested most of the participants was the argument that if they contributed to the sustainable management of forests, they would receive carbon benefits based on their actual performance in arrears. This prompted an immediate response from all participants, including non-iTaukei Indian-Fijian women



that there would be no way they would engage in activities designed to conserve or protect existing natural resources without some form of advance payment. They considered any proposal to pay them in arrears based on results assessed largely by “external experts” to be outrageous and their universal response was a definite NO. Most participants went on to add there are differences between planting a crop that gets destroyed by floods or livestock who die from disease because this is a risk they have to bear, but to suggest that rural women provide their services in advance of being paid and yet to be agreed upon payment for emission reductions are not the same. Their conclusion was whoever came up with this proposal has absolutely no idea of where women are coming from in Fiji. Indeed, some of the more vociferous participants questioned whether women or men in other countries or even the designers of such an approach would buy into such an agreement.

As part of the ER-P the vexed issue of benefit sharing was discussed widely by most participants. At one level most iTaukei participants argued that the TLTB ensures that royalties for land leased for whatever purpose are paid to the mataqali who theoretically distributes it to all Tokatoka, but during some consultations, especially in coastal mangrove settlement or at least land contiguous with these mangroves the TLTB in some instances is not completely transparent. The facilitators were requested not to identify specific instances based on the consultations because they are “frightened” of the repercussions. However, it appears that in the context of high-value leases such as those involving coastal resort developers, the TLTB may have accumulated benefits that may not have been shared with the intended beneficiaries. Although older participants argue that in relation to women the situation has improved over the past decade in the context of the actual distribution of benefits because in the past the Turaga iTaukei (clan leader) generally kept the benefits for himself and his entourage and distributed them at his discretion. Thus, if carbon benefits are to be distributed as part of the ER-P then it is necessary to distribute them on a collective basis and not an individual household basis and there is the necessity to recognize the specific developmental needs of women (e.g., enhanced food security through support for “kitchen gardens” to provide more nutritious food for all household members versus men (e.g., men may prioritize, for instance, the permanent surfacing of an access road). But most participants, including the small number of men agreed wherever possible it is preferable to forge a consensus between women and men especially as the carbon benefits are reported as likely to be financially limited.

- 6) While it was relatively easy to agree on the benefit sharing mechanisms the sixth issue identified as being important during the consultations, was the issue as to who would be responsible for the sustainable management of the forests or the mangroves? Most participants argued that at present women are either deliberately or otherwise excluded from the formal management of natural resources. That even where the GOF at the district, provincial or divisional level has a very limited presence in the mataqali women are not invited to participate, but even if they were most participants argued these GOF personnel are not necessarily technically competent nor socially engaging with the local population. Rather they stress the technical tasks they are supposed to undertake such as the girth measurement of trees logged, ensuring that livestock are not “destroying” forest undergrowth, and that NTFPs are not being over-harvested, but actually, the only effective task they undertake is girth measurement of trees logged. Participants wanted to know if the ER-P had some form of “management” that they could participate in and benefit from. All participants stated they have little or no knowledge of collaborative approaches to management, but when the difference between this form of management and co-management was explained to them, they said they preferred the former to the latter because ideally village women could bring to the table their strengths and “experts” could bring to the table their strengths. It needs to be noted that all participants irrespective of ethnicity are very interested in “win-win” outcomes.
- 7) However, the seventh issue that commandeered a significant level of discussion involved whether iTaukei women, as joint owners of customary land, actually had effective control of the land they are supposed to own? It was pointed out that on marriage, because of the patrilineal kinship system which also includes patrilocal post-marital residence for most women, they become members of their husband’s mataqali and are not customary landowners of land in his mataqali. While they still retain a semblance of stakeholder rights in land of their natal mataqali, they can be caught in limbo between pre-marital mataqali and post-marital mataqali rights to land. Participants acknowledged that theoretically their children had the right

to inherit or rather to become a full customary landowner of their husband's mataqali. In practice most mataqalis do not restrict the access of women to mataqali land, but they can if they choose to do so. A more substantive issue and one related to benefit sharing is what may occur when mataqali land is leased for high-value economic activities for up to 99 years? It is here that quite a few participants thought they would or could be disadvantaged and they are seeking to understand how the ER-P could assist them. Moreover, it was in the context of this issue, that many women asked how would a carbon title work or not work to their advantage in the context of benefit sharing? They had simply not heard anything about this issue nor do they really understand it.

- 8) The eighth and last important issue that was raised related to non-carbon benefits. As most participants understand that carbon benefits are unlikely to be financially very substantial, they were seeking to know what other non-carbon benefits would they accrue? When the facilitators mentioned greater levels of gender empowerment, most participants argue this was a very abstract and esoteric benefit: they wanted to know what would be practical non-carbon benefits of a more concrete basis. The facilitators asked them what were practical non-carbon benefits and some of the suggestions were: (i) better knowledge of NTFPs, such as medicinal plants that could be used in modern medicine (they have heard there are some medicinal plants in some of the forests that can be used in the treatment of cancer, diabetes and hypertension); (ii) enhanced opportunities to secure effective market access, not just for NTFPs, but also local horticultural foodstuffs and handicrafts; (iii) improved grazing practices that enable them to raise healthier and heavier livestock that can also be marketed commercially; (iv) better knowledge of insecticides and herbicides, including safe handling of these agricultural chemicals that do not result in negative environmental impacts; (v) practical knowledge on what forms of climate-smart agriculture would result in the need to avoid deforestation and degradation, (specific reference to the cultivation of high value kava); (vi) training and equipment to take part in fire-fighting and disaster management; and (vii) effective dispute resolutions that would enable customary landowners at the Tokatoka, Mataqali and Vanua level to be resolved, so that women could avoid being accused of encroaching on the customary land of other landowners. Non-iTaukei Fijian-Indian women were not sure of the non-carbon benefits apart from (iii), (iv), and (vi), but they did suggest that when leases come up for renewal, that their names should also be included on new leasing agreements.

#### **5.1.4 Conclusion**

It needs to be noted that these consultations with women in the ER-P Accounting Area are not the sum totality of issues that could or should be discussed with women, and they are structured to focus on the ER-P. However, the consultations do strongly suggest that all women, but especially the iTaukei women living in the rural villages, are not bereft of ideas, suggestions or perspectives that have been used to inform the actions envisaged in the ensuing GAP. Issues such as respect for cultural identity and the non-commercialization of culture are also very important to indigenous peoples and the iTaukei women are no different in this respect, but the ER-P cannot specifically deal with this issue, unless at the local level ER-P participants decide as part of ER-P activities, to support community-based ecotourism ventures. This of course is becoming increasingly possible as more-and-more of coastal Fiji is being commercialized, but the initiative will need to rest with the local communities. Women could use both carbon and non-carbon benefits to develop ecotourism although to be objective this type of activity was not often discussed among non-coastal iTaukei women.

## **5.2 Livelihoods, Poverty and Forest use**

### **5.2.1 Introduction**

The rural iTaukei households living on the ER-P islands rely on the forests to a significantly greater extent than the rural Indian-Fijian households. As a rough "rule-of-thumb" based on a quantitative assessment of forest-dependency on the island of Viti Levu household dependency among the iTaukei exceeds 50% (at elevations below 500 MSL) and can be as high as 85% (at elevations above 500 MSL: admittedly a very small number of villages) whereas for Fijian-Indians household dependency is generally between 20% and 35%.

On Vanua Levu dependency among iTaukei households is lower at an average of 40% compared to 15% for Fijian-Indians. Whereas on Taveuni the average dependency is approximately 35% and negligible for Fijian-Indians. The iTaukei as customary owners of the forests are permitted to legally log indigenous trees for commercial purposes, but Indian-Fijians as leaseholders are not legally permitted to log these trees for such purposes unless it has been stated in the lease, but they can log non-indigenous species such as pine.

In relation to NTFPs there used to be no restrictions and Fijian-Indians could seek permission from the mataqali to harvest NTFPs, although to catch fish and other aquatic products in the streams passing through customary land this is more difficult. In recent times this is because iTaukei women in the villages are selling their fish to trading intermediaries and passing traffic, which is something they did not do in the past. Most of the NTFPs collected are for self-consumption, but some NTFPs such as wild yam, kava (strictly speaking kava is not found “wild” in the forests, but is actually cultivated), medicinal herbs and fruits are also sold on local markets. In the coastal mangrove areas women are likely to sell crabs, prawns, shell fish, eels, and yams.

However, under the current forest laws even iTaukei women require permission from the Ministry of Forestry to enter nature reserves and closed forests to collect NTFPs, which while usually forthcoming require the Conservator of Forests, located in Suva, to issue such permission. In the first instance mataqali may have allocated forest land for such purposes, but it is unclear as to whether iTaukei women from the same mataqali also gave their consent. Anecdotal evidence suggests this was not always so in all instances, although many officials claim women, or at least some women must have provided their consent because mataqali cannot allocate land for such purposes without 60% of the mataqali agreeing. But there are many instances, because of the patrilineal kinship system, where women are not considered members of their husband’s mataqali and hence have no voice.

Another more recent issue – as recent as November 2018 – Fiji Pine Limited has erected signs in its pine plantations, which are generally on land leased from mataqali, stating that under no circumstances are people permitted to enter their plantations to harvest NTFPs. This affects non-iTaukei women to a greater extent than iTaukei women because more of their villages are contiguous with these plantations especially in the Western and Central Regions of Viti Levu.

However, few households can derive sustainable livelihoods simply from the harvesting of NTFPs alone, even if this was possible in the past. Nevertheless, there is a clear trend that the poor are more likely to collect NTFPs than the non-poor, using a higher share of the collected NTFPs for their own household consumption. At present apart from Fijian-Indian rural households living in close proximity to forest land under customary land tenure there is not a problem with “outsiders” exploiting NTFPs, nor it seems involved in “illegal” logging (this being defined as encroaching on Mataqali land). Although for coastal communities relying on mangroves for their livelihoods, there appears to be few restrictions imposed by the managers of these mangroves which legally is the Ministry of Land and Mineral Resources.

Sacred forests are symbolically important to the owners of customary land. For instance, rituals associated with the confirmation of social hierarchy and power structures such as offering the first wild harvests of the year to the chiefs in recognition of the bounty of the goods are important in traditional Fijian indigenous culture. They are of important cultural significance to households on the ER-P islands. Although there appear to be fewer instances of this occurring nowadays based on consultations undertaken for both the SESA and this GAP. As for Fijian-Indians sacred forests assume no important cultural symbolism: leasing forest land is quite different to owning forest land.

Ethnicity of a particular household does not wholly explain poverty in the ER-P accounting area, although as explained above and in more detail in Section 5 of the SESA, the indigenous iTaukei are more likely to be living in poverty than either the Fijian-Indian ethnic group or other smaller ethnic minority groups. However, for non-village based waged employment available to villagers without education beyond primary schooling (75% of males 71% of females), some of the highest paid jobs exist in the sawmilling and logging industry and mining and quarrying. Where Fijian-Indians have more income-generation opportunities than the iTaukei this is often through the small and medium enterprises they are involved in.

The iTaukei are more likely to have very small businesses (often roadside stalls) and/or to be employed by Fijian-Indian wholesale and retail traders. In relation to cash income, the iTaukei derive a greater percentage of their income from whatever upland crops they sell (25%), livestock (35%), logging (each Mataqali is allowed to log up to 100 hectares at a time under the existing quota system and the proceeds are partially shared with all members. Although as the GAP Study Team found these proceeds are not necessarily distributed among women either on a transparent or equitable basis. Rural Fijian-Indians derive 50% of their income from sugarcane production, 35% from other crops, and 15% from livestock. Tourism income is important in Fiji, but few of the households in the ER-P accounting area, irrespective of their ethnicity, were found to be benefiting directly from this sector, unless they were either directly or indirectly active in this sector (often they need to be in close proximity to a resort). The situation is now changing with more job opportunities opening as the tourist sector expands. By 2018 the average adult income from tourism for rural households involved was FJ\$4,232 compared to all forms of agriculture and forestry of FJ\$3,125. However, this is based primarily on what iTaukei who have leased their land to resort operators are earning from annual leases, and more recently also a percentage of the annual audited net turnover from the resort's operation. Some of these landowners are earning double, triple and quadruple the average annual adult income, and some of these landowners interviewed for the SESA and GAP while they belonged to mataqali that also owned forest land stated they were not remotely interested in the ER-P because they could see no benefits in the ER-P for themselves.

### 5.2.2 Poverty

Fiji is vulnerable to disasters triggered by natural hazards, which can undermine sustained economic growth and poverty reduction. According to the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific's ranking of countries most exposed to natural hazard-induced disasters, Fiji is 14th, with 27.7% exposure. In February 2016, tropical cyclone Winston (Category 5 intensity – the most intense) caused damage and losses equivalent to 29.2% of GDP, which slowed growth to only 0.7% that year. These are a one off calculation the damage and losses were largely in rural areas and economy recovery of the villages is still on going. See the following Figures 5.3 and 5.4 as examples of the slow recovery of the natural environment after a major cyclone.

**Figure 5.3 Impact of Cyclone Winston (February 2016) on mix of coastal and mangrove forest present day (April 2019)**



**Figure 5.4 Remains of a locally planted pine plantation after Cyclone Winston**



The longer-term impact of cyclones is shown above. The coastal community of Nayavutoka on the east coast of Viti Levu lost agricultural land, mangroves and a pine tree plantation (and many houses had to be rebuilt). The economic shock to the community is still apparent today, in spite of external assistance. The village is one of many in the path of Cyclone Winston.

Almost 26,000 Fijians are pushed into poverty every year due to cyclones and floods, and that number is expected to rise to over 32,000 by 2050 (*WB Figures, from Making Fiji Climate Resilient*). It is difficult to suggest that poverty does not exist in Fiji and no matter what poverty instrument that is used whether it be the basic needs poverty line or the food poverty line or the income poverty line, poverty exists in Fiji. There are methodological problems with the poverty lines including what constitutes the Per Adult Equivalent Basis, static nature of Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES), whether there is commonality among all communities or within specific households, inherent gender bias, and limited household record keeping. A recalculation of the poverty criteria used has identified six characteristics of low-income households as below Table 5.2 that make sense in the context of the SESA and they include household composition, household head unemployment, education, housing and access to electricity.

**Table 5.2 Characteristics of Low-income Households in the ER-P Accounting Area**

<b>Household composition</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>iTaukei</b>	<b>Non-iTaukei</b>
<b>Household composition</b> Average size of Households	Larger households tend to be poorer, and HH size decreases where HH are less poor. Fijian-Indian households are smaller.	3.6 > 14 years 2.2 < 14 years Total average: 5.8	3.8 > 14 years 1.2 < 14 years Total average: 5
<b>HH Head Unemployment</b> Percentage of HH with HH head unemployment	There is significant unemployment in the lower deciles among HH heads. Unemployment is greater in Fijian-Indian households at the same income level as <i>iTaukei</i> , but this may be a factor of the elder male being the titular head with adult working sons.	18%	30%
<b>Livelihood</b> Percentage of HH that earn income from wages or salary	The likelihood that the head of HH earns from wages or salary increases where HH are not living in poverty. Income poverty relates to the income poverty of the <i>iTaukei</i> is significant who own land, houses and produce food.	24%	46%
<b>Education</b> Percent of HH reaching secondary or post-secondary levels of education	There are fairly strong education levels across all income groups with Fijian-Indian HHs somewhat less educated in rural areas.	Secondary 85% Post-Secondary 13% Total 98%	Secondary 70% Post-Secondary 23% Total 93%
<b>Dwelling</b> Percentage of HH which own housing and live in self-built housing	Even among poorer HH there is still fairly strong house ownership; self-built households for iTaukei are typically corrugated iron clad in coastal areas but wood in upland areas. Fijian-Indians normally have wooden houses.	Ownership 94% Self-built 75%	Ownership 82% Self-built 86%
<b>Access to electricity</b> Percentage of HH with access to electricity	Access increases as HH become less poor in rural areas but <i>iTaukei</i> are less likely to have electricity in more remote villages without this being an indicator of a lower decile.	57%	81%

First, a critical finding of our study that is not represented in the HIES and other studies, is that migration of household members from rural to urban areas, or a shift from farming to wage or salaried employment – whether or not the migrating member sends remittances back. This demonstrates a movement out of poverty for the *household*. Those who are left behind have often supported others to leave, and are continuing to support the next generation to obtain an education and leave the farm. Parents or siblings who remain behind, therefore, may live in deeper poverty as they assist their family to have an education and leave the household. Our study undertook a more nuanced exploration of education and migration to understand this overall rural household trend of apparent increased poverty that ignores the extended (*ex-loci*) household and the support to members to move out of poverty. Again, and again, we heard of parents and siblings making sacrifices to educate family members, enabling them to get better jobs and in many cases to migrate. These are represented in our mini cases in the sector sections of this document and in the Annexes. Further, our household surveys found that 36 out of 54 households considered education to be one of the top three poverty reduction strategies.

Second, the desire to educate children and enable them to move into wage or salaried employment brings to light another form of poverty – opportunity poverty. Nearly all families talked about the expense of educating children. For rural households, even secondary education may be costly if there is no school in the area and a child must be boarded. Regardless of the education level of the heads of household, most households aspired to post-secondary education and indeed many had achieved this for at least some children (but often at a sacrifice as described above). A household that is unable to educate its children may not seem poor in other ways – and indeed are not considered by their neighbours or themselves – but the inability to fulfil aspirations is a form of poverty.

Third, the poverty studies do not capture the makeup and dynamics of households - the titular versus *de facto* head of household; the movement of people in and out of households; the dependency of adult children over 18 who do not live at home; the (perhaps occasional) remittances provided by those who have migrated to urban centres or emigrated overseas, and so on. For example, we learned that in wage earning households, it may be a child who is the main wage earner and who therefore manages the household finances, often saving money in their own account for their future needs. Or as noted in the table above, an unemployed 'head of household' in non-iTaukei households may be the father of adult sons, and while he is no longer working, he may contribute to childcare or other household activities. The generalizations are as follows:

- Many rural iTaukei households are resource rich, but cash poor and find it difficult to meet communal and religious obligations and purchase goods and services for the household that require the use of cash;
- Larger households tend to be poorer and household size decreases as households move out of poverty or were never in poverty in the first instance;
- There is significant unemployment in poorer households but unemployment is greater in non-iTaukei households than iTaukei households;
- The likelihood that the household head earns more income from wages or salary increases as s/he is not considered to be from a poor household or in danger of moving into poverty;
- Poverty rates among iTaukei are lower than they are for non-iTaukei in rural areas of the ER-P because the former have access to customary land that cannot be alienated unlike the land leased by non-iTaukei that might not be renewed;
- While the participation of the rural population in education at all levels is quite impressive by comparison with some other middle-income countries, non-iTaukei are somewhat less educated than the iTaukei;

- Home ownership is high among both the iTaukei and non-iTaukei and those that are forced to rent are generally considered to be poor, as are those who use substandard building materials to construct houses; and
- iTaukei in remote rural areas are less likely to have access to electricity than non-iTaukei living in less remote rural areas, but this as an indicator of poverty is not wholly accurate.

The larger impact on poor people means that natural hazards can cause significant increases in poverty. Modeling the impacts of natural disasters on the losses of individuals can be used to clarify the impact of disasters<sup>[1]</sup> on income distribution and poverty in Fiji. However, overall the government estimates that the incidence of poverty declined from 31.0% in 2008–2009 to 28.1% in 2013–2014.

Poverty remains a significant concern in Fiji, despite the overall level of development and the moderately high average incomes. Poverty trends indicate that the national incidence of poverty declined from 35% in 2002–2003 to 31% in 2008–2009. This reduction in poverty was uneven—urban areas saw a reduction in poverty from 28% to 19%, while poverty in rural areas increased from 40% in 2002–2003 to 43% in 2008–2009, possibly as a result of the decline in the sugar industry, expiring land leases for agriculture. All urban divisions saw some reduction of poverty, but most rural divisions, except the rural northern division, saw increases in the incidence of poverty. The Northern Division remains the poorest of all the divisions, with some 45% of the occupants below the basic needs' poverty line. Northern rural areas had the highest rate of rural poverty (51%, despite a decline from 57%), while Northern urban areas had the highest rate of urban poverty (38%). Overall though, the highest concentration of poor people is in urban and peri-urban areas.

Average household incomes increased from F\$12,753 in 2002–2003 to F\$17,394 in 2008–2009, with larger increases for urban households (F\$23,036 in 2008–2009, or 51% higher) than rural households (F\$11,608 in 2008–2009, or 10% higher). These trends reflect a range of factors, including: (i) the increasing displacement of sugarcane farmers as a result of expiring land leases, and declining incomes resulting from the gradual reduction in sugar prices; (ii) the loss of employment in the garment industry caused by the closing of preferential access to the main export markets; (iii) rising consumer prices; and (iv) low real growth in wages. These factors have eroded the standard of living for the poorest members of the community. Regional disparities have resulted in significant urban migration; and while poverty rates are higher in rural areas, most poor people are concentrated in urban and peri-urban areas around the main urban centers of Suva and Nadi.

The ethnic dimensions of poverty indicate that the two major ethnic groups had almost the same incidence of poverty in 2002–2003 (around 35%) and the same reductions in poverty to around 31% in 2008–2009. Other ethnic groups saw a slight increase in poverty. Indigenous Fijians (iTaukei) increased their share of the poor from 55% to 60% while Fijians of Indian descent reduced theirs from 42% to 35%, although this reflects a similar change in broader population demographics. Poverty at 35.9% in the Central Division of Viti Levu where the ER-P Accounting Area is considerably smaller than either the Eastern Division of Viti Levu and Northern Division of Vanua Levu, but it increased by a very small percentage in rural areas (focus is on rural areas not urban areas) of 1.0% and similar quite small increases occurred in the other two divisions. Whether it can be argued that rural households living in these three divisions are poorer because of their greater reliance on the forests is difficult to quantify. This is because robust empirical evidence is lacking, although intuitively, it is likely that rural households with a greater dependency on the forests than other rural households, who rely on diversified sources of land-based income generation activities and waged-based incomes, are less likely to be poor than the former.

Linking the above assertions to the gender of household heads, it can be found that of poorer households (if defined by the income poverty line of FG\$3.10 per capita/per day rather than multidimensional poverty criteria, given that this has not been applied systemically in Fiji) there are slightly more male-headed households living in poverty than female-headed households. This has some ramifications for the GAP and these are: that while there are poor female-headed households, there are also poor male-headed households and the issue then becomes one more of, or at least partly of poverty rather than just gender. Unfortunately, there is no robust data on household dependency ratios for Fiji as there are for poverty analyses in some other



countries, that is also factor in gender issues. However, the larger the number of children the poorer the household is likely to be, and in all three divisions the percentage of poor households with three or more children in 2008-2009 was 52.6% for rural areas compared to 27.4% for urban areas. Link this to the incidence of poverty and rural areas had a 36.7% poverty rate in 2013-2014 compared to a 19.8% poverty rate in urban areas, and this is largely reflected in the ER-P Accounting Area.

#### a) Food Security

Food security is an issue in some parts of the ER-P and there is constant threat of cyclones every year. The increased demand for cash crops, mainly kava, has seen an increase in the need to purchase food and foodstuffs and necessarily contributes to people's livelihood choices and contributes to relatively rapid changes in land use. The popularity of cash crops like kava, has increased even in the remoter, highland areas of places on Vanua Levu and on Taveuni the widespread expansion of kava and combination of kava and taro (grown as a cash crop) has seen quite dramatic loss of upland forest in a very short period of time and includes encroachment into Protected Areas (PAs). There are a number of livelihood factors behind these decisions; including risk averseness, due to the expectations of cyclones "money now", and the use of contract farming.

#### b) Agroforestry and Agricultural Crops

The agriculture of Fiji is quite diverse and is highly dependent on location, local climate and soil types. There are sizeable areas of alluvial land and extensive areas of more mountainous agricultural and forest land. The alluvial sandy loams and sandy soils of the alluvial flats and colluvial areas have relatively high fertility when drained. The humic latosols that predominate in the upland areas are characterized by stony clay, stony sandy clay, and stony silt to 60 cm in depth. Although prone to erosion, these soils have relatively high fertility and are particularly suited for short-term root cropping, yaqona (kava) production, or long-term tree cropping. iTaukei women alongside men are responding to the market although some older women are concerned that the resultant deforestation does not bode well for either spiritual or environmental reasons.

Agroforestry is particularly significant where there are relatively dense groves of mature trees found around the boundaries of villages. A wide range of cultivated trees of high utility and easy accessibility are and important species include: oranges, mandarin oranges, rough lemon, breadfruit, jackfruit, coconut, bananas and plantains, Tahitian chestnut (*Inocarpus fagifer*), oceanic lychee (*Pometia pinnate*), coral tree (*Erythrina variegata*), and *Cordyline terminalis*, along with other trees of medicinal or spiritual importance, such as those used in ceremonial garlands or for scenting coconut oil. There are over 100 trees or tree-like species or cultivars in the ER-P Accounting Area and iTaukei women appear to have a greater knowledge of these than iTaukei men. Most of these were in existing agricultural areas, rather than in surrounding primary forest stands, although some of the forest species are occasionally found as protected individuals in recently cleared upland garden sites.

In keeping with the vanua concept, veikau, or forest, areas are seen by Fijians as integral components of the wider land-use system, and were generally used by the entire community, regardless of the more restrictive clan (mataqali) affiliations required to obtain access to agricultural lands. Forest areas supply materials for construction and firewood and provide a domain for hunting and foraging. Although the pressure for commercial logging in such areas has made communal use of forest lands more restrictive, access to more distant forest areas is still very much open, as long as a member of the community is extracting resources for personal or communal use, rather than for commercial purposes.

#### c) Important Crops

Basic food crops include mixtures of taro and yams. Important agroforestry crops include bananas and plantains (*Musa cultivars*), kava, or yaqona (*Piper methysticum*), hibiscus (*Hibiscus manihot*), *Citrus* species, breadfruit (*Artocarpus altilis*), duruka (*Saccharum edule*), sugar cane, papaya, coconut, Malay or mountain apple (*Syzygium malaccense*), Polynesian viapple (*Spondias dulcis*), soursop (*Annona muricata*), vutu kana (*Barringtonia edulis*), guava (*Psidium gunjava*), cocoa (*Theobroma cacao*), jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*), two palms (*Veitchia joannis* and *Pritchardia pacifica*), now found more often growing wild, and waciwaci (*Sterculia vitiensis*). In active garden areas, these species are generally found interspersed with the dominant staple food crops in both upland and alluvial lowland and river terrace



gardens, as well as remaining there throughout fallow periods, which traditionally ranged from 5 to 15 years, with cropping periods of 2-7 years. Correspondingly longer cropping periods and shorter fallow periods are characteristic on the richer alluvial and colluvial soils nearer the villages. Although burning of debris cleared from new garden patches is practiced widely in Fiji, the practice has been traditionally discouraged in some mataqali because it was believed to have deleterious effects on soil and arboreal regeneration.

In the upland garden areas, taro and *cassava* are the dominant ground crops. Taro is generally planted after clearing and where climatic conditions allow it is intercropped with kava as a co-dominant crop. Cassava is planted next in a rotation, sometimes up to three or more times in succession. Less common crops or intercrops in these gardens include yams (*Dioscorea alata*), wild yams (*D. nummularia*) (which are both cultivated and grow wild in fallow and secondary forest areas), tannia (*Xanthosoma sagittifolium*), giant taro (*Alocasia macrorrhiza*), and giant swamp taro (*Cyrtosperma chamissonis*), which is occasionally found growing wild, although probably originally planted, along small streams and poorly drained areas bordering the garden areas. One factor responsible for decreasing fallow periods and increasing cropping periods and associated agro-deforestation has been the propensity of Fijians to abandon more labor-intensive traditional crops, such as yams and taro, in favor of cassava, which is less often intercropped and which requires little or no fallow between successive plantings.



#### d) Minor crops

Other minor, but locally important crops include ginger, mung bean, citrus fruit, and pineapple. Also, of considerable economic and subsistence importance is a range of other traditional and more recently introduced fruit-trees, found planted or protected. Traditional trees provide seasonal flushes of fruit for consumption and sale include the wi, Polynesian vi-apple or hog plum (*Spondias dulcis*), and the vutu kana (*Barringtonia edulis*). Of the recent introductions, papaya (*Carica papaya*) is particularly common and an excellent non-seasonal vitamin- and mineral-rich fruit; seremaia, or soursop (*Annona muricata*), is common in gardens and around villages; and the uto ni Idia, or jackfruit (*Artocarpus heterophyllus*), is increasingly common. Guava is an important seasonal fruit; it is generally found growing wild, especially where livestock have been grazed, but is occasionally planted or protected in gardens or village areas. The mango, which are a post-European introduction to Fiji are important tree crops in the Western Division. It can be noted that crops that have been more recently introduced are more likely to be cultivated by non-iTaukei women and men.

#### e) Non-Timber Forest Products

Fiji has a wealth of fruit and nut trees that have potential for development for local and export markets, yet very little scientific work has been done on these important local species. There is considerable interest in Fiji in replanting these native species for both food security and livelihood benefits across the islands. These traditional species are well adapted and have multiple traditional uses. However, planting material is not generally available for planting on a semi-commercial scale and seedlings do not always grow true to type in cultivation.

Most notable among the wild foodstuffs are wide diversity of wild yams, the most important species being *Dioscorea nummularia*, *D. pentaphylla*, and *D. bulbifera*, and ferns, mostly referred to as wata or ota, the most commonly consumed species being *Athyrium* spp., *Diplazium* spp., *Tectaria latifolia*, *Stenochlaena palustris*, and *Marattia smithii*. There are more than 200 wild food products in the ER-P area. When the wide range of edible birds, frogs, grubs, insects, fishes, eels, freshwater prawns, and other foods that are found within agroforestry zones is included, the significance of wild food resources to upland forest-dependent villages becomes obvious. Moreover, apart from being nutritionally important - particularly in the cases of some seasonally abundant fruits, nuts, wild yams, and wild greens - these wild products also constitute important low-capital in put, low-risk cash "crops" for seasonal sale at local markets and constitutes an important source of income for iTaukei women. See the following Figures 5.5 and 5.6 for some examples.

Figure 5.5 Collection of NTFPs	Figure 5.6 Women fishing in mangroves
	
Near Nayavutoka village Viti Levu	Waivou village Viti Levu

NTFPs are a supplementary source of income for many families in the ER-P area, the presence of a particular NTFP does not necessarily mean that it has any commercial value. However, they are an important source of livelihood support even without sales since they have so many domestic purposes, from housing materials (roofing for example), to fencing, food and herbal medicines, and animal food as per the Table 5.3 below:

**Table 5.3 Common NTFPs**

Product and unit	Common Name	Plant part used
<i>Agathis vitiensis</i>	Fiji kauri	Resin—Glaze for pottery and may be lit as torch
<i>Calophyllum inophyllum</i>	Portia tree	Leaves and fruits—Medicine
<i>Cocos nucifera</i>	Coconut	Shells—Kava bowls, handicrafts, ornaments Husks—Sinnnet
<i>Cordia subcordata</i>	Beach cordia	Stem—Wood carvings Branches—Wood carvings
<i>Dicranopteris linearis</i>		Resin—Used to start fires
<i>Freycinetia arborea</i>		Bark and leaves—Medicine
<i>Garcinia pseudoguttifera</i>		Fruit—Edible Leaves—Medicine Oil—Aromatic oil
<i>Intsia bijuga</i>	Borneo teak	Stem—Clubs, spatulas, kava bowls
<i>Palaquium vitilevuense</i>		Sap (latex)—Chewing gum
<i>Pandanus thurstonii</i>	Screw pine	Leaves—Mats and woven handicrafts
<i>Turrillia vitiensis</i>		Stem, branches—Food bowls

### 5.2.3 Summary of Potential Livelihood Issues

The Fijian term for land, vanua, "has physical, social and cultural dimensions which are interrelated". These include the vegetation and animal life as well as the social and cultural system. It follows that all trees on a community's land are seen to be integral to the whole agricultural system and to human welfare.

Over 100 trees or tree-like species are found in the agroforestry systems of villages in Viti Levu; collectively they represent a resource of enormous economic, cultural, and ecological importance. These trees, along with the many other species found in surrounding forest stands, have been preserved as part of an integral agroforestry system for generations, but are almost totally neglected by most present-day agricultural developers and researchers. Consequently, although the agroforestry systems of villages remain relatively intact, recent pressures to encourage cash cropping of bananas, cocoa, kava, and root crops, and to develop commercial livestock grazing, have led to deforestation. The new generation of farmers, which often are not so well educated in traditional systems, may fail see the long-term utility of integrated agroforestry, and consequently may neglect the trees used in agroforestry.

Based on the in-depth qualitative consultations, with the communities, the topics related to REDD+ were discussed and the communities raised many issues related to livelihoods, these are summarised in Table 5.4 below:

**Table 5.4 Summary of Livelihoods Issues and Forest Dependency**

Major topic	What is at issue?	Relevance to REDD+	Applicable World Bank Safeguards
<b>LIVELIHOODS</b>			
Insecure livelihoods	Many areas are prone to natural disaster from cyclone, heavy rain flooding etc. and can impact on crop production.  Land use planning should to be conducted for the local context and in a participatory way. Some of the ER-PD activities may not be appropriate i.e. substitution of kava crop for vanilla in some areas	Implications for local people's active involvement in REDD+ may be limited due to impacts from disasters and reduce both their chances to benefit i.e. a community's priority are likely to change after a local natural disaster and may diverge from REDD+	
Promoted agricultural intensification of some crops and system e.g. kava by the MOA	Emphasis on export cash crops such as kava and taro; agroforestry systems neglected and complicated	Possible negative implications for increasing forest cover.  Use of toxic chemicals such as the glyphosate-based herbicides could if used incorrectly result in serious health problems for users and others affected by use.	OP4.04 OP4.09 OP4.36
Income from forestry is long term and may be limited	Remoter upland areas have some potential to earn more income from forestry, but this can be limited. Often the rotation period for logging is too short and or the logging plan is not based on a sustainable basis Little extension advice is available on SFM.	Choice of reduced impact logging followed by plantation and long rotations, access to forest areas or plantations potentially could be restricted	OP 4.12
Reliance on firewood	Most rural people (but also including at least some part of the populations of small rural towns) rely on firewood for	Excessive firewood collection from live trees may reduce regrowth of timber trees, thus reducing rate of natural	OP 4.12

Major topic	What is at issue?	Relevance to REDD+	Applicable World Bank Safeguards
	heating/cooking. For the poor hhs, firewood can also be a source of cash income.	regeneration. Implications for increasing forest cover. Access to forest areas or plantations could potentially be restricted	
NTFPs, importance of for supplementary income and/or subsistence.	Use of NTFP has importance for food security and cultural issues; not so important for cash income	Uncertain how the REDD+ program will support NTFPs	OP 4.12 OP 4.10
Insecure income from annual cash cropping	Many areas are prone to natural disaster; communities often cash poor. Income earned from cutting sugarcane	Possible negative implications for increasing forest cover, i.e. difficult to invest in long term forest slow growing spp. unless planning for next generation. Access to forests and plantations could be restricted	OP 4.12
Increase in annual cash crop incomes through intensification (some areas already have high levels of production such Sigatoka river valley and some farming in Nasouri highland)	Few locations in ER-P upland areas where market integration exists at high enough level to promote intensification so that local communities would be convinced to use less land for agricultural production.	Considering poor market integration, limited extension services likelihood that this will not occur during the program implementation period	
REDD+ investment and performance-based payment system.	Unclear benefit system	Poor HHs unlikely to want to participate in schemes whereby their labour is not rewarded fairly quickly. Their need for cash to maintain livelihoods is too great. Risk that they will not be able to participate at all in REDD+ unless ODA provides activity-based payments and Program provides extension advice	OP 4.10
	REDD+ investment requirements are unclear – <i>ex post facto</i> subsidies.	If it is required that HHs have to make their own major investments in, for example, enrichment planting it will most likely exclude all cash poor families.	OP 4.10
General impact of market forces	With insecure livelihoods and limited alternatives people have little choice but to follow the	Some of the crops responding to market forces have negative impacts for forest	OP 4.10 OP 4.09 OP 4.36

Major topic	What is at issue?	Relevance to REDD+	Applicable World Bank Safeguards
	<p>agricultural product markets, especially when promoted by local buyers and authorities.</p> <p>There are opportunities for tree crops such as breadfruit and mangoes but value chains not understood</p>	<p>cover, and biodiversity e.g. kava and taro.</p> <p>Use of toxic chemicals such as the glyphosate-based herbicides could if used incorrectly result in serious health problems for users and others affected by use.</p>	
Fires	Wildfire appear to be a major disincentive to establishing forestry and agroforestry, young plantations and seedlings can easily be lost to fires wiping out investments by a community	Integrated approach to forest seedling planting and fire management is required	
Degraded land	Rehabilitation of extensive degraded lands	Use of biomass plantations	OP4.36
Land use planning	<p>Unsustainable land-use planning and practices – use of steep slopes etc.</p> <p>Whether the GOF can establish a mechanism of enforcement to regulate unsustainable land-use planning and practices</p>	<p>Enforcement/ regulations on land use – will regulations be followed (or enforced). Possible changes to agriculture and potential to restrict access to some forests or plantations.</p> <p>Development of a communication strategy on legislation that addresses unsustainable land-use practices</p> <p>Potential FGRM and SG issue</p>	OP 4.12

#### 5.2.4 *Safeguard issues related to the GAP*

To make it easier for affected stakeholders and interested parties to understand the actual nature of the suite of safeguards that the WB is required to utilize if specific impacts trigger or are likely to trigger negative impacts the following Table 5.5 (extracted from Section 14 of the ER-PD) explains in some detail these safeguards. It also needs to be noted that in August 2016 the WB adopted new safeguard policies as reflected in the Environmental and Social Policies that will run parallel with the earlier safeguard policies for seven years. The new policies do not apply to this ER-P.

**Table 5.5 World Bank Safeguard Policies Triggered**

World Bank Safeguard Policies	Triggered	Proposed Approach
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) The Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment (SESA) has identified potential environmental impacts including: 1) soil erosion on sloping areas, and from poor maintenance tracks; 2) loss of soil fertility due to removal of biomass in harvesting; 3) health risks associated with the use of pesticides and herbicides; 4) loss of biodiversity and habitat

<b>World Bank Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered</b>	<b>Proposed Approach</b>
		fragmentation due to conversion of natural forests into plantations of pine by lease holding private sector companies; and 5) possible invasive plants if agroforestry or NTFP species are introduced without guidance. The Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) will establish the modalities and procedures to address potential negative environmental and social impacts from the implementation activities identified in the ERPD, including the screening criteria, procedures and institutional responsibilities. The specific process in the ESMF are to: 1) establish clear procedures and methodologies for the environmental and social assessment, review, approval and implementation of interventions to be financed under the program; 2) specify appropriate roles and responsibilities, and outline reporting procedures, for managing and monitoring environmental and social concerns related to program interventions; and 3) determine the training, capacity building and technical assistance needed to successfully implement the provisions of the ESMF.
Natural habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	This policy is triggered as the ER-P will work both within existing protected areas and other forest habitats of varying significance, although it is not expected to involve conversion of critical natural habitats. The ERPD includes activities in High Conservation Value Forests. The ESMF includes provisions to assess possible impacts prior to actions being undertaken on the ground. This policy will ensure that the interventions in the ER-P area consider biodiversity conservation and critical natural habitats. During the implementation phase, monitoring activities will be established to ensure that biodiversity and critical natural habitats are not adversely affected.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	Yes	The overall program objective includes reduction of deforestation and forest degradation and interventions are expected to have significant positive impacts on the health and quality of forests. This policy is triggered due to the potential changes in the management, protection, or utilization of natural forests or plantations that could arise from REDD+ and activities may indirectly affect the rights and welfare of people and their level of dependence upon or interaction with forests. The ERPD include activities affecting management, protection, or utilization of natural forests and/or plantation forests. Potential impacts and proposed enhancement/mitigation measures will be included in the ESMF. Forest management plans are expected to be prepared during implementation
Pest Management OP/BP 4.09	Yes	Agricultural and agroforestry practices supported by activities under the ER-Program may involve the use of pesticides for nursery management and possible crop intensification. Impacts and risks of any potential use of chemicals in forest management and agroforestry activities, if needed, will be analysed and mitigated through actions contained in forest management plans. The ESMF will provide guidance on development and implementation of an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) which provides principles on prevention, early detection, damage thresholds, and design, mechanical and biological control methods rather than chemical pesticides.
Physical and Cultural Resources	Yes	This policy is triggered as the activities proposed in the ER Program could indirectly affect areas containing sites with physical cultural resources. The indigenous people of Fiji often have close connection with forest

<b>World Bank Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered</b>	<b>Proposed Approach</b>
OP/BP 4.11		areas, including spiritual connections, it is possible that in isolated cases REDD+ activities could interfere with villager defined sacred forest sites. The ESMF will include 'chance find' procedures and guidance on development and implementation of a Physical Cultural Resources Management Plan
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	The majority of the people living in the ER-P Accounting Area are the indigenous iTaukei but there are other ethnic groups also who will be invited to participate in the ER-P if they are leasing land through the TLTB or Land Bank that would primarily have plantation forests and perhaps some open forests. Some of these leaseholders rely on the forests for a range of foodstuffs, medicinal products and for products essential for their specific cultural rituals. Implementation of the ER-P may result in restricted access to forest resources but a separate IPPF will not be prepared but rather the ESMF will include provisions for ethnic groups other than the indigenous iTaukei to also benefit from carbon and non-carbon benefits. The ER-P includes mechanisms that will help address the underlying problem of inadequate consultations with communities in specific locations for the Community REDD+ Agreement (CRA) and a locally prioritized management plan that require an assessment of impacts and possible mitigation measures to avoid or address potential undesirable effects.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	Yes	OP/BP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement is triggered to ensure affected persons (including land owners, land users and forest dependent communities and/or individuals) are properly consulted and not coerced or forced to accept or commit to REDD+ activities or other forest management/reforestation activities involuntarily, and that best practice approaches as informed by OP/BP 4.12 are adopted. The SESA has identified and assessed the possibility of any involuntary land acquisition or restriction of access to natural resources that may occur, and management processes are included in the ESMF. A Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) has been prepared which lays down the principles and objectives, eligibility criteria of displaced persons, modes of compensation and rehabilitation, participation features and grievances procedures that will guide the compensation and potential resettlement of program affected persons. The RPF will guide the preparation of site-specific Resettlement Action Plan (RAP). There is high potential for an involuntary restriction of access (for example, NTFPs, fuelwood collection) to legally designated production and protection forest areas and protected areas resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of affected persons. A Process Framework (PF) has been prepared to guide procedures to identify, assess, minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts on local livelihoods by restriction of access. The PF is to ensure adequate consultations with specific communities in specific locations for proposed interventions through the preparation of process plans when working with the management board entities and with a benefit sharing agreement mechanism for the natural resources use. Site-specific RAPs and Action Plans for Access Restrictions for activities will be identified during implementation as required. The ER-P includes mechanisms that will help address the underlying problem of inadequate consultations with communities in specific locations including through the CRA process

<b>World Bank Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered</b>	<b>Proposed Approach</b>
		with the YMST and locally prioritized forest management plans that require an assessment of impacts and possible mitigation measures to avoid or address potential undesirable effects including a benefit sharing mechanism for natural resources use. OP/BP 4.12 on Involuntary Resettlement is triggered to ensure affected persons (including land owners, land users and forest dependent communities and/or individuals) are properly consulted and not coerced or forced to accept or commit to REDD+ activities or other forest management/reforestation activities involuntarily, and that best practice approaches as informed by OP/BP 4.12 are adopted.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	This policy is not triggered as the program will neither support the construction or rehabilitation of dams nor will it support other investments which rely on services of existing dams.
International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The program does not have any investments will be located on international waterways so this policy is not triggered.
Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	Neither the program nor related investments will be located in disputed areas as defined in the policy.

In addition to the World Bank requirements, Fiji also needs to comply with the UNFCCC's safeguards principles and requirements. The ER-P's proposed safeguards will be developed in respect of the Cancun safeguards<sup>8</sup> (see Box 14.1 on UNFCCC and more information on safeguard information system (SIS) in section 14.2.4 in the ER-PD that was submitted to the Carbon Fund) and to the extent possible the SIS currently under development and is expected to be completed in a phased approach over the next three to five years and will be consistent with national REDD+ safeguards approaches and the ESMF. The World Bank's safeguards policies are broadly consistent with the Cancun principles, but have more detailed guidance on procedural requirements and Fiji will follow national safeguards approach where possible and where they meet both UNFCCC and WB safeguard requirements.

This GAP also recommends that Fiji remember it is a signatory to the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination, International Covenants relating to Civil and Political Rights and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, ILO Convention 169, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and as mentioned elsewhere the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

For all women impacted upon by the ER-P there really does have to be practical ways to ensure respect for the rights of the iTaukei and Fijians of Indian descent women. Notwithstanding any international law or the purposeful actions embedded in REDD+ the real issue in Fiji is how is the ER-P and specifically the agreed upon GAP going to be implemented in the field. As argued in this GAP there are mixed results from what REDD+ has achieved to date. It has not for instance worked with Fijians of Indian descent, but this will be necessary during ER-P implementation. Despite all the hubris about underlying cultural, political and economic tensions between the iTaukei and Fijians of Indian descent since 2014 election, which was largely deemed to be relatively democratic, Fiji had another election in November 2018 as argued elsewhere this

---

<sup>8</sup> The two major safeguard actions identified by the UNFCCC are: 1) respect for the knowledge and rights of indigenous peoples and members of local communities (this can include Fijians of Indian Descent), by taking into account relevant international obligations, national circumstances and laws, and noting that the UN General Assembly has adopted the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; and 2) the full and effective participation of relevant stakeholders, in particular indigenous peoples and local communities. It can be noted here that both the ER-P FRGM and C&P instruments have also been developed with these safeguard principles in mind.



elected government despite all the numerous qualifications is by-and-large accepted by the body politic. Fiji also has a robust opposition so at a generalized level the political outlook is generally positive. How this translates into greater empowerment for all women impacted upon by the ER-P remains to be seen, but for now the GoF has accepted the importance of gender considerations alongside *inter alia* the measures to address the actual drivers of deforestation and degradation, land tenure, and forest governance issues.

While a Safeguard Information System (SIS) is not a requirement of the Carbon Fund's Methodological Framework, collaborative work has been on-going on the SESA, ESMF, and the GAP and this has extended to include the SIS. The Ministry of Forestry is set to establish a SIS and Summary of Information (SOI) working group (as part of the TWG on Safeguards). The working group will contain NGO and CSOs, members from MOF and other line ministries. The main task is to deliver information and comments for the SIS and SOI's contents during the development process, to support MOF in acquiring the approval from MOF for the SIS and send the SOI to TLTB prior to submission to the UNFCCC.

### 5.3 *Socio-economic impacts mitigations identified in the SESA and links to the GAP actions*

The findings of the SESA have been used develop activities of the ER-P for the Accounting Area and are incorporated in the final design. This includes associated collaborative and participatory approaches to sustainable forest management, the development of equitable and transparent benefit sharing plans, modalities for monitoring, reporting and verification of results based on efforts to reduce carbon emissions and the social inclusion of women and other marginalized groups. As noted above the ESMF will establish the modalities and procedures to address potential negative environmental and social impacts from the implementation activities identified in the ERPD.

The SESA has identified some possible negative impacts even though in general the SESA argues all or most impacts should be positive because reducing carbon emissions is environmentally a very sound objective. But it is not the environmental impacts *per se*, rather it is the social impacts especially those associated with possible restricted access to natural resources from the forests and mangroves in the proposed ER-P Accounting Area. If the ER-P is going to encourage the iTaukei to log less and accrue carbon financial benefits from reducing carbon emissions then there will need to be more sustainable approaches to forest management. This in the short-term will affect the incomes of those communities who rely for part of their livelihoods on the sale of logged trees from the forests. Similarly, if there are to be restrictions on the households that rely to some extent on NTFPs for their livelihoods there will be some negative impacts that will need to be mitigated as there will where households go hunting and fishing or are raising livestock in the forests or collecting firewood for either domestic use or for sale. There are also conceivably negative impacts on those households, groups residing within non-iTaukei villages who are involved in production forestry, notably pine and mahogany forestry if attempts are made to encourage such households to extend the production cycle to maximize the objectives of the ER-P. If more systemic land-use planning activities are to be introduced through the ER-P, and the SESA has made a case for such activities to take place, they have to start at the local level and not be promulgated at the national level otherwise they will be largely ineffective. One of the most important objectives of the ER-P is to promote collaboration among and between stakeholders not conflict and the SESA strongly recommends that sensitive issues associated with lease holdings be very carefully analysed to ensure there is no inter-ethnic conflict or at the very least minimize such tensions.

The SESA is quite positive when it comes to important issues such as benefit sharing arrangements so long as "elite capture" can be avoided wherever possible and all putative beneficiaries can enjoy both carbon and non-carbon benefits. As a concluding comment the SESA strongly recommends that more effort be made to disseminate information about REDD+ and the proposed ER-P and there be a continued emphasis on the non-carbon benefits. This is wholly supported in the GAP. The following Table 5.5 from takes the proposed interventions from the ER-P and draws on the SESA and ESMF for the impacts and mitigations and links the proposed actions in the GAP.

**Table 5.5 Socio-economic impacts mitigations and GAP actions**

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
<b>Component 1: Strengthen enabling conditions for emission reduction</b>				
<p>Subcomponent 1.1 Integrated District Land Use Planning (IDLUP)</p> <p>(To promote more sustainable long-term integrated landscape management)</p>	<p>-Improved land use planning, objective is to reduce conversion of natural forest or reduce degradation of natural forest</p> <p>-The participatory planning process envisaged, may encourage the recording and sharing and handing down of local land and forest knowledge between generations. The reduction or even loss of this transfer between generations is seen as a concern in some communities.</p> <p>-Opportunity to take account of and integrate with the NBSAP objectives and action plans</p> <p>-Expected to cross cut sectors, MOF, MoEnv MOA land use, TLTB, Provincial councils, District REDD+, NGOs, CSO</p>	<p>- Potential for reduced access to forest and NTFP resources for forest dependent communities through improvements or changes to forest access through changes in boundaries or access rights</p> <p>- Possible exclusion of poor, remote or vulnerable and potential for gender exclusion issues.</p> <p>- Possible change or impact on livelihood issues due to introduction of a land use plan or changes in current land use and plan that may not follow existing agricultural crop production, i.e. may require investment and change increasing risk to hhs</p> <p>- Possible FGRM issues</p>	<p>-Socio-economic screening collaborative management used to help resolve any boundary issues and ensure access to forest; helps resolve the potential exclusion and gender issues.</p> <p>- If there are any disputes the FGRM process may be used by iTaukei, and non-iTaukei to resolve grievances.</p> <p>- Awareness raising and training on land use planning and involvement of the community and adopting a fully participatory approach</p> <p>- In the unlikely instance where the FGRM process is not successful and where a land use plan is enforced for activities that are inconsistent with the new land use plan, OP4.12 will be triggered.</p> <p>- The assessment of environmental and social risks and any necessary consultations on policy reforms will be undertaken. If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts</p> <p>- Free prior and informed consultations need to include iTaukei and non-iTaukei to achieve broad support with all affected parties, with emphasis on inclusion of vulnerable (poor households and communities, remote communities, lease holders (non landowning households), women and men, youth.</p> <p>- The provisions of OP 4.10 may also apply where necessary and a Process Framework would be followed.</p>	<p>Action 1</p> <p>Action 2</p> <p>Action 3</p> <p>Action 4</p>

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
		- Potential for changes to land leasing arrangements with non-iTaukei	-Training on improved crop production and crop diversification	
1.1.1 Development of Integrated District Land use plans (IDLUP)	- Plans in 20 Districts over life of the program	- As above	- As above	Action 2
1.1.2 Develop integrated community management plan	- 40 community consultation workshops over life of program As above	- As above	- As above	Action 4
Subcomponent 1.2. Strengthening forest governance and law enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved protection and conservation of the natural forest</li> <li>- Awareness raising and training on the sustainable use of forest, improved management and forest laws</li> <li>- Improved social awareness of the importance of forests and that they are finite</li> <li>-Awareness training on FFHCOP, SFM, Fire management</li> <li>-Expected to cross cut across sectors MOF and MOA land use, TLTB,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Similar to above, possible impacts on livelihoods due to changes in crops or land use</li> <li>- Improved governance may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FGRM would be introduced and used to help resolve any disputes</li> <li>- Improve transparency, encourage the participation of community in discussing and improving forest management. Ensure that people who agree to participate in the Yaubula Management Support Teams (YMST) are in broad agreement with on the need to improve the management of forests as to whether it is necessary to restrict access to the forests and if necessary no household should be worse off as a result. In such instances OP 4.12 will apply.</li> <li>- Identification of conservation orientated livelihood and sustainable forest use models designed not to impact on natural forest in Protected Areas. However, where households that are negatively impacted are able to secure livelihoods by being offered alternative livelihoods within the provisions of OP 4.12</li> </ul>	Action 4

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
	Provincial councils, District REDD+ NGOs, CSO			
1.2.1. Raise awareness on revised legal and regulatory framework, strengthen forest law enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As above;</li> <li>- Establish Forest Care Groups in 20 districts over the life of program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This activity may result in some risks associated access restrictions</li> <li>- Could result in livestock (horse, goats, cows) not having access to forest</li> <li>- May also result in restrictions on collection of firewood, logging, hunting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Depends if the laws are more strictly enforced and the status of the forest i.e. a reserve or a protected area. In some circumstance (unlikely) FGRM followed and final option would be OP 4.12</li> </ul>	Action 6
1.2.2 Capacity building on forest laws, enforcement and governance at community level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Awareness raising at District level three trainings per year on carbon enhancement, application of the FFHCOP and land leasing processes</li> <li>- Improved social awareness of the importance of forests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Women may be excluded</li> <li>- Exclusion of poor, and vulnerable hhs</li> <li>- Possible elite capture</li> <li>- Possible particular problems in coastal economic zone where high value land leases are to be found</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use FPIC and need to ensure community consultations with iTaukei and non iTaukei</li> <li>- Matagali and TLTB need to continue to ensure transparency</li> <li>- FGRM would be introduced and used to help resolve any disputes as above final option would be use of OP4.12</li> </ul>	Action 6
1.2.3. Capacity building on forest law enforcement at industry and trade level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two inter agency training per year on forest law</li> <li>- Two trainings per year on reporting process for non-compliance of forest related legislations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Similar to above at the village level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Awareness raising and training on proposed processes to be used i.e. FPIC, FGRM and OP4.12</li> </ul>	

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
Subcomponent 1.3 Forest information system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improved information on status of the forest</li> <li>- Improved forest monitoring providing feedback into planning and management process</li> <li>- Training for MOF staff</li> <li>- Potential to provide linking feedback to the communities managing protecting and using the forests</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible gender and poverty issues related to access to forest;</li> <li>- Possible livelihood issues through changes in land use and increased governance</li> <li>- Similar to 1.2 above</li> <li>- Possible miss use of information system leading to elite capture of remaining forest resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Similar to 1.2 above</li> <li>- Socio-economic screening, collaborative management helps resolve any boundary issues and ensure access to forest</li> <li>- Improved forest monitoring providing feedback into planning and management process and discussion with local communities through the YMST to improve forest protection and management and agree to designate areas for livelihood related activities including NTFP collection. OP 4.12 will apply.</li> <li>- Aim for forest management plans to improve local ownership, and sustainable approaches to reduce pressure on timber harvesting. Introduce more sustainable management approaches to NTFP collection.</li> </ul>	
1.3.1. Upgrade Forest information & data base systems	Data and equipment purchase activities	- Not applicable	- Not applicable	
1.3.2 improved monitoring and reporting to feed forest information system	- As above in 1.3	- As above in 1.3	- As above in 1.3	
<b>Component 2: Promoting integrated landscape management</b>				
Subcomponent 2.1. Sustainable natural forest management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally positive, some clarifications of forest natural forest boundaries</li> <li>- Potential for increased transparency where necessary on management of remaining natural forest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some possible impacts on livelihoods, i.e. improved conservation of natural forest may not include unfettered or continued access to all forest areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matagali self-select to be part of a public private partnership for Forest Management Licenses. Their involvement is voluntary.</li> <li>- Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM</li> <li>- Implement collaborative management of natural forests between communities through the YMST improved forest</li> </ul>	Action 3 Action 6 Action 11

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lead Agency: MOF</li> <li>Collaborators: Ministry of iTaukei Affairs iTaukei Lands Trust Board</li> <li>Saw-millers Association</li> <li>NGO, CSOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-This activity may result in some risks associated access restrictions to Forest Management License areas by non-Matagali.</li> <li>- Matagali self-select but may depend of 60% agreement legal principle and this may also be more problematic where different Matagali do not agree on boundaries between the Matagali especially if the boundaries are still imprecise.</li> </ul> <p>(Note that TLTB has long experience of resolving boundary disputes and these are normally resolved amicably)</p>	<p>planning and management process and discussion with local communities through the YMST to improve forest protection and management and agree to designate areas for livelihood related activities to reduce pressure on critical forest areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If FGRM outcome is not satisfactory OP 4.12 will apply to ensure that involuntary resettlement impacts, such as when boundaries between core and buffer zones are not resolved by the Forest Division and YMST, will be mitigated.</li> <li>- If any non-Matagali households (leaseholders, tenants, squatters) are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes as a result of Forest Management Licenses (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.01 and OP4.10 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts</li> </ul>	
2.1.1 Land tenure clarification and SFM management planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-5 agreements between landowners and logging operators approved per year</li> <li>-3 Forest Leases secured per year</li> </ul>	- As above	- As above	Action 6 Action 11

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social and economic benefits of having clearer boundary and tenure</li> <li>-Forest owners/ landowners more aware of socio-economic benefits of SFM</li> </ul>			
2.1.2 Activity Missing				
2.1.3 Implement and Monitor logging aligned to FFHCOP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-10 sites monitored quarterly</li> <li>-Awareness raising</li> <li>- Results disseminated widely to all stakeholders through newsletter and social media</li> <li>-Forest owners/ landowners more aware of socio-economic benefits of SFM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential in remoter upland areas that dissemination of results awareness (SESA fieldwork showed that there is limited dissemination of information in remote upland areas)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A clear communication strategy to ensure dissemination go information etc. (currently not an activity in the ER-P)</li> <li>- Use other cultural appropriate means, i.e. social media may not work or may not be appropriate with some vulnerable hhs</li> <li>-Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM</li> </ul>	
Subcomponent 2.2 Enhancement of Carbon Stocks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Generally positive, some clarifications of forest natural forest boundaries</li> <li>-Lead Agency: MOF</li> <li>Collaborators: Fiji Pine Ltd For pine</li> <li>Fiji Mahogany Trust for mahogany</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally minor socio-economic impacts expected see review of various models below</li> <li>- Possible gender and poverty issues related to access to forest;</li> <li>- Possible change or impact on livelihoods if restrictions placed on accessing forest for NTFP collection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implement collaborative management of natural forests and plantation areas with communities (through the YMST). OP4.12 may apply but this is specific to communities who may face a change in legal or legalisable access to plantation forestland.</li> <li>- To ensure women or other poor and vulnerable groups are not excluded the GAP highlights how it is necessary to ensure full gender inclusion. However, where restrictions are to be imposed restricting access to forests to collect NTFPs and this negatively impacts on women and their households then the provisions of OP4.12 will apply because the impact results in loss of livelihoods.</li> </ul>	

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
		- Possible health and safety issues related to plantation harvesting	- Provide training on health and safety related to timber harvesting <sup>9</sup>	
2.2.1 Investments in reforestation, short and long rotation plantation - pine plantations	-Restocking of pine plantation with 2500ha/yr. - Continued economic benefits of land leases - Continued or improved fire watch/ control -Improved monitoring report by the MOF once a year - Expected to be on existing or extended pine lease	- Access issues on pine leases for NTFPs (already occurring Vanua Levu in some areas <sup>10</sup> )	- Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM - If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be triggered	
2.2.2. Investments in reforestation, short and long rotation plantation investments - mahogany plantation	-Restocking of logged over mahogany forest plantation at 780 ha/yr. between 2020-2022 -Improved monitoring report by MOF	- Possible health and safety issues if herbicides are used	- Provide training on safe use of herbicides etc.	
Subcomponent 2.3. Afforestation and reforestation - restoration of ecosystem services	- Matagali should self select for activities - Detailed below	- As above	- Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM - If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be triggered	Action 11
2.3.1. Implement land owner	-Matagali should self select for activities		- Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM	

<sup>9</sup> Health and Safety at work Act (1996)

<sup>10</sup> Fiji Pine Public Notices: "According to the Draft Planted Forestry Policy Statement 2015 the guiding principles 4.3.2 state no natural forest or minor forest produce will be harvested removed or damaged in the development of a new plantation". Fiji Pine prohibits the logging or removal of minor forest products "under any circumstance" from its leases.



ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
engagement through Fiji Pine Trust Extension Scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fiji Pine Trust facilitate registration of at least 4 groups in ER-P per year (each group with at least 25ha)</li> <li>-Establishment of 200ha pine woodlot per year</li> </ul>		- If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be triggered	
2.3.2 Activity missing				
2.3.3. Community based restoration for 4 million Trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matagali will self select for activities, encourage community decisions and decision making involving women.</li> <li>- Establish an incremental 400ha per year from 2020 at the baseline of 300ha.</li> <li>-Establishment of 4000ha by year 3</li> <li>- At least 100 communities/ Mataqali register for intervention</li> <li>- Socio-economics benefits of afforestation/ reforestation</li> </ul>	- Possible gender and poverty issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where a problem occurs first recourse would be through the FGRM</li> <li>- If FGRM process fails, OP4.12 will be triggered</li> </ul>	
Subcomponent 2.4 Promotion of climate-smart agriculture and sustainable livelihoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Matagali will self-select for activities</li> <li>- Socio-economic benefits of risk/ and awareness raising of climate change issues</li> <li>- Lead Agency: MOF Collaborators:</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible gender and poverty issues;</li> <li>- Possible access to forest issues;</li> <li>- Possible changes in land use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities should be voluntary and OP4.12 would not be expected to apply provided that the land use plan (or similar) is not enforced or restrictions imposed. In first instance of a dispute FGRM would be used if this fails OP4.12 applies</li> <li>- Benefit sharing still under discussion, Matagali would be expected to benefit in one form or another</li> </ul>	Action 5 Action 10

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
	- Ministry of Agriculture, Kava Commodity Clusters, Fiji Crop and Livestock Association, Kava Association, Famers, NGOs	- Possible social impacts from changes in land use (with some land users no longer able to farm / harvest / collect NTFP).	- Selection of the livelihood support should be targeted to contribute to reduce forest dependency; Similar to above discussions through the YMST to design best approach that fits with local forest dependency and use and climate smart agriculture that best suits the local area and market conditions - Training on improved crop production and crop diversification, where crops are not agreed to FGRM for example if communities want crops that do not confirm to the land use plan would be used to resolve issues. Depending on the crops and detailed activities or possible enforcement of the land use plan OP4.09, and OP4.12 may apply	
2.4.1 Implementation of Riparian restoration to mitigate flash floods	- Establish at least 6 sites annually at 300ha per site - 6 Reports of community consultation on traditional species used and preferred species for restoration. - At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year - Socio-economics benefits of mitigation of floods	- Possible changes (minor) in land use in some riparian area which could have socio-economic impacts	- Matagali will self-select for activities and therefore their involvement is voluntary - Land will not be acquired for this activity, as it will be land already being used by forest-dependent households. If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes the FGRM will be followed (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) and where they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts	
2.4.2. Afforestation and restoration for ecosystem services	-Establish at least 5 sites annually at 100ha per site -6 Reports of community consultation on traditional species used and preferred species for restoration.	- As above	- As above	

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year</li> <li>- Socio-economic benefits of afforestation</li> </ul>			
2.4.3 Enhanced alternative livelihood and restoration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-As above, could include incentivized climate-smart agriculture and agroforestry</li> <li>-Establish at 200ha of alternative intervention per year</li> <li>-6 Reports of District alternative livelihood intervention</li> <li>-At least 3 field schools for farmer-to-farmer exchange per year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Climate smart crops” could add to the burden of the community and especially women farmers if proposed crops (such as vanilla) require extra time and resources or technical training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This type of activity is unlikely to have any negative impact if a consensus can be achieved at the local level and the program is able to assist impacted or targeted households seek financial assistance.</li> <li>- Land will not be acquired for this activity as it will be land already being used by forest-dependent households</li> <li>- Careful selection of “climate smart crops” is required to avoid negative impacts and ensure uptake. Particular attention needs to be taken of impact on women.</li> </ul>	Action 5 Action 10
Subcomponent 2.5 Promotion of forest protection to conserve existing natural forest carbon stocks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Secure 60% community consensus at each priority site through FPIC process by 2023</li> <li>- Community awareness raised on the importance of PAs</li> <li>- Socio-economic benefits of watershed protection</li> <li>- These activities unlikely to result in any risk of relocation, land acquisition.</li> <li>- Lead Agency: MOF</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Possible changes in land use</li> <li>- Possible gender and poverty issues;</li> <li>- Possible access to forest issues;</li> <li>- Access restrictions by local communities to natural forest may happen if the legal framework is strengthened and forest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Similar to above, in the first instance FGRM applies and OP 4.12 will apply if issues can not be resolved</li> <li>- If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using land for other purposes (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts</li> <li>- Biodiversity surveys could be used to refine potential areas</li> <li>- Careful planning and consideration of resources is required for communities</li> </ul>	Action 6

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
	- Collaborators: Ministry of Environment, iTaukei Lands Trust Board, Department of Lands NGOs, CSOs	turned into conservation area		
2.5.1. Implementation of natural forest conservation agreement (at the deforestation frontier)	- Secure 60% community consensus at each priority site via FPIC process by 2023 - Socio-economic benefits from the reduction in risk of land degradation or soil erosion	- As above. - This activity may result in some FGRM risks associated with disenfranchisement and access restrictions - Potential to result in changes in levels of income	- Similar to above, in the first instance FGRM applies and OP 4.12 will apply if issues can not be resolved - If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using this land for other purposes (e.g. traditional agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts	
2.5.2 Formalise protection of forest area under the Forest Decree 1992 and other instruments such as the TLTB Act	-Improvements to policy at least 2 Discussion Papers drafted and submitted to Forestry Board per year -Endorse and enforce PA status at least one site per year -Secure at least 1 REDD+ Conservation Lease per year	- As above. This activity may result in some risks associated access restrictions and changes in levels of income	- If any households are affected by being forced to desist from using this land for other purposes (e.g. traditional swidden agricultural cropping or livestock grazing) they will be compensated for loss of production and OP4.12 will be used to mitigate possible negative impacts	
2.5.3 Develop and Implement community-based Forest Protection Management Plan based on co-management regime between the Forest	-At least 3 Community consultation using Open - Standards and other tools to identify target species, key threat and management strategy for protection	- Possible changes in land use - Possible gender and poverty issues; - Possible access to forest issues; - Access restrictions by local communities to	- Similar to above, in the first instance FGRM applies and OP 4.12 will apply if issues can not be resolved	Action 7 Action 8 Action 9

ER-P intervention to address drivers and enhance carbon stocks	Socio-economic impacts and mitigation			
	Activities and potential positive impact	Potential negative impact	Mitigation	Cross cutting GAP action
Management Enterprise and management body of the Protected Area	-2 Forest Protection Management Plan formulated per year	natural forest may occur		
2.5.4 Secure sustainable financing to support the long-term maintenance and upkeep of the forest protected area	-2 Community and Stakeholder consultation develop - Business Plan -Secure “seed fund” for sustainable financing of ER-P priorities by 2023			
<b>Component 3: Program management and emission monitoring</b>				
3.1 Program coordination and management	-Support for capacity building and at central Province and District levels, -Improved coordination across sectors and ministries	- Facilitate institutional setup, coordination mechanisms, program implementation manual; - Training programs and Financial Management		Action 8 Action 9 Action 12
3.2 Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) includes monitoring of safeguards	-MRV plan implemented at national, divisional and provincial levels	Development of effective M&E system that includes training on data collection and reporting on safeguards information	- It is requirement that the RPF be monitored and evaluated to ensure all measures to mitigate the negative impacts of involuntary resettlement are adequately documented	
3.3 MRV - Management and processing of MRV activities	-M&E Guidelines, Verification Reports, Communication Materials and Report	- Development of effective MRV data and forest cover information. - No negative impacts expected		

**Example of notes of the Focus Group Meeting with women from Yalava village, Vanua Levu, 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2019.**

The village has 52 households, 11 women from the village present plus a female facilitator.

1. Decision making

Decision making on crops, money and education is mainly a male dominated process but women did have some say approximately 70-30 rising to 50-50 on some issues in some households. But the decision making process can be complex. Men will often spend money on themselves, women will spend money for the family and children.

2. Benefit sharing process

The benefit sharing is discussed by the village and works equally for women and men.

3. Fiji Pine, pine plantations and other plantations

Fiji Pine planted about 20 acres of pine on the village land in 2003/04. Fiji Pine restricts access but the land is still looked upon as village land by the community. The village cannot cancel the lease, but are generally happy with Fiji Pine. Matagali as a whole decided to lease the land to Fiji Pine.

The village planted about 10-20 acres of pine and Fiji Pine provided the seedlings. This is seen as for village use, and can be used for house building / family needs.

Small area of sandalwood less than 20 acres, seedlings came from the market. No teak. Some mahogany but less than 20yrs old.

4. Land use planning – none other than Fiji Pine choosing an area of land for pine.

## 5. Land leases

- Much of farming land leased out for sugar cane production. Lease payments from land leased out (to Fijian Indian families who generally grow sugar cane).
- Husbands receive the lease payments. Decision to lease land made by the Matagali.
- The sugar cane leases are for 50 years, Fiji Pine leases are for 99 years.

6. Fires

No fires recently, a fire occurred 1-2 years ago. Fiji Pine does not pay the villagers to help put the fire out.

7. Mangroves

People go to the mangroves most days. Mangroves are very important for food, fish, crabs, shellfish, medicines, and fuel – firewood. No honey is produced.

WWF came to talk to the village and raise awareness on the importance of the mangroves.

8. Sources of income / cash

- Sell handicrafts in the market (direct to customer – no intermediary).

- Seasonal work as cane cutting labour on sugar cane farmland about FJD30 per fortnight but based on volume cut.
- Men earn more as its based on amount cut.
- Generally it is very difficult to find paid work.

## 9. Children/ education

Hope to educate children so that they can leave the village for a better life.

## 10. Poverty

The village has 52 households of which about 20 households struggle to get by and three to four households are considered to be very poor.

## 11. Crops and food

Most households go fishing most days, as above people go to the mangroves most days.

Crops include: coconut, taro, yam, cassava, sweet potatoes, banana and some vegetables.

Livestock include chickens, goats, cows. Goats and cows can be eaten or sold. Cows are usually eaten at festivals and weddings.

## 12. Kava

Consumption remains about the same despite the current high price.

## 5.5 *Validation workshop*

**Gender Action Plan Validation Workshop: Overview, comments and feedback notes, May 9<sup>th</sup> 2019, Suva, Fiji**

**Participants included: Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation, Ministry of Lands, GIZ, WWF, IUCN, USP, WCS.**

The limitations to the GAP work were provided as it is an overview – consultations were limited by time and resources and so this is not an exhaustive study – observations and suggestions for the ER-P to consider based on observations from Viti Levu, Vanua Levu and Taveuni.

Gender analysis is for the ER-P accounting area only, and therefore is not a holistic analysis of gender issues in Fiji society. Obviously this is important, but for the current Study there were limits on time and resources.

The point was made that it the Study and Repot are not a study to solve all women's issues or gender inequities but focus on the Emission Reduction Program (ER-P)accounting areas for Fiji.

The Study does look at how WB safeguards can help can contribute to addressing involvement or empowering women to have a more equal relationship with men in ER-P accounting area.

The point was made that it is very difficult to talk about generalizations socio-economic situation for women in Fiji, it is known to be highly variable and depends on a wide range of factors

- Location of the village – coastal, inland, upland and lowland;
- Resources associated with the location including:
  - Land, which can be constrained by slope rock etc.;

- Access to Mangroves - many Fijians are highly dependent on mangroves up to 30-40% people are dependent on mangroves;
- Access to forest/ NTFPs/ medicinal herbs;
- Villages reasonably well endowed with physical “resources” but not every village, much depends on the location.

The point was made that many villages/ communities reported that access to cash is a major problem for many rural women – they often work for little money, but even so this is very important for the family.

Social characteristics also important (villages are not homogenous and not every body agrees, there can be significant differences between Matagali and locality).

- Women have different ideas in different Matagali;
- There are differences between different villages even in the same Matagali.

There is some exclusion of Fijian women from decision-making mechanisms and processes at all levels - this exclusion means that not everybody has the level of involvement that is necessary for a program of this complex nature.

There are continuing concerns that the majority of Fijian women are uninformed of their legal rights and so effectively are barred from claiming, exercising and protecting those rights.

Challenging situation – disbursed and diffuse projects - there are many small projects and programs to support women in different ministries and departments. A further challenge is how to coordinate and develop some continuity and cohesiveness.

Issues and suggestions for the ER-P

- Advance payments – no advance impacts whole program how is program to expect people to participate and collaborate when benefits are unclear and some time away? This not unique problem to Fiji and is of concern to women.
- Inclusions of mangroves – importance for climate change. No technical or carbon accounting reason why they should not be include and from a gender perspective vital.
- Communications/ outreach REDD+ message not reaching remote areas not even semi -remote area and should engage iTaukei and non iTaukei Women (and men) more actively involved (more ownership) in the program – experience shows people more involved results in better outcomes.
- Can compare villages with or without gender equity – look at examples to improve the program.

Difficult questions facing the implementation of the ER-P

- How to ensure poorer and vulnerable hhs are involved? A standard view is that everybody is equal but talking to women this is clearly not the case.
- How to obtain an inclusive “gender responsive approach” and include it in the program?
- Program should include opportunities for all Fijians iTaukei and non-iTaukei – currently not shown in ER-P.
- What do carbon benefits mean to women – and how to involve women in this? Most don’t know about carbon benefits. A suggestion is to follow a community basis rather than benefits for individual hhs.



The GAP was discussed in some detail as per the matrix.

#### Comments and feedback to the GAP

Participants were especially pleased that cost estimates had been provided along with a brief summary of the proposed interventions.

Stakeholders were identified who would, should or could be involved in the implementation of the GAP.

A timeline of the proposed action and the suggested monitoring indicators would be helpful.

The proposed GAP actions were considered to be useful and relevant although a representative from the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Reduction queried the actions proposed by arguing that while from a gender responsive perspective they were very good she was worried that they were not specific enough. For instance, she argued of making reference to markets as per Action 9 why did the GAP not provide examples of specific activities such as a Value Chain Analysis for NTFPs.

The Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Reduction could be expected to play a more active role in the implementation of the GAP rather than acting as an enabling institution for other ministries, including key ministries such as Forestry to play a more important role in gender mainstreaming of GAP activities.

Another point that was raised related to whether or not collaborative approaches to forest and mangrove management would work in the context of Fiji because most of the forest land and land surrounding the coastal mangroves is customary land and belongs to the indigenous iTaukei anyway.

The last point was noted, but it appears some of the participants were confusing or conflating co-management with collaborative management. The point was made that indigenous iTaukei people are the customary landowners of most of the forest land and the issue is not one of co-management as the land belongs to them, but that collaborative management was being suggested for ER-P activities that ideally would lead to greater forms of sustainable forest and mangrove management. It was argued if a country such as Vietnam that is effectively a one-party state can accept the principle of collaborative management then why not could a more pluralistic society like Fiji not also accept such a principle. The conclusion on the day was that participants would go away and think about this principle, which it is argued here is quite a reasonable response. We cannot expect participants to embrace such principles without giving them some thought and reflecting on their efficacy.

Several participants questioned why a GAP was necessary at all, arguing that in Fiji women and men accepted roles in traditional iTaukei society and there was little point emphasizing the dynamics of gender difference. They argued that indigenous women do not conceptualize separate spheres for women and men at the village level, that indeed this separation is more the result of gendered images of traditional iTaukei society by non-Fijians who do not understand the link between gender and tradition in Fiji. Instead they argued that the GAP should focus on actions that would benefit women and men in the traditional contexts of gender hierarchy and to suggest that the ER-P should or could empower indigenous women would not be well received at the village level. Even though evidence from the villages contradicted this argument to some extent and it was pointed out that the GAP was not designed to exclude men to simply benefit women they were unconvinced with this argument. Therefore, it is concluded the ER-P is going to have to work very hard to convince such participants that there are cogent reasons why the GAP needs to be gender responsive.

These same participants also questioned why the GAP should also identify non-iTaukei women because they argued the ToR was designed to focus on gender and forestry issues relevant to iTaukei women. It was explained that the ER-P Accounting Area also includes non-iTaukei villages and women living in these villages may also be impacted upon by the ER-P. For instance, it was pointed out that non-iTaukei women living contiguously with forests also harvest NTFPs, but if this only impacts upon a small number of non-iTaukei women they are also living and working on land leased from iTaukei communities and if the latter try and impose ER-P related activities such as afforestation on these leaseholders than non-iTaukei women will be affected. It also needs to be noted that there are links between indigenous and non-indigenous women such as during the six months of sugarcane harvesting or even in local markets. It was accepted by the majority of

participants that the GAP should also make provision for non-iTaukei women to actively participate where it is considered relevant.

The GAP is also strongly influenced by the need to include actions associated with the coastal mangroves in the ER-P not least of all because 35-40% of iTaukei women depend to a very large extent on these mangroves. A spurious argument was mounted that while the importance of mangroves is recognized there could be no focus on mangroves until Phase Two because it was too late to include them in the ER-PD to be submitted to the Carbon Fund at the end of June 2019. It was argued during the REL study that it was not possible to quantify the impact of including mangroves in calculations to assess the reduction in carbon emissions. This argument was debunked on the grounds that the technical arguments were based on assumptions that there was not enough information relating to the sequestration of coastal mangroves in Fiji. It was also learned that the Fiji REDD+ Steering Committee had always opposed the exclusion of the coastal mangroves from the ER-P not because of their importance to iTaukei women, but because of the cumulative impact their inclusion would have on reducing carbon emissions. However, at the time of preparing this Report no firm decision had been made to include the coastal mangroves in the ER-P – at least for what is referred to as Phase 1 – but it was explained at the Validation Workshop they would be included in the GAP even if their conclusion were to be delayed to a Phase 2.

Women are to be targeted not simply as passive participants but actively engaged ER-P stakeholders. It was accepted that this would vary from village-to-village, province-to-province and division-to-division based on a variety of social and environmental differences, but also ethnicity.

Most stakeholders also expressed a concern as to whether the activities could or would be upscaled and replicated. They are aware of current REDD+ projects, but they also questioned as to why these projects had generally not moved beyond the pilot stage despite in some instances, projects being implemented nearly a decade ago.

The GAP is specifically linked to the implementation of the ER-P, but they want to see a GAP that goes beyond the end of this ER-P in 2024. The GAP Study Team argued that principles of this GAP are not time-bound, but in the context of the ER-P it is necessary to prepare a timeline that is consistent with the financing program supported by the WB.


The estimated costs most participants stated they would have to study them more closely, but were pleased that a “ball-park” estimate had been made. None of the participants seemed to think the suggested budget was unreasonably high and in fact some suggested that the budget is too low, but it was generally agreed this should be the subject of more discussion with a better understanding of applicable cost norms for Fiji. There was some discussion as to whether funds remaining in the FCPF-REDD+ program from the WB could be used for such purposes.

The extant point that most of the participants made though was that without a specific budget actions associated with the GAP would probably not be implemented and this will form a very strong recommendation of this GAP.

Monitoring indicators did not elicit much response from the participants although some participants argued it was very important to differentiate between quantitative and qualitative monitoring indicators and between outputs and outcomes. Some of the actions included both types of indicators but the GAP Team is awaiting feedback from the Ministry of Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation because it is currently involved in developing similar monitoring processes with offshore fisherfolk and the Ministry of Fisheries. However, all participants agreed it was more important to capture the views of rural women who will be targeted in this ER-P and of equal importance to encourage these women to develop their own participatory M&E system for the ER-P.

In conclusion the Validation Workshop was a very useful and necessary process.

## 5.6 *Locations visited in Fiji*







## ***Bibliography***

- Abbot, D. (2006), *Poverty in the Pacific: Definitions, Trends and Issues*. Suva: UNDP Pacific Sub-Regional Center
- Asian Development Bank (2015), *Country Gender Assessment: The Republic of Fiji*. Manila: Asian Development Bank
- Baxter, N. (1980), *Food in Fiji: The Produce and Processed Foods Distribution Systems*. Canberra: Australian National University
- Bibi, P.M. (2017), "Tourism, Indigenous Women and Empowerment: A Case Study of Tavenui, Fiji" (MBus Thesis), Lismore: Southern Cross University
- Blodgett, E (2001), *Fijian Sugar Plantations and the Ethnic Battle to Govern and Island Nation*. New York: TED Studies No.62
- Carswell, S. (2003), "A Family Business: Women, Children and Smallholder Sugarcane Farming in Fiji", *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 44 (2), pp.131-148
- Chan, I. (2010), *The Different Roles of Men and Women in a Fijian Village*. Canberra: Australian National University
- Chattier, P. (2008), "Gender, Survival and Self-Respect and Dimension of Agency within a Poor Indian-Fijian Community" (PhD Dissertation). Canberra: The Australian National University
- De Ricci, J.H. (1878), *Fiji: Our New Province in the South Seas*. London: E. Standford
- Department of Lands and Surveys (1992), *Land Tenure Systems in Fiji*. Suva: Ministry of Lands and Mineral Resources
- Dharma, C. and Vasemaca, L. (2005), *Women and Men of Fiji Islands: Gender Statistics and Trends*. Suva: University of the South Pacific
- Duaibo, S. (2017), "The Problems and Prospects of Sustainable Forestry Management in the Tropics: A Case Study on the Vanua Nasoqo, Nabobuco, North Central Viti Levu, Fiji (MA in Development Studies). Suva: University of South Pacific
- Gibson, D. (2013), "Community-based tourism in Fiji" in S. Pratt and D. Harrison (eds), *Tourism in the Pacific Islands: Current Issues and Future Challenges*. Oxford: Routledge
- Griffen, V. (1989), *Women, Development and Empowerment: A Pacific Feminist Perspective*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington
- iTaukei Land Trust Board (2018), *Land Ownership in Fiji*. Suva: iTaukei Land Trust Board
- Jones, L (2013), *Study on Poverty, Gender and Ethnicity in Key Sectors of the Fijian Economy*. Canberra: Australian AID
- Kado, M. (2007), "Tourism and Poverty Alleviation in Fiji: Examining the Impact of Gold Coast Tourism on Village Livelihoods: the Case of the Villages of Namatakula and Vatuolalai (Unpublished MA in Development Studies)". Suva; University of South Pacific
- Lai, B. (2010), *Fiji Islands: From Immigration to Emigration*. Canberra: The Australian National University
- Leckie, J. (1997), "Gender and Work in Fiji: Constraints of Re-negotiation". *Women's Studies Journal*, 13 (2), pp.127-53

- Ministry of Forestry (2019), *Emissions Reductions Program Document (ER-PD)*, Suva: National REDD+ Steering Committee
- Movono, A. and H. Dables (2017), "Female Empowerment and Tourism: A Focus on Businesses in a Fijian Village", *Asia-Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 5 (1), pp.1-12
- Nabobo-Baba, U. (2006), *Knowing and Learning: An Indigenous Fijian Approach*. Suva: University of South Pacific
- Nabobo-Baba, U. (2008), "Decolonizing Framings in Pacific Research: Indigenous Fijian Vanua Research Framework", *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 4 (2), pp.141-154
- Naresy, W, T. Raikoti and S. Waysvonovono (2010), *Preliminary Report: Poverty and Household Incomes in Fiji (2008-09 Household Income and Expenditure Survey Results)*. Suva: Bureau of Statistics
- Narsey, W, (2007). *Gender Issues in Employment, Underemployment and Incomes in Fiji*. Suva: Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics
- Narey, W (2012), *Poverty in Fiji: Changes 2002-3 to 2008-9 and Policy Implications*. Suva: Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics
- Rakasetra, V. (2013), "Women's Work and Fertility in Fiji", *Pacific Health Dialogue*, 2 (1), pp.28-42
- Ravuv, A. (1983), Vaka I Taukei: *The Fijian Way of Life*. Suva: University of South Pacific
- Sibley, J.E. (2014), *The Financial Competence of Low-Income Households on Fiji*. Suva: United Nations Capital Development Fund
- Thaman, R.R. (1988), "Fijian Agroforestry: Trees, People and Sustainable Polycultural Development" in J. Overton (ed), *Rural Fiji*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies
- Tarabe, A.S (2018), "Fiji: Navigating a Dual Tenure System and REDD+" in A.L. Tamayo and R.D. Chavez (eds), *Customary Tenure Systems and REDD+: Ensuring Benefits for indigenous People*. Philippines: Tebtebba Foundation.
- Tuiwawa, M., S. Pene and S. Tuiwawa (2013), *A Rapid Biodiversity Assessment, Socio-Economic Study and Archaeological Survey of Rewa River Mangroves, Viti Levu, Fiji*. Suva: Department of Environment, MESAC, IUCN and University of South Pacific
- Warren, D.M. (1991), *Using Indigenous Knowledge in Agriculture Development*. Washington: The World Bank
- Wilson, C. (2009), *Land and Conflict in the Pacific Region*. Suva: The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
- World Bank and Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics (2011), *Republic of Fiji: Poverty Trends, Profiles and Small Area Estimation (Poverty Maps) in Republic of Fiji (2003-09)*. Washington: The World Bank and Fiji Islands Bureau of Statistics
- World Bank Group (2017) *Systematic Country Diagnostic 2017 – Republic of Fiji*. Washington: The World Bank
- Yabaki, T. (2006), "Women's Life in a Fijian Village" (EdD Thesis). Canberra: Australian National University