

Fiji REDD+ Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism

DELIVERABLE 4

June 2018



Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) Communications Strategy and Training Report



Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>i</i>
Executive Summary	2
1. Introduction	3
2. FGRM Communications Strategy	4
2.1. Goals and Objectives.....	4
2.1.1 <i>Core Communication Principles</i>	5
2.2. Communicating the Function and Use of the FGRM	5
2.2.1 <i>Introducing the FGRM</i>	6
2.2.1.1. Conveying Information.....	6
Key Messages	6
Raise Awareness from Initiation	7
Stimulating Demand.....	7
Creating Incentives.....	7
2.2.1.2. Delivery Methods	7
Communication Platforms	8
2.2.1.3. Target Audience	9
Forest-users (Local Communities).....	10
Private Landowners or Lessees	11
REDD+ Resource and Support Groups	11
REDD+ Project Implementers.....	11
FGRM Designated Agents.....	11
Independent Experts.....	12
REDD+ related Institutions or Agencies	12
2.2.1.4. Assigning Responsibility	12
iTaukei Village Headmen.....	12
Local Officers.....	13
Multipliers	13
Government Ministries and Agencies	13
2.2.1.5. Timeframe.....	14
Managing Expectations	14
2.2.2 <i>Action Plan</i>	15
2.2.3 <i>Communicating Effectiveness</i>	15
2.2.4 <i>Incorporating Feedback</i>	16
3. FGRM Training Report	17
3.1. Identifying the Need for the Workshop and Training	17
3.2. Workshop Objectives.....	17
3.2.1 <i>Session Plan and Agenda</i>	18
3.2.1.1. Session Plan.....	18
3.3. Training Techniques	19
3.3.1 <i>Research and Analysis</i>	19
3.3.2 <i>Surveys</i>	19
3.3.3 <i>Lecture</i>	20
3.3.4 <i>Participatory Trainings Methods and Tools</i>	20

3.4. Workshop Outcomes	20
3.5. Learning and Feedback	21
3.5.1 <i>Survey Responses</i>	21
3.5.1.1. Pre-Survey Summary	21
3.5.1.2. Midway-Survey (End of Day 1) Summary	24
3.5.1.3. Post-Survey Summary	25
3.5.2 <i>Additional Observations and Comments From Participants</i>	27
3.6. Recommendations and Follow-up	28
3.6.1 <i>Recommendations</i>	28
3.6.2 <i>Follow-up</i>	29
Attachments	30
Attachment 1: Acronym List	31
Attachment 2: Communications Plan Template	32
Attachment 3: Workshop Participant List	35
Attachment 4: Workshop Session Plan and Agenda	36
Attachment 5: Case Studies.....	38
Attachment 6: Surveys	41
Attachment 7: Revised Reporting and Recording Forms	45

Acknowledgements

The FGRM Team and Integra wishes to acknowledge the agencies, ministries, boards, nongovernmental organizations, civil society organizations, and individuals who helped contribute to the “FGRM Stakeholder Workshop and Training”. Special thanks and appreciation is extended to all the workshop participants who provided not only their knowledge of the dispute resolution process, but also insight into some of the challenges the FGRM and REDD+ will face. We also wish to extend our gratitude to Ms. Reama Naco, REDD+ Communications & Knowledge Management Specialist, who helped to record the training and provide marketing materials for the workshop.

This report was authored by Corey Nelson, Ulai Baya, and Mereseini Seniloli (FGRM Team) of Integra for the REDD+ Secretariat.

Executive Summary

The “Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) Communications Strategy and Training Report” is the third phase (of four) under the Fiji REDD+ Readiness FGRM Consultancy. The communications strategy and training delivered in support of the FGRM build on the outcomes of the previously conducted analysis and community consultations and supports the design of the alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanism for REDD+.

The proposed communications strategy addresses the delivery of key messages, such as how to/when to access and use the FGRM, as well as creates general awareness of REDD+ programming. The strategy, augmented by inputs received during and after the training, is included in this deliverable to inform all REDD+ stakeholders about the existence of the FGRM and instruction for its operation. This FGRM communications strategy should be included, and is in alignment with, Fiji’s larger *Communications Strategy for REDD+*; supported by the REDD+ Steering Committee’s (RSC) Education Working Group (tasked with communication and education for all REDD+ activities)¹.

The training report includes the purpose, objectives, and outcomes of a stakeholder consultation and training workshop where key FGRM representatives, beneficiaries, and counterparts were introduced to the FGRM and educated on the recommended reporting and recording processes and procedures. The stakeholder training targeted three key groups of FGRM designated support staff – (1) iTaukei Village Headmen (*Turaga ni koro*), (2) REDD+ FGRM agents, either in a full-time, part-time, or resource capacity, and (3) resource and support groups that will likely be involved in REDD+ conflict resolution. These representatives were trained on the proposed FGRM procedures and processes and on how to report and record grievances for both REDD+ readiness and implementation phases using two (2) approved forms and grievance redress guidelines. The first form is designed for use by iTaukei Village Headmen (supported by dictation to Village Councils) to document REDD+ related disputes and subsequent resolutions. The second form is designed for FGRM designated officers (i.e., Forest Officers from the Ministry of Forest and the REDD+ Liaison Officer (R+LO) from the REDD+ Unit) to record and report issues and grievances relating to REDD+ activities under their authority.

Feedback from the workshop on overall design of the FGRM and reporting and recording processes were collected via open dialogue, exercises, and through surveys conducted at the beginning, middle, and end of the two (2) day training session, from all participants. Inputs received from workshop participants are presented here (in the Training Report) in addition to being reflected in the revision of the reporting and recording forms for approval by the REDD+ Secretariat and the communications strategy. This participatory feedback should also be used to improve the overall FGRM process, which may result in updates to its initial design.

Notably, the training provided only cursory conflict resolution training. It will be important that the REDD+ Secretariat conduct specific and targeted mediation, facilitation, and conflict resolution training during the start-up phase of the FGRM for these same groups.

¹ As Working Groups tend to shift or as new ones are introduced it will be important to revisit this placement as appropriate.

1. Introduction

This deliverable offers a communications strategy and training feedback component that can help support the development of the FGRM, whose goal is to improve and publicize grievance redress policies and guidelines for forest-users. Devising and promoting a communications strategy that infuses training and capacity building for the FGRM will strengthen Fiji's commitment towards the achievement of a participatory, inclusive, and collaborative approach to address disputes that may arise from REDD+ activities.

A **FGRM Communications Strategy** has been developed that identifies target audiences, key messages, tools and techniques, responsibilities, and timeframes for Fiji's REDD+ FGRM and is included in the next section. The **Training Report** details the design and organization of the FGRM workshop, as well as feedback from stakeholders on the FGRM process and reporting and recording forms. Feedback from attendees was used to improve both the communications section and reporting and recording processes. In addition adjustments may need to be made to the design of the overall FGRM to accommodate feedback received during the stakeholder consultation workshop and training.

2. FGRM Communications Strategy

Even the best-designed FGRMs cannot function effectively unless users are aware of its existence and understand how it functions. As part of a comprehensive communications strategy, the REDD+ Secretariat and REDD+ Unit (which will contain the FGRM Team) will coordinate with other agencies, institutions, and resource groups to communicate and publicize the existence of the FGRM for REDD+; its procedures and processes, reporting and staffing, operating service standards, and other relevant information. A central factor to the overall success of the FGRM, a communications strategy, will also give the FGRM the visibility it needs; creating understanding amongst stakeholders about their role in the FGRM process and improving communities' knowledge of REDD+ goals and objectives for improved livelihood and sustainable forest management.

2.1. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal: To enhance awareness and communication with key stakeholders on how to address issues, conflicts, and/or disputes as they relate to impacts from REDD+ activities in Fiji.

Objectives: The communications strategy is guidance for how to distribute information and receive feedback from stakeholders regarding the purpose, use, and outcomes of the FGRM. In order to achieve this there are three overarching objectives:

1. Enhance understanding of REDD+ and forest-related policies and environmental issues (as they are related to and or may be impacted by REDD+) among forest-users and adjacent communities.
2. Strengthen forest-users access to information and resources for conflict resolution outside of the informal and formal systems for REDD+ related issues.
3. Promote the use of the FGRM to address any REDD+ related disputes by building trust and ownership processes through transparent and open communications and receptive feedback.

Outputs: Given the overarching goal and objectives listed above, the following are key outputs to be achieved through deployment of the communications strategy:

- Increased awareness and understanding of REDD+ policies and procedures amongst key stakeholders, to include beneficiaries and government staff.
- Increased awareness and understanding of how to report a REDD+ related grievance and the process for its resolution in the FGRM by forest-users.
- Improved processes for reporting and recording grievances by designated FGRM officers.

While the REDD+ Secretariat has empowered Roko, Forest Officers, and supporting institutions to publicize and educate communities on REDD+ policies and practice, it was made clear during community consultations and the FGRM training that additional, improved, and tailored information is needed to help address misperceptions, potential risks, and build trust. As part of the communications strategy for the FGRM it will be important to reinforce individuals and communities understanding about what exactly is “REDD+” – what are the benefits and costs and what are their rights, including, as part of, free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC).

2.1.1 Core Communication Principles

The communications strategy for the FGRM will also abide by the core principles as outlined in the *Fiji REDD+ Communication Strategy*²:

- **Long term sustainability programmes and activities** – Ensure delivery of long-term, positive, ecological, economic and social impacts
- **Managing expectations** – Stakeholder groups need to be assured that the REDD+ objectives are attainable and the reasonable stakeholder expectations can be met. This can be achieved through inclusiveness, transparency and accuracy through the timely dissemination of information
- **Community ownership** – Ensure local community involvement and strengthen the feedback mechanism process
- **Formation of Strategic Partnerships** – Ensure government coordination with relevant and potential development partners, CSOs, academic institutions, community based organisations (CBOs) and the private sector for the delivery of REDD+ initiatives
- **Consideration of the marginalised and vulnerable groups** – Ensure that REDD+ information is understood at all these various levels
- **Consideration of Gender** – to sensitize the Fiji National REDD+ Programme to gender issues and needs in accordance with SDG [Sustainable Development Goal] 5

2.2. COMMUNICATING THE FUNCTION AND USE OF THE FGRM

Fiji's REDD+ Readiness Preparation Proposal (R-PP) emphasizes creating ownership through active involvement of all stakeholders. When communities are informed and mobilized to support the process of REDD+ they become more invested in its outcomes and more capable of adding value throughout its evolution. For the FGRM, the more stakeholders are informed and involved in the process of grievance redress, the more they are able to improve the process, help in the recognition of patterns, and more fully understand their rights. The communication strategy for the FGRM should include consultation and participatory components to ensure transparency and accountability, information sharing and accessibility, disclosure of outcomes, and most importantly to ensure engagement of key stakeholders in the FGRM process. As part of this campaign it will also be important to identify any risks or fears that forest-users may have regarding use of the system and discovering what else users might need to voice a complaint or participate in the process (e.g., training, mentoring, resource materials).

The FGRM process does not stop/preclude grieving parties from pursuing their contested matter(s) legally if they are not satisfied with the outcome. FGRM is a community-based mechanism that is user friendly amongst REDD+ stakeholders with flexible procedures bridging the formal and customary overlaps of rights and interests representation.

² The following section is directly pulled from the REDD+ document "Fiji REDD+ Communication Strategy" published by the REDD+ Secretariat and the Ministry of Forest.

2.2.1 Introducing the FGRM

How the FGRM is introduced to REDD+ implementers, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders will have significant implications for its overall effectiveness. Important aspects to consider when introducing the FGRM, addressed during the design phase, include:

- **Conveying Information** – What information needs to be conveyed and transmitted in a clear and understandable way?
- **Delivery Methods** – What are the mediums needed to deliver key messages?
- **Target Audiences** – Who are the target groups who will be receiving the information on the FGRMs existence and use?
- **Assigning Responsibility** – Who is responsible for conveying information and who can help (multipliers)?
- **Timeframe** – What timeframe is necessary to communication about the FGRM?

2.2.1.1. Conveying Information

It will be important to consider the target audience(s) when determining what information is being conveyed to ensure it is being transmitted and received in a culturally appropriate and easily understood manner. Messaging needs to account for local language, oral and visual preferences, and appropriate expertise. Most messaging regarding the FGRM should be as simple and as basic as possible to avoid confusion and misconceptions about the process and outcomes, whilst managing expectations.

KEY MESSAGES

Central to the communications strategy is the delivery of key messages that will communicate the purpose, process, and outcomes of the FGRM to all stakeholders. Messages will focus on tangible examples of achievements and lessons learned.

The following overarching messages are important to communicate:

- What are rights under REDD+?
- What is a feedback and grievance redress mechanism (FGRM)?
- What is the FGRM for REDD+?
- What are common types of disputes?
- How can the FGRM help resolve disputes?
- Who are the people involved in the FGRM process?
- How can the FGRM be accessed and what are the steps of the process?
- What are the options for resolution under the FGRM and how are they enforced?
- What are the time frames for resolving specific types of disputes?
- Where can information be obtained regarding REDD+ and the FGRM?

RAISE AWARENESS FROM INITIATION

During community consultations, key informational interviews, and feedback from training participants, the FGRM consultancy team observed that operation of existing institutional grievance redress mechanisms (GRM) in Fiji was unclear to the majority of stakeholders. Few people knowledgeable of GRM functions, related to land management, either work at the institutions housing the GRM and/or for NGO/interest-based organization that have had to support communities in the resolution of certain grievances. Therefore it is highly recommended that awareness about the FGRM be raised alongside its implementation to encourage stakeholders continued use of the mechanism. In this way conflicts are immediately addressed and trust is built. Awareness raising activities for the FGRM can be best coupled with general awareness activities about REDD+ as a means for cost effectiveness and it establishes linkages between the mechanism and REDD+ programming.

STIMULATING DEMAND

Stimulating external demand for the FGRM will also be important for its effectiveness. The distrust that currently exists with formal dispute resolution mechanisms in Fiji is significant in communities. This is a barrier that the FGRM will have to overcome, as most users will associate the FGRM with other GRMs currently being used by other land management boards; thus the FGRM will have to “deal with others baggage”. As a result communication will be a critical tool needed to correct any misconceptions that may arise during the FGRMs introduction and to promote its use. This can be achieved through an effective consultation and participation process characterized by:

- Establishment of clear goals and expectations amongst all parties;
- Community involvement at every step of the process;
- Clear distinction between the formal, informal, and semi-formal placement of the FGRM and how it fits into the overall dispute resolution process;
- Unbiased, transparent, and approved FGRM officers, support staff, and process that invite feedback from forest-users on processes for continued improvement; and
- Effective coordination amongst ministries, agencies, resource and support groups, and communities in grievance redress.

CREATING INCENTIVES

The creation of incentives for users of the FGRM at its onset can also help stimulate external demand and institutional recognition of the mechanism, improving its use. Incentives can be simple stipends (e.g., transportation costs, telephone credit) to local users so that the FGRM becomes more accessible. Such costs, as well as other costs associated with the operationalization of the FGRM, should be obtained from benefits coming from REDD+ investments. Incentives could also include in-kind technical assistance (e.g., services addressing community needs).

2.2.1.2. *Delivery Methods*

In order to reach all stakeholders, the use of effective communication tools and techniques are critical. Properly identified mediums will help ensure lasting and active participation,

appreciation, and engagement in the FGRM process. Thus, the role of communication, promotion, and documentation will help the FGRM and REDD+ achieve a more sustainable and accountable grievance redress process that will only improve REDD+ programming.

Communication on REDD+ in Fiji has to date taken various avenues, through regional, national, and local programs and initiatives. There are regular radio talk-back shows, REDD+ booths and information centers set up during national events, REDD+ panel discussions are held in both national and regional events, to include the recent COP23. Fiji's Ministry of Forest (MoF), with support from the Pacific Community (SPC), and *Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit* (GIZ) has developed a variety of brochures and posters explaining climate change and REDD+ in simple terms and academic assessments and reports have been published on REDD+ readiness and impacts for Fiji by donors. These materials have been distributed and help raise awareness at stakeholder meetings.

The FGRM can piggyback on these communications by making sure that information regarding the FGRM's existence is included in these materials and that supplemental and more detailed information on the process and procedures for grievance submission (e.g., FGRM Manual) are provided in appropriate mediums.

COMMUNICATION PLATFORMS

Specific mediums that can be used to build awareness of the FGRM include:

- **Oral** – This form of communication most closely aligns with traditional/customary forms of engagement and provides a delivery that is accessible to most people regardless of literacy, economic or social standing, or remoteness whilst being participatory in nature. Formats can include community conversations, Village Council meetings, presentations, and speeches (often in local iTaukei).
- **Verbal (spoken rather than written)** – This medium is geared for public consultation and participation and is likely to include a mixture of communication approaches that include engagement in dialogue rather than one-way spoken word. Verbal mediums will work hand-in-hand with written mediums. For example, as training is provided to FGRM staff and beneficiaries on the use of the FGRM a mixed method approach would be more impactful for delivery and knowledge attainment. Formats can include meetings, conferences/seminars, roundtable discussions, workshops, focus groups, trainings, drama/role-playing (and other art-based activities), road shows, and exhibitions.
- **Print Media** – Print media provides referable material to the literate portion of the community and allows for a more detailed breakout of initiatives and processes to be transmitted and a method to obtain feedback. This will be the most common form of media communication for the FGRM as many communities that will be participating in REDD+, and thereby the FGRM, are remote in location and may not have ready or reliable access to mobile or internet services in their communities. Formats may include posters, flyers, pamphlets, brochures, factsheets, lessons learned booklets, banners, event materials, press releases, and possibly billboards. REDD+ issues and news are already disseminated in other agency newsletters and through the Ministry of Information channels. Information on the FGRM can be added to these channels and will continue to be strengthened by feeding relevant FGRM news and information through other sector

newsletters and media. A Fiji REDD+ quarterly newsletter is currently under development and reference materials and a spotlight on the FGRM can be included.

- **Electronic Media** – Electronic media, especially radio, web-based, and TV, are effective when trying to reach out to a broader range of stakeholders simultaneously and are a powerful tool for raising interest and awareness. These mediums may be a good choice for communicating the FGRM’s general program objectives, design, overall framework and intended outcomes. Radio programming can provide conversation platforms on REDD+ and any issues communities are facing. Websites (building on to <http://fiji-reddplus.org>) and knowledge management portals will provide ease of information access to stakeholders, where they can access and reference materials at their own convenience and provide feedback on issues. TV spots can also be used to familiarize and publicize the community with the FGRM process through educational programming and newscast.
- **Social Media** – Social media can also be utilized to share information on the FGRM through platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram. Fiji REDD+ has an active Facebook channel that could support communication efforts.

2.2.1.3. Target Audience

Stakeholders must be informed that the government will be establishing a FGRM to resolve possible disputes that might arise as a result of REDD+ activities. To grasp specific interests and critical areas of importance for all stakeholders it is important to understand the distinction among these audiences in order to tailor the type of communication appropriately. This communications strategy identifies seven (7) target audiences/FGRM stakeholders:

1. **Forest-users (Local Communities)** – native Fijians (iTaukei) as primary landowners (this includes Landowning Units) that may be impacted by REDD+ that have a reliance on forests and/or forest-based products and resources.
2. **Private Landowners and Lessees** – non-landowning agents, such as Indo-Fijians (lesers) or private non-Fijian landholders that may be affected by REDD+ activities.
3. **REDD+ Resource and Support Groups** – local, national, and international networks that advocate on behalf of forest users. Some of these groups have experience in awareness raising, communication, and conflict resolution. These groups can also serve as resources, offering subject matter expertise (e.g., forestry, law, REDD+, conservation, public policy) in addition to facilitation, mediation, and negotiation support services.
4. **REDD+ Project Implementers** – national and international organizations that are involved or will be involved in implementing and managing REDD+ sites outside of government managed locations.
5. **FGRM Designated Agents** – consisting of all informal and formal agents working in roles that are directly related to support of the FGRM (i.e., iTaukei Village Headmen (*Turaga ni Koro*), Forest Officers from the Ministry of Forest, *Roko Tui*, REDD+ Project Coordinators).
6. **Independent Experts** – individuals possessing expertise in conflict resolution, as well as specific subject matter expertise (e.g., forestry, law, private sector engagement, gender, agriculture) that may serve as part of an Independent Assessment Group (IAG).
7. **REDD+ related Institutions or Agencies** – high-level structures within the Government of Fiji such as Ministries or Boards, who have some involvement and therefore a stake in REDD+. These members may serve on the RSC and as a result may have a role to play in the resolution of grievances in a board review capacity.

Each of these target groups will be approached in a tailored way. The information to be conveyed and the delivery modality are discussed in the remainder of this section.

FOREST-USERS (LOCAL COMMUNITIES)

Forest-users can become informed about the FGRM through simple and consistent messaging. It will be important for all communications for these groups to be accessible in both oral and written formats that provide points of contact (POC) should they wish to ask questions or seek clarification regarding any parts or processes of the FGRM. These groups may be actively engaged in a REDD+ activity site or be adjacent; as such they may be located in more remote areas of the country. Communication channels must therefore be multi-pronged and include a strong element of oral communication (for those that are illiterate). The FGRM should be introduced into each REDD+ community through a presentation to the Landowning Unit (LoU) representatives and other community members that includes an oral explanation of the FGRM process, an introduction of FGRM designated staff to whom they will be reporting their grievances, written materials they can reference and where those materials can be accessed in their communities after the presentation, and an element of role-play to demonstrate understanding by community members. Through these delivery methods all community members receive messaging about the goals, processes, and specific grievance outcomes of the FGRM. They also receive specific instructions on how, when, and where to engage in the FGRM. By introducing FGRM designated staff to communities the REDD+ Secretariat, under the MoF will generate goodwill and build trust in the process by creating accountability for FGRM staff by “putting a face to a name”.

Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups

Vulnerable and more marginalized groups may face greater challenges when attempting to access and use the FGRM because of barriers such as illiteracy, lack of knowledge about rights, mistrust of government, fear of retribution, lack of access to technology, belief REDD+ may not act on their behalf to address grievances, and lack of legitimacy about REDD+ in relation to enforcement or accountability. There are a number of arrangements incorporated into the design of the FGRM that can reduce or remove these obstacles, ensuring that the mechanism is more socially inclusive. The FGRM is designed to:

- Provide multiple methods (oral and written) for grievance submission and multiple uptake locations/officers.
- Engage local intermediaries (community-based or CSO) as support or resource groups to help facilitate the submission of complaints and provide information on rights and FGRM processes.
- Deploy community-specific communication strategies to allay fears about and increase comfort level with submitting grievances.
- Ensure there is no formal or informal charge (and options for anonymity) when submitting grievances.
- Provide follow-up on the progress of grievance submissions directly to the Complainant.
- Clearance for support groups to submit grievances on behalf of Complainants.

- Provide a structure for enforcement of resolutions and multiple means to hold FGRM staff accountable.

PRIVATE LANDOWNERS OR LESSEES

Indo-Fijian communities, while not landowners, may also be impacted by REDD+ activities because they lease land that may be used for REDD+ activities or be adjacent to REDD+ sites. While there is a structured mechanism for resolving issues pertaining to land-use or livelihood in these communities, it will be important that they understand that they also have access to the FGRM if they are unable to resolve disputes with REDD+ LoUs or other stakeholders/actors. Private landowners that are non-iTaukei also have access to the FGRM. These non-iTaukei groups can be informed about the FGRM through written and published communication methods that detail the goals, processes, and specific grievance outcomes.

REDD+ RESOURCE AND SUPPORT GROUPS

Resource and support groups, including NGOs, CSOs, and other special interest organizations, will be comprehensively informed about the FGRM because they will have a specific role in supporting local communities through grievance uptake, awareness and access to information, and/or act as intermediaries (i.e., mediators, facilitators, negotiators). Learning about their role in the FGRM will be supported by formal training on FGRM procedures and processes and opportunities for additional training on topics, such as conflict resolution, led by FGRM designated staff. The outcomes of these trainings will be increased knowledge on REDD+ policies and procedures and awareness and new knowledge regarding FGRM protocols and their role in advocating and supporting forest-users. Written communications will also be made available to these groups to supplement the training and options for providing feedback and POCs will also be made available.

REDD+ PROJECT IMPLEMENTERS

Fiji's REDD+ Programme supports a hybrid approach for implementation that allows for both government and implementer/project-led REDD+ activities. While it will be required that implementer-led activities have their own GRM in place, it will also be a prerequisite that their mechanism be similar and act in alignment with the national REDD+ FGRM. This is done to eliminate confusion with regard to multiple F/GRM processes; breed familiarity with similar procedures, and to create a more seamless process should there be a need to advance a grievance that is not resolved through an implementer-led GRM to the national FGRM. Implementers will have access to information on the FGRM through written means and through oral engagement with the REDD+ Liaison Officer (R+LO) and through communications of the RSC (as members).

FGRM DESIGNATED AGENTS

FGRM designated agents include government officials serving in a resolution (Forest Officers, *Roko Tui*) or monitoring (REDD+ Project Coordinators) capacity to support REDD+ activities and customary officials (iTaukei Village Headmen) that are responsible for providing support for grievance uptake, handling, and possible resolution. Each group will receive training in REDD+ policies and procedures and on the purpose and use of the FGRM, in particular how to record and report grievances that are submitted to the mechanism and/or monitoring. These agents will be

involved in the FGRM presentations to communities and will have access to the FGRM Manual³ – complete with steps, procedures, forms, checklists, and POCs. In addition these agents have the opportunity to submit feedback to the R+LO through written means or verbally through monthly uptake progress meetings.

INDEPENDENT EXPERTS

Independent experts have a specific role to play in the FGRM as part of the Independent Assessment Group (IAG). These experts will be expected to have previous training in conflict resolution and will be selected based on their subject matter expertise. They will have access to written materials, such as the FGRM Manual, and will receive instructions on how to undertake investigatory assessments rather than grievance uptake.

REDD+ RELATED INSTITUTIONS OR AGENCIES

Although often underestimated, the functioning of the FGRM as a management tool is imperative. The REDD+ FGRM will need to be communicated clearly with partnering government institutions and agencies, where high-level decision-makers must be informed of the FGRM through training and formal communication. A presentation of the FGRM should be made at each agency. Representative members of the RSC should participate in the training and have access to the FGRM Manual. Additional supplemental communications regarding their role will be instructed as similar to the independent experts, through written guidance.

2.2.1.4. *Assigning Responsibility*

Communications must be seen as a central function of the FGRM, critical to the effective delivery of the mechanism and its role in the attainment of the overall goals of REDD+. A strong communications presence for the FGRM needs to be established to augment the work being done on national REDD+ projects. Resources must be mobilized and management must prioritize communications in order for users to understand how, when, and why they can engage the FGRM to resolve issues on REDD+. The development of a “Communications Plan” that is in alignment with the overarching *Communications Strategy for REDD+* and should be overseen by the REDD+ Secretariat with development by the REDD+ Technical Advisor, Communications Officer, and Grievance Director (see *Attachment 2* for a template with examples for the design of a formalized communications plan).

ITAUKEI VILLAGE HEADMEN⁴

iTaukei Village Headmen are to serve as a resource for their villages. This group should be able to inform community members on the differences between informal (customary), semi-formal (FGRM), and formal process for addressing REDD+ related disputes. This responsibility includes explaining the FGRM process and procedures, with information attained through training on the FGRM, the use of informal grievance dispute forms, monthly communications on monitoring with the REDD+ Project Coordinators to the R+LO, and facilitating submissions to

³ This should compliment the REDD+ field guide. This will allow officers and resource persons to answer questions regarding REDD+ in a standardized way when communicating with local stakeholders.

⁴ At the time of the training it was noted that the recent change from “headman” to “administrator” means that these positions can now be filled by appointment (e.g., possibly non-iTaukei). This could be problematic as the Village Headmen has traditionally been involved in the resolution of iTaukei grievances (those most likely to be impacted by REDD+ activities). It is suggested here is to revisit who this point person should be as a result of the change.

the FGRM as needed. The primary means of communicating this information to communities will be oral and supplemented through print mediums provided by the REDD+ Unit.

LOCAL OFFICERS

Current REDD+ village/community awareness programs are being carried out by a multi-sector team that includes the MoF, Agriculture Department (Land Use Section), trained landowners, Provincial Officers, CSOs, NGOs, SPC, and GIZ. These program activities are usually facilitated in part during initial consultations and form part of the evidence towards the fulfillment of FPIC process. Government officers that will support REDD+ activities at the local, project, and regional-level include Forest Officers, R+LO, REDD+ Project Coordinators, and *Roko Tui*. These Officers are responsible for supporting REDD+ awareness programs and as such will support the FGRM in varying capacities. Communications efforts for the FGRM will coincide with those on REDD+ policies and procedures so that the FGRM is seen as a component of the overall national programming of REDD+. Information will be communicated through verbal, printed, and electronic means to community members and these officers will act as resources for information clarification, protocol, and monitoring.

MULTIPLIERS

Information sharing with local communities is also supported through the engagement of NGOs, CSOs, law advocates, private sector entities, universities, and other special interests groups. Education, awareness, and feedback can take place through non-governmental avenues and these multipliers have been identified as stakeholders who will be part of the FGRM either through mediation, facilitation, negotiation, and/or research support. These groups will need to be trained in conflict resolution measures and the FGRM process in order to be able to replicate information to the communities they wish to help. They will be able to act as resources for communities on the FGRM process in addition to REDD+ policies and procedures. These groups are often skilled in community participation methods and can inform community members of their rights and means to engage the FGRM through oral and verbal means. They can be most effective at engaging through dialogue, role-playing, and written communication, but they will not be designated for the production of print or electronic media (these primary messages should only come from the government of Fiji and can then be referenced or expanded on by these groups). They are on-the-ground actors and are trusted within communities; therefore they are able to multiple the efforts of the government on awareness.

GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES

At the national-level an effective communications strategy for the FGRM will build on existing practice and focus on a transparent and accessible flow of information. Government institutions, boards, and REDD+ entities will need to commit to consistent messaging for the FGRM regarding its use and process. Without a comprehensive and collaborative approach misconceptions and mixed messaging will occur, which will damage the reputation of the FGRM and erode trust in its process. The messaging on the FGRM should come from the REDD+ Communications and Knowledge Management Specialist (Communications Officer) in coordination with the REDD+ Grievance Director.

It is recommended that institutional communication planning should take place through the development of a *REDD+ Communications Taskforce*⁵, which will provide a forum for discussion across government entities. Representatives (i.e., communications officers) within the Taskforce are then responsible for feeding information gained during these meetings back to their respective ministries and agencies. The Grievance Director will also provide written updates on a regular basis to the National Climate Change Committee, National Environment Council, and REDD+ Secretariat regarding the status of the FGRM through an emailed newsletter/briefer.

2.2.1.5. *Timeframe*

The communications strategy requires a parallel rollout with the overall operationalization of the FGRM. The strategy should be met with milestones from the FGRM and include feedback throughout the process for improved communications and to address any challenges that may be met during its implementation.

Key Communication Markers: Completed in an estimated 2-4 months, in alignment with “Phase 1” of the operationalization of the FGRM (D-3). Steps are proposed in a sequential order, but some actions can happen concurrently.

1. **Presentations to government institutions** on the purpose and design of the FGRM, to include their roles and responsibilities in its engagement (allow for feedback).
2. **Generation of a “REDD+ FGRM POC List”** of REDD+ FGRM designated officers at both the institutional and local-level and interest groups to create a FGRM network.
3. **Integration and spotlighting of FGRM** into REDD+ newsletter and posting of information on REDD+ website and social media groups.
4. **Review and produce awareness materials** designed to raise awareness for all forest-users on the FGRM and simultaneously on REDD+ policies and procedures for reinforcement through the development of targeted material in both English and iTaukei formats – video, web, and paper materials.
5. **Informing of resource and supports groups** of FGRM policies and procedures, as well as their possible engagement in the mechanism, to include functions and responsibilities.
6. **Public information road show** introducing FGRM staff⁶ to REDD+ communities through in person meet-and-greets (Q&A) – supplemented with marketing materials and resources (print and electronic) and instruction through role-play – making sure that communities understand REDD+, the FGRM process, and the roles and responsibilities of staff (including POCs).
7. **Digital campaigns**, such as allocation of REDD+ activities space and updates on relevant Ministries websites, and the use of digital and social media platforms.

MANAGING EXPECTATIONS

It will be important to communicate to all REDD+ beneficiaries and implementers that not all problems are meant to be resolved by the FGRM. The FGRM is an ADR mechanism that exists as an extension of the customary system and as an alternative to the formal system (when possible). It should be viewed as a tool to help facilitate and propose resolution approaches.

⁵ SPC (Pacific Community) set up a similar “taskforce” for gender communications.

⁶ This will include FGRM staff from the FGRM Unit for all community introductions and designated FGRM support staff that have local jurisdiction.

2.2.2 Action Plan

To implement this communications strategy effectively will require that the REDD+ Secretariat and supporting REDD+ Unit institute the following:

- **Proactive.** Take the lead in generating positive media coverage and reaching out to target audiences with tailored messaging.
- **Consistent.** The REDD+ Grievance Director must maintain open, transparent, and routine communication channels to the REDD+ Secretariat and government counterparts, keeping track of all FGRM communication activities being carried out in coordination with the REDD+ Communications Officer (as noted in REDD+ Communication Database). There should be uniformity and consistency in messaging being delivered with all REDD+ programming.
- **Coordinated.** Management and institutional recognition of the contribution that communication can make to implement the FGRM alongside REDD+ and its outputs to stakeholders. Timing to maximize impact in tandem with other REDD+ related communication activities.
- **Commitment.** Assign budgetary allocation to communication activities, to allow partners to achieve clear outcomes and impact from their work.
- **Innovative.** Address the overlap of formal and informal institutions pertaining to customary ownership, commercial undertaking and certainty, sustainable development and rights and interests of parties through transdisciplinary lens.

This deliverable outlines the recommended approach to communications for the FGRM. The next phase will be the development of a formalized Communications Plan (based on the strategy) in coordination with the REDD+ Secretariat. A template has been provided, with examples in *Attachment 2* to help guide the development of the plan.

2.2.3 Communicating Effectiveness

In the operational phase, 15-months after starting FGRM activities, the Grievance Director should aim to communicate regarding the FGRM's effectiveness. Specific messages related to lessons learned during grievance handling and corrective actions taken for improving the grievance handling process should be shared. During operationalization, there is a more formal process for informing stakeholders than in the initial (start-up) phase. For local communities it is recommended to keep the original format of role-play as a way to explain the faults, lessons learned, and proposed actions.

It is assumed that after operationalization, certain groups will become fully engaged in FGRM operation, such as (i) Forest Officers, Roko, R+LO, and REDD+ Project Coordinators, (ii) NGOs, CSOs, and interest groups, and (iii) institutional groups (i.e., RSC). These groups will also be advocates and continue to inform forest-users about the possibilities and procedures of the FGRM at the local-level.

2.2.4 Incorporating Feedback

A line inviting feedback will be included on all project/publications and communication materials as a way to monitor the FGRM's progress and public perception.

The FGRM clients are a new target group emerging after operationalization. Each year, the REDD+ Technical Advisor in coordination with the Communications Officer and R+LO should contact a randomized sample of clients by phone, hearing clients experience with the FGRM.

Once the FGRM process has been in operation for a year the MoF should analyze the success of the program from data obtained from the grievance database, survey feedback, and, if necessary, enter into a consultation process with the public to determine the public's view on the success of the FGRM program. The results of this analysis surveys should be shared by the Grievance Director with FGRM designated staff as part of a dialogue to improve processes and procedures through a semi-annual workshop session.

3. FGRM Training Report

The *FGRM Stakeholder Workshop and Training* was hosted on the 30th and 31st of May 2018 at the Tanoa Hotel in Suva, Fiji. This workshop was designed to introduce key REDD+ stakeholders to the FGRM process for REDD+ in Fiji and to train participants on how to report and record grievances that may arise as a result of REDD+ readiness or implementation. The two-day workshop was also a platform for discussion and feedback on the overall FGRM design; finding areas of possible improvement and potential next steps for rollout. It should be noted that the workshop and training was *only* on the process and procedures for the FGRM and must be supplemented by trainings in conflict resolution techniques and approaches.

The workshop was held in English and materials were distributed in English. The forms distributed for reporting and recording were in English and iTaukei and should be finalized/updated to ensure accuracy and appropriateness of language by the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs.

Integra designed and led the workshop with Corey Nelson (FGRM Team Lead) as the lead trainer and facilitator, Ulai Baya (Legal Expert) as the secondary facilitator, and Mereseini Seniloli (Social Expert) as the participatory design lead. A total of 25 participants (see *Attachment 3*) attended the two-day workshop with representatives ranging from landowners, Forest Officers, *Roko Tui* representatives, interest groups, NGOs, CSOs, academia, REDD+ Project Coordinators, REDD+ staff, ministry, regional coordination agencies, and the land board.

3.1. IDENTIFYING THE NEED FOR THE WORKSHOP AND TRAINING

The purpose of the workshop was to instruct potential FGRM support staff, resource and support groups, REDD+, and inform government representatives at relevant institutions on FGRM processes and procedures for REDD+. The curriculum focused on the justification and design of the FGRM to support REDD+ and culminated in training on how to report and record grievances that are REDD+ related using two distinct forms. Participants were also selected to become trainers-of-trainers (ToT) in order to serve as representative counterparts for the FGRM in their institutions, organizations, and communities. The ToT component helps to build capacity of institutions by developing the capabilities of individual stakeholders to participate in and manage their role in the FGRM process towards successful and meaningful resolution of outcomes. It was acknowledged during and after the workshop that follow-up training would be needed to familiarize ToT with the FGRM and the forms, as the information relayed was complex and thusly constrained the ability for true fluency in a tight two-day format.

3.2. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Building on existing expertise and the experiences of participants in dispute resolution processes and procedures was critical to the success of the workshop. Integra designed and customized participatory training materials and tools to capture the knowledge of participants and to build their capacity in feedback and grievance redress (the FGRM), as related to REDD+. The primary objectives of the workshop are as follows:

Workshop Objectives

1. To improve understanding on the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in the FGRM process.
2. To increase understanding on the FGRM procedures and processes.
3. To increase understanding on how designated forms fit into the dispute resolution process.
4. To train iTaukei Village Headman and Forest Officers on how to report and record grievances using the aforementioned two forms.

Following successful completion of the workshop, participants will become multipliers, capable of further disseminating knowledge on the roles, responsibilities, and processes of the FGRM; enriched by experiences shared and gained in the training. These multipliers will in turn be able to train other members of their institutions, organizations, and communities in the FGRM for REDD+.

In the workshop participants also learned about how the FGRM fits into the bigger “REDD+ Picture”. They learned how (steps), when, and where disputes can be reported, recorded, and resolved for REDD+. Participants also learned of available tools (forms) and techniques for completing FGRM requests. Direct interaction with land rights, gender and social inclusion, and climate governance experts afforded workshop participants the ability for direct and quick responses to their queries on the FGRM. This access to expertise on grievance redress also allowed for face-to-face facilitation and open discourse and debate so specific issues could be discussed and flagged for the implementation of the FGRM and the rollout of supplemental/follow-on trainings.

3.2.1 Session Plan and Agenda

A *Session Plan and Agenda* (see *Attachment 4*) was developed and shared with participants and the REDD+ Secretariat prior to the delivery of the training. The session plan was designed to build on knowledge attained over a variety of key topics, providing context for the development and design of the FGRM and an understanding of its use. A case study approach (see *Attachment 5*) was used over the course of the two-day session to assess participants understanding and ability to apply the knowledge acquired. Feedback and discussion were critical to achieving workshop objectives and participatory activities were included throughout the training to capture participant’s perspectives, ideas, and perceived challenges on the FGRM and the reporting and recording processes (forms).

3.2.1.1. Session Plan

- **Purpose of the Training** – Review of the workshop objectives and expected outcomes.
- **REDD+ Overview** – Presentation to ensure understanding of what is “REDD+”.
- **FGRM Overview** – Review of the key findings from the institutional risk assessment conducted by the FGRM Consultancy. This included a review of potential conflicts (grievances that may be encountered during readiness and implementation) as well as a presentation on lessons learned/weaknesses identified in existing grievance redress

systems. A high-level summary of findings from both of the assessments and from community consultations helped to frame the design of the FGRM, as well as the challenges it may face.

- **Existing GRMs Structures in Fiji that are Relevant for REDD+** – Discussion and presentation on the customary and formal systems of governance that exist in Fiji and how they currently function, as well as how the FGRM will complement these systems. Introduced quasi-legal standing of the FGRM as a semi-formal or ADR approach.
- **Overview of the FGRM** – Discussion and reasoning on where the FGRM should function, who will operate it, and how it will complement existing systems. Detailed presentation on the procedures and processes of the FGRM to include an overview of institutional and individual roles and responsibilities. Case study approach was used to walkthrough how to resolve a dispute employing FGRM steps and identifying roles of persons to evaluate understanding.
- **FGRM Reporting and Recording Forms** – Deep dive into roles and responsibilities for those involved in the reporting and recording of grievances for the FGRM. This section focused on the recently developed forms for dispute resolution that will be used by those at the customary-level and by FGRM staff and support staff. This was the main focus of the training and involved several participatory training techniques to ensure understanding of how to use the forms. Feedback was critical and was incorporated into the communications strategy, possible updates to the FGRM design, and the next iteration of the FGRM forms for submission to REDD+.

3.3. TRAINING TECHNIQUES

Integra provided and relied on a variety of resources to support the session plan and workshop design. A combination of information, tools, and techniques were utilized to ensure that different types of learners would be able to readily access and understand the information presented over the course of two-days.

3.3.1 Research and Analysis

Previous research and analysis materials from the FGRM Consultancy were made available to participants prior to, during, and after the training. These included FGRM deliverables such as the *FGRM Study and Analysis (D-2)*, *FGRM Design and Reporting Forms (D-3)*, and the FGRM Terms of Reference (ToR). REDD+ materials from the Fiji REDD+ Unit were also made available and points of contact were provided at the end of the training if participants wished to follow-up or engage further on a certain topic or outcome of the FGRM training.

3.3.2 Surveys

Three surveys were developed to assess knowledge and monitor/ensure objectives were being met prior to, during, and at the end of the workshop (see *Attachment 6*). The surveys were reviewed in real time to provide structure and identify any areas that required further clarification during the training, as well as to provide a summary of “next steps” for the FGRM based on participant’s feedback.

3.3.3 Lecture

Presentations were given over the course of the two-day workshop, led by Corey Nelson and supported by Ulai Baya, that involved lecture style instruction on the findings from previously conducted assessments and their integration into the FGRM design. This was an ideal method to introduce such a complex subject where the participants were not familiar with the topic of a FGRM, as it is a new product.

3.3.4 Participatory Trainings Methods and Tools

To supplement the lecture and the available literature resources, participatory training methods were used to enhance the subject matter and to make the information more digestible for participants. Participatory techniques also allowed for discussion, problem solving, and a means to evaluate knowledge of the topics presented. Techniques employed included:

- **Discussions** – Learning was derived from the participants themselves through problem-solving discussion.
- **Exercises** – Several small group exercises were undertaken for experiential learning such as role-playing, visual mapping, and puzzle solving with a focus on teambuilding. These exercises were especially effective as a representative slice of potential FGRM actors were present during the training, allowing for the establishment of individual and institutional relationships needed to support the mechanism.
- **Case Studies** – Real life situations were presented to trainees for their analysis and consideration of possible resolution approaches. These case studies were revisited multiple times over the course of the training for participants to propose alternative or enhanced approaches to the resolution of their dispute as they progressed in their learning about the processes and procedures of the FGRM.

3.4. WORKSHOP OUTCOMES

The chief result of the workshop was to have a roster of trainers that would serve in key roles of the FGRM at both the customary and semi-formal levels that could be engaged in the dispute resolution process for REDD+. The key expected outcomes of the workshop are as follows:

Workshop Expected Outcomes

1. Participants can identify the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in the FGRM process, to include their own.
2. Participants have an understanding of the FGRM procedures and process and are comfortable walking a dispute from uptake to resolution.
3. Participants become familiar with how the use of written reporting (use of forms) fit into the dispute resolution process.
4. iTaukei Village Headmen and Forest Officers are able to report and record grievances using two designated FGRM forms.

The FGRM was “road tested” and based on survey results, discussions, and feedback received the workshop was able to achieve all of the expected outcomes. However, participants did note that they did not feel comfortable acting as ToT on the use and completion of the FGRM forms. Supplemental training was requested, specifically for the iTaukei Village Headmen and Forest Officer whose responsibility it will be to not only complete the forms but also address any queries regarding the forms and FGRM process from Complainants.

Workshop participants are now, however, aware of how to access and use the available materials, processes, and tools needed to support the development of a plan for further training for their counterparts – building a FGRM user community. The need for the development of a FGRM Manual for future trainings would also help participants in being able to familiarize themselves with the process and be a resource for reference points. The bones of the FGRM Manual have been laid out in D-3, as is a training design accessible in PowerPoint format (both have been made available the REDD+ Unit). Both a manual and training design for future FGRM trainings can be formalized by REDD+ once the Grievance Director and R+LO have been hired.

3.5. LEARNING AND FEEDBACK

The workshop provided multiple avenues of engagement through a range of participatory activities, problem solving, and open discussion. In support of continual learning principles, feedback was an integral part of the workshop and training. Beyond dialogue and other participatory engagement techniques, surveys were used at three points (before, during, and after) to evaluate not only the attainment of knowledge on the subject matter but also the participants’ perspectives on the delivery of the training itself. The results are provided in the following section to improve the training material and format for rollout of future deliveries.

3.5.1 Survey Responses

Written feedback from participants was received during the training through survey and through the use of a “parking lot” – to collect queries that required additional information not available at the time of the discussion or that was outside of the authority of those participating in the training to address. This feedback is summarized below with commentary on either how it was addressed during the training or how it would need to be incorporated into future trainings/materials.

3.5.1.1. Pre-Survey Summary

A “Pre-Survey” was conducted prior to the opening of the workshop (during the registration period) and was used to assess participants understanding of key topics to be discussed throughout the workshop. The questions aligned with the session plan and the responses were used to adjust the training content as needed over the course of the two-day workshop. For example, since the pre-survey revealed that most participants had a good baseline understanding of REDD+ less time was spent on the overview of REDD+ and more time was allocated for understanding existing GRMs and their capacities in Fiji, as the pre-survey revealed fewer participants understood the structure and function of these mechanisms. This was an important distinction for the team as the FGRM design is based on existing mechanisms and must work in coordination/complement them.

KNOWLEDGE OF REDD+ – Most participants were able to provide the definition of REDD+ and some were able to elaborate beyond the definition to identify non-carbon benefits, such as eco-system services, forest products, environmental damage, food resources, and cultural value. Several participants noted that REDD+ required policy in order to encourage developing countries to protect/conservate and sustainably manage their forest reserves.

This point was also raised several times by participants during the workshop, that the lack of REDD+ legislation creates confusion amongst beneficiaries and continues to be an area of concern that has gone unaddressed. *Current forest policies in Fiji are not REDD+ compatible.* The facilitators assured participants that this was highlighted in our analysis and risk assessment (D-2), presented to the RSC, and that it would again be reinforced during our presentation to the RSC at the Validation for the FGRM.

EXPERIENCE WITH A REDD+ RELATED GRIEVANCE – Few participants had any experience with a grievance or conflict related to REDD+. This is primarily due to the existence of only two recognized carbon-trading projects in Fiji, as of 2017. Both activities are still in their pilot phases (although the Drawa Forest Block has made their first sale and has received their first payment for ecosystem services (PES) as of June 2018). Of the few participants that did have experience with a REDD+ related dispute the types of conflicts reported included:

Resolved: The following disputes have been resolved and were done so using the customary system for grievance redress.

- Land boundary issues
- Access to forest resources
- Access to locations
- Illegal logging

Resolved: The following disputes were resolved with the help of mediation through a third party.

- Lease terms (TLTB originally placed a 99 year term (current government policy) on the lease, but the Drawa Forest Block requested 30 years)

Unresolved: The following disputes were noted as being complex issues that have not been resolved. These are dispute types that may enter into the FGRM for resolution.

- Carbon payments and how long will resource owners have to wait to receive money
- Recognition of Drawa Forest Block pilot site by the Government of Fiji
- Lack of communication on REDD+

It was noted across all disputes listed that there was a gap in awareness and consultations that often elevated and resulted in the disputes themselves being lodged. A case study approach that included real REDD+ related disputes was used during the workshop to provide a component of awareness raising and consultation; allowing participants to become familiar with the importance of FPIC in the REDD+ process and the importance of allowing anyone to submit a grievance to the FGRM (giving voice and promoting inclusiveness in the resolution of conflicts). It was also beneficial for the group to walkthrough and try to resolve their case study using the FGRM process and procedures.

PURPOSE OF A GRM – Most participants demonstrated a general understanding of the purpose or intent of a grievance redress mechanism, describing it as a structure or process that can be used to “resolve grievances to satisfaction of all parties”. Every respondent noted customary systems as the primary means to resolve local and/or landowner and resource group grievances. Some participants used terms such as “systemic” or “avoid roadblocks” to describe the process of a GRM and the outcome being that of identify risks or problems and how to resolve it in legal or customary way.

UNDERSTANDING OF HOW EXISTING GRMS SYSTEMS OPERATE IN FIJI – Some participants were well informed on existing institutional GRM processes and of these most were representatives from Government agencies. All participants noted that there are three options for dispute resolution in Fiji currently: formal, customary, and police/court, but most only had a very broad/general awareness of how those systems went about resolving grievances (e.g., who was involved, the various steps of dispute resolution) and were not able to flesh out details or incorrectly referenced which institution was responsible for resolving certain dispute types. General terms were used in the description of those involved in disputes related to land use, management, or rights, such as: government, landowners, developers, industry, land department, indigenous department and government department. Few participants left the section blank and one participant wrote “No idea”.

The FGRM was therefore an excellent opportunity for the group to build on their foundational understanding on how a GRM functions whilst also detailing the steps and procedures for how a grievance will move through the FGRM pipeline. Understanding how a grievance advances, who is responsible for each part of the process, and the different resolution approaches available was critical for participants to familiarize themselves with the FGRM. This part of the workshop also improved participants understanding of how the FGRM compliments existing GRMs and governance systems and provided a grounding/mapping of existing GRM structures to fill in knowledge gaps.

PERCEPTIONS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF EXISTING GRMS IN FIJI – Most participants waffled between “Yes” and “No” in response to this query, noting that existing formal GRMs had deficiencies and the customary GRM didn’t always have the capacity to resolve complex grievances or have consistency in resolution approaches. Several participants echoed a need for improved policies to be put into place.

It will be critical that REDD+ and the MoF ensure that the FGRM continues to adhere to the *Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) Guiding Principles* and that forest-users perceive the ADR to be effective in its mandate. It was noted in the post-survey by every participant that they believe the FGRM has the capacity to resolve grievances in an effective way (they have confidence in the design), but implementation and the dedication to maintaining the system will be critical.

EXPERIENCE FILING A GRIEVANCE OR USING A FORM TO REPORT A GRIEVANCE – Participants were split 50/50 in their response to having had an experience with filing a grievance and none of the participants had any experience with submitting a grievance using a form.

This was not unexpected and a large portion of the workshop focused on understanding the processes and procedures of the FGRM. A walkthrough of the forms designed for reporting and recording was also included. A case study approach was used to reinforce learning.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE GRIEVANCE REDRESS PROCESS IN FIJI –

Participants listed the following areas for improvement in response to this query:

- Create a proper and standard process,
- Provide and maintain written documentation,
- Functional and easily accessible database for case management,
- Greater transparency,
- Bottom up and top down approaches,
- Faster turnaround time for resolutions,
- Inclusiveness for all stakeholders and equal voice (unbiased),
- Agreement on resolution approaches, and
- Accessibility to communities.

The FGRM design follows the FCPF Guiding Principles and addresses all of the aforementioned concerns and as part of the workshop the facilitators made sure to highlight how the recommend design will account for these concerns and allow multiple opportunities for users of the FGRM to provide feedback. The FGRMs quasi-judicial structure also allows for the mechanism to be adaptive and flexible; able to easily adjust to suit users needs and remove or adjust any derelict processes during implementation.

3.5.1.2. Midway-Survey (End of Day 1) Summary

Questions were posed at the end of Day 1 of the workshop. At his stage participants had been exposed to and contributed to discussions on the findings of the institutional and risk assessments from D-2, understood the principles for how the FGRM should function, and, after engaging in a robust discussion on existing GRMs, and where deficiencies rest and improvements could be made. In preparation for Day 2, where the overview of the FGRM would be presented, participants were asked three questions: (1) whom they thought should be involved in the FGRM, (2) what they believed the FGRM should do (mandate and purpose), and (3) what should be the most important outcome of the FGRM.

WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN FGRM – Participants listed a number of possible agents to be involved in the FGRM that included the government, CSOs, NGOs, landowners, and Chief/Village Headmen. Most participants summarized their response to include all parties involved in the dispute, primarily landowners, and appropriate authorities.

The FGRM provides a justification for the inclusion of each FGRM staff, supporting staff, and resource or support group. The workshop facilitators made sure to review each FGRM actors role and their responsibility in the process, with clear reporting lines and procedures for involvement.

WHAT DO YOU WANT FROM THE FGRM – In summation for what the FGRM should do and achieve, participants hoped the FGRM would provide clear guidelines and a process to users (a manual), empower users, determine a timeline to receive a response and a decision, be predictable in process, be inclusive to all parties to a dispute, identify options supported by all

parties for resolution, resolve disputes amicably, and become (legitimized) as an accepted dispute resolution mechanism.

The FGRM is designed to and addresses each of the concerns listed by participants and the facilitators made sure to speak to each point during the overview of the FGRM procedures and processes. Many participants felt that the institution of a *Land and Resource Tribunal* (as proposed by the FGRM Consultancy) would help with enforcement, accountability, and “legitimization” of the FGRM.

Several participants also noted that they hoped that the FGRM would help resolve issues or be placed within the customary system and respect decisions made at the customary-level. This was a particular key area of concern for many participants as most disputes involving land issues are currently resolved in the customary system. This concern must be addressed more directly in future trainings; stressing that all disputes should be attempted for resolution at the customary-level first, prior to entry into the FGRM. The FGRM should be seen as an option only to be exercised when disputes cannot be resolved in the customary system. The FGRM is an alternative or a compliment to, not a replacement for, existing dispute resolution practices. Emphasis should be made on the FGRM as an “in-between” step amid customary and formal systems for grievance redress.

3.5.1.3. *Post-Survey Summary*

Following the end of the training participants were assessed by a “Post-Survey” in order to gauge and evaluate not only what they learned from the training, but also on the training’s effectiveness and what they felt was needed as next steps for the FGRM.

DID THE TRAINING MEET IT’S OBJECTIVES – Each participant responded that they felt the training met its objectives, but a few requested that more training be provided on how to complete the forms: (1) because there was a great deal of information that a “one time go through” was insufficient for familiarizing and feeling comfortable with the forms and (2) because specific representatives involved in the completion of the form (i.e., Forestry Officer and iTaukei Village Headmen) would need additional training that focused on their specific form and their role in its completion.

IS THE FGRM CAPABLE OF ADDRESSING AND RESOLVING GRIEVANCES AS IT IS CURRENTLY DESIGNED – Every Participant affirmed that they had confidence in the FGRM as it is currently designed to resolve REDD+ related grievances. Participants felt that the process and procedures were easy to understand, worked well with existing customary systems, and provided a tool for capacity building at the community-level (written documentation process and a form). The FGRM also provided multiple resolution approaches at various levels and the option for Complainants to leave the mechanism and return to the customary system (or exit to the court) if they so wished.

Some participants felt that the structure might need to adjust as new challenges arise during implementation – hence the need for adaptation and flexibility built into the semi-formal design of the ADR. The FGRM must also incorporate/respect existing processes (customary and other formal GRMs) rather than overrule them, as it may face rejection. Coordination, collaboration, and clear lines of responsibility, accountability, and enforceable will also need to be defined with institutional counterpart prior to the FGRMs implementation (through the suggested MoUs negotiated by the Grievance Director). In order for the FGRM to function efficiently actors

involved must also become fluent in not only the FGRM process and procedures, but specifically in their designated role and responsibilities.

Participants reiterated that a highly functional, easily accessible, and online database exist for case management. Suggestions were made that the paper forms might even be replaced with electronic or mobile applications to access the database in the future.

COMFORT USING THE FORMS (TRANSLATION AND DIRECTIONS) – All participants noted that they feel comfortable using the forms as presented (see *Attachment 7*) and that the forms were user friendly. The translation must be confirmed by the Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, as a few participants' noted grammatical errors or confusion in the currently transcribed iTaukei. Care should also be taken in the translation to account for the appropriateness of word choice (e.g., certain words may not be familiar to older generations). The length of the form was also mentioned and could be revisited after a trial period to see how the form may be abridged. If possible the forms could be seen as secondary tool (when in the field for example without access to the internet) to a mobile application or access to the online database. Practice filling in the forms would be needed as well to familiarize FGRM agents, but the directions were viewed as clear and easily understood.

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TRAINING – Participants responses ranged from good, to very good, to excellent in the evaluation of the overall training. Cited responses include:

- Lead Facilitator is very clear and more awareness is needed as this is big eye opener.
- Some improvements needed to the FGRM framework but good for Fiji to have a documented GRM framework and process in place.
- Include forestry logo on forms.
- Could be done well in 1-2 days, more discussion in future trainings.
- Dispute [conflict] resolution training must be part of this as a follow-up.
- Discussions were very illuminating and met expectations.
- Facilitators know their stuff, but they seemed rushed to cover a wide-ranging topical issue that needs to be disseminated slowly with logical thinking approach in mind.
- Well defined and facilitators were well versed with FGRM and able to answer all questions. Need a week of training to fully grasp the FGRM system.
- Not enough time compared to the topics covered. Request for more training as REDD+ is a new concept in Fiji.
- Well informed. Duration is short, need 3 days as it is a new product and process in Fiji
- We learn from each other.
- Group work and presentation made it participatory and easily understandable.
- Want the same team to carry out future FGRM training of trainers.
- Now I know how to direct and resolve a grievance in regard to REDD+ in my area.
- Take down to village level for training.
- Well detailed even though there was a lot of information to download. Would recommend more training for stakeholders (headmen, forestry officers, agriculture, Min of Affairs, Roko).

The key takeaway, noted above and throughout the training, was that although the information was rich and well received it was too much for true comprehension over a two-day span. More detailed and specific training is needed for FGRM agents on their roles and responsibilities and

how it fits into the overall FGRM process. This is expanded upon in the recommendations section below (see *Section 3.6*).

3.5.2 Additional Observations and Comments From Participants

A few additional observations from the training that will need to be considered and addressed by the REDD+ Secretariat in the instance that updates need to be made to the FGRM design:

- **“Informal” vs. “Customary”** – The use of the term “informal” vs. “customary” was raised during the workshop. Some participants felt that the term *informal* delegitimized the customary system for governance and asked that this be revisited. When offering the training to community representatives (i.e., Village Headmen) and community members (REDD+ beneficiaries) the term could also be confusing, as it is not referred to as informal and customary is more common. The FGRM Consultancy will update the FGRM design (D-3) to reflect this change and it is recommended that this be retained for future trainings.
- **Promoting customary resolution first** – Throughout any training the customary system must be promoted as the first and preferred option for grievance resolution, with the FGRM seen as an alternative (ADR) if a resolution cannot be reached in the customary system. This is currently stressed in both the D-2 and D-3 and was mentioned multiple times throughout the training, but participants felt this was not emphasized strongly enough. It is recommended that in future trainings this topic be directly addressed as an independent topic to allow for greater emphasis and understanding.
- **Use of the term “Semi-formal”** – Participants experienced confusion initially in the introduction of the term “semi-formal”. This was an unfamiliar term and required additional clarity on how it operates and sits “in-between” the customary and formal systems. Justification for the FGRM as “semi-formal” must be emphasized along with its definition during future trainings:
 - **The FGRM cannot function in the customary system because:**
 - It has to be able to cover disputes that may range from simple to complex and that may involve multi-parties and multi-issues.
 - Other parties may be involved in disputes that are not iTaukei.
 - Customary dispute decision-makers (e.g., iTaukei Village Headmen) may not have the fiscal means, technical capacity, or legal knowledge to resolve certain disputes independently.
 - **Cannot be Formal**
 - No REDD+ legislation exist currently so the FGRM can only be quasi-judicial – enforceable by contracts (e.g., through an MoU) or through the establishment of a tribunal.
 - Formal institutions may be party to a dispute. Independence and transparency must be accounted for to secure against bias.
 - The formal system is costly, time consuming, and may not be accessible for several of the potential forest-users engaged in REDD+.

3.6. RECOMMENDATIONS AND FOLLOW-UP

The workshop provided an opportunity to introduce key stakeholders to the FGRM, its processes and procedures, and the use of written documentation for reporting and recording of grievances. In addition to the comments outlined in the *Section 3.5* (and summarized here) Integra has compiled a list of recommendations/next steps based on the feedback received.

3.6.1 Recommendations

- In order for the FGRM to be viewed as effective its processes and procedures must be adhered to, the system maintained, and it must be supported by policy and a database that is easily accessible for case management.
- The FGRM must continue to follow the FCFP Guiding Principles and its mandate to include the promotion and use of FPIC, inclusiveness, transparency, and an unbiased approach towards conflict resolution that is amenable to all parties involved.
- The FGRM must build capacity at the community-level and make sure to not delegitimize the customary system. It must be stressed that Complainants attempt to use the customary system first, as a means for resolution, prior to entry into the FGRM. Following implementation and pilot testing of the FGRM, it would be prudent to examine if a requirement (similar to project-led REDD+ activities use of their GRMs first) be instituted that an *Informal Dispute Resolution Report* be required as part of the documentation process for the FGRM.
- Provide/spend more time detailing what a “semi-formal” mechanism is for grievance redress so that beneficiaries and FGRM staff and support groups are clear on the FGRM’s placement as an “in-between” step between customary and formal systems.
- Use the term “customary” rather than “informal” during training, as it is a more acceptable and easily understood term.
- Provide additional training on the FGRM steps and the roles and responsibilities. Two days was an insufficient amount of time to cover such a complex topic and follow-up training will be needed. Hosting follow-on trainings that are targeted to key FGRM actors will help to not only familiarize each group with FGRM processes and procedures, but should also focus on their specific role and responsibilities under the mechanism. For example, training on the FGRM for Forest Officers where their role and responsibilities are emphasized.
- Institutional agreements for the FGRM must be in place to ensure that there is no overlap in jurisdiction, misunderstanding regarding ownership or responsibility, and to ensure that accountability and enforcement can occur as a result of a resolution approach.
- Translation of the forms must be finalized, clarified, and adjusted for appropriateness and practicality. Following implementation the forms should be revisited to see if they are effective and if improvements can be made.

- Training is needed for the two designated groups responsible for their completion (iTaukei Village Headmen and Forest Officers), on how to fill in the forms and how to determine if a dispute is REDD+ related.
- Training is needed on conflict resolution techniques and approaches for all FGRM actors.
- Future trainings are to be led by the Grievance Director and the R+LO (both should be hired immediately, prior to implementation of the FGRM) so that they are identified as the designated points of authority, resources for, and experts on the FGRM.
- A FGRM Manual should be developed (building on the design detailed in D-3) and provided during future trainings, providing reference materials and checklists for participants to follow.
- Regional communication will is required for consistency of delivery and process.

3.6.2 Follow-up

Two points were raised during the training that the FGRM Consultancy recommends the REDD+ Secretariat follow up with directly:

1. **Supporting the improvement of TLTB's GRM:** Representatives from TLTB found the design and structure of the FGRM favorable, to include the detailed steps and procedures for dispute resolution and readily supported the development of the FGRM Manual. As a result, it was asked if they could use the FGRM as a blueprint to improve the internal GRM at TLTB and possibly develop a manual of their own. The question was raised: "Is there money that can be provided to TLTB to improve our GRM?". It is suggested that the REDD+ Secretariat follow-up with TLTB directly on the use of REDD+ funds for institutional capacity building that would promote and help coordinate with the FGRM structure.
2. **Adjusting the Customary Point of Contact for the FGRM:** At the time of the training it was noted that there has been a recent change from in titling from "Headman" to "Administrator". Meaning, that these positions could now be filled by appointment (e.g., possibly non-iTaukei). This could be problematic as the iTaukei Village Headmen has traditionally been involved in the resolution of iTaukei grievances (those most likely to be impacted by REDD+ activities). It is suggested here is to revisit whom this point person should be as a result of the change.

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1: ACRONYM LIST

ATTACHMENT 2: COMMUNICATIONS PLAN TEMPLATE

ATTACHMENT 3: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT LIST

ATTACHMENT 4: WORKSHOP SESSION PLAN AND AGENDA

ATTACHMENT 5: CASE STUDIES

ATTACHMENT 6: SURVEYS

ATTACHMENT 7: REVISED REPORTING AND RECORDING FORMS

ATTACHMENT 1: ACRONYM LIST

ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
CBO	Community-based Organization
COP	Conference of Parties
CSO	Civil Society Organization
D-2	FGRM Study and Analysis
D-3	FGRM Design and Reporting Forms
FCPF	Forest Carbon Partnership Facility
FGRM	Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanisms
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GIZ	<i>Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit</i> (German Agency for International Cooperation)
GRM	Grievance Redress Mechanism
IAG	Independent Assessment Group
iTLTB (TLTB)	iTaukei Land Trust Board
LoU	Landowning Units
MoF	Ministry of Forests
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
PES	Payment for Ecosystem Services
POC	Point of Contact
Q&A	Questions and Answers
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
R+LO	REDD+ Liaison Officer
R-PP	Fiji's Readiness Preparation Proposal
RSC	REDD+ Steering Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SPC	Pacific Community
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers

ATTACHMENT 2: COMMUNICATIONS PLAN TEMPLATE

<p>Goal: To enhance awareness and communication with key stakeholders on how to address issues, conflicts, and/or disputes as they relate to impacts from REDD+ activities in Fiji.</p>						
Outcomes	Target Audience	Communication Tools	Responsible Parties	Coordination	Multiplier	Timeframe
<p>Objective 1: Enhance understanding of REDD+ and forest-related policies and environmental issues (as they are related to and or may be impacted by REDD+) among forest-users and adjacent communities.</p>						
<p>Example</p>						
<p>Local communities awareness of REDD+ policies and their rights are increased.</p> <p>Indicator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased number of requests for REDD+ resource information. Decrease in number of complaints that align with misunderstanding or misperceptions of REDD+. 	<p>Forest-users, private landowners, and leasers</p>	<p>Print materials in English and iTaukei; Presentation and speeches from Forest Officers and REDD+ staff</p>	<p>Forest Officers, Roko Tui, REDD+ Communications Officer</p>	<p>Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, REDD+ Secretariat, FGRM Unit, RSC</p>	<p>NGOs, CSOs, Project Implementers (local and international networks)</p>	

<p>Goal: To enhance awareness and communication with key stakeholders on how to address issues, conflicts, and/or disputes as they relate to impacts from REDD+ activities in Fiji.</p>						
Outcomes	Target Audience	Communication Tools	Responsible Parties	Coordination	Multiplier	Timeframe
<p>Objective 2: Strengthen forest-users access to information and resources for conflict resolution outside of the informal and formal systems for REDD+ related issues.</p>						
<p>Example</p>						
<p>Fewer forest-users are opting for resolution of conflicts and choosing the FGRM to resolve complicated disputes.</p> <p>Indicator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer disputes related to REDD+ are addressed by other formal GRMs. • Fewer disputes are elevated to court proceedings. • Increasing in number of registered complaints to the FGRM. 	<p>Forest-users</p>	<p>Print materials in English and iTaukei; Presentation and speeches from Forest Officers and REDD+ staff; Reporting and recording forms (uptake); Training of FGRM designated staff</p>	<p>Forest Officers, REDD+ Communications Officer, R+LO, Grievance Director</p>	<p>Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, REDD+ Secretariat, RSC</p>	<p>NGOs, CSOs, Project Implementers (local and international networks)</p>	

<p>Goal: To enhance awareness and communication with key stakeholders on how to address issues, conflicts, and/or disputes as they relate to impacts from REDD+ activities in Fiji.</p>						
Outcomes	Target Audience	Communication Tools	Responsible Parties	Coordination	Multiplier	Timeframe
<p>Objective 3: Promote the use of the FGRM to address any REDD+ related disputes by building trust through transparent and open communications and receptive feedback.</p>						
<p>Example</p>						
<p>FGRM is a trusted form for the resolution of REDD+ related grievances by forest-users.</p> <p>Indicator(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of cases resolved through the FGRM. • Responses from surveys and follow-up are positive. • Increase in the successful resolution of disputes through the FGRM (accountability). 	<p>Forest-users</p>	<p>Feedback from surveys and site visits; print and electronic communications to REDD+; verbal dialogue from communities transmitted by Forest Officers, REDD+ Project Coordinators, and Resource and Support Groups, Training of FGRM designated staff</p>	<p>Forest Officers, REDD+ Project Officers, R+LO, REDD+ Communications Officer</p>	<p>Ministry of iTaukei Affairs, REDD+ Secretariat, FGRM Unit, RSC</p>	<p>NGOs, CSOs, Project Implementers (local and international networks)</p>	

ATTACHMENT 3: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT LIST

	Name	Organization	Phone	Email
1	Loraini Kasainaseva	Pacific Community (SPC)	8035139	lorainib@spc.int
2	Sele Tagivuni	Grace TriFam – GTM	7344800	Sele.tagivuni@gmail.com
3	Ilaitia Leitabu	REDD+ Project Coordinator Emalu	9229864	ilaitial@connect.com.fj
4	Paulini Tuiteci	Nadroga/Navosa Reforest Program	8791093	paulinituiteci@gmail.com
5	Litiana M	FELA	7457128	Liti.sole@gmail.com
6	Isoa Korovulavula	IAS/USP	9269391	korovulavula@usp.ac.fj
7	Peni Maisia	Drawa Forest Block	8353295	
8	Semi Dranibaka	REDD+ Secretariat/MoF	9966814	Semi.dranibaka@gmail.com
9	Leon Batigai	MoF	9183866	leonebatigai@govnet.gov.fj
10	Seveci Taka	REDD+ Project Site Forest Warden	8727778	Stakaiwai897@gmail.com
11	Marama Sukani	TLTB	3312733 ext 608	msukani@tltb.com.fj
12	Vilisi Naivalulewi	Project Officer GIZ	305983	Vilisi.Naivalulewi@giz.de
13	Waisale Ramoce	Manager Policy iTaukei Affaire	9045881	Waisale.ramoce@govnet.gov.fj
14	Waita Cumrale	Drawa Forest Block	2008033	waitacumrale@gmail.com
15	Narendra Chand	REDD+ TA	9907643	narendrachand@gmail.com
16	Marama Tuivuna	REDD+ / MoF	9980096	maramatuivuna@gmail.com
17	Maika Tabukova	FNU	9182695	Maika.tabukovu@fnu.ac.fj
18	Arieta Nailagovesi	MoF	9527268	etanailagovesi@gmail.com
19	Reama Naco	REDD+ / MoF	9920073	Reama.naco@gmail.com
20	Panapasa Tubuitamana	MoF	8742619	panawakaniyar@gmail.com
21	Tevita Kunadei	MoF	9714170	tevitakueadei@yahoo.com
22	Emma Christopher	Live and Learn	8663971	Emma.christopher@livelearn.org
23	Susana Waqainabete-Tuisese	Conservation International	7775125	swaqainabete-tuisese@conservation.org
24	Jove Vowai	TLTB	9995900	jvowai@tltb.com.fj
25	Isoa Kasainaseva	TLTB	9983674	ikasainaseva@tltb.com.fj

ATTACHMENT 4: WORKSHOP SESSION PLAN AND AGENDA

REDD+ Feedback and Grievance Redress Mechanism (FGRM) Training of Trainers

30 – 31 May 2018, Tanoa Hotel, hosted by the REDD+ Secretariat and Integra

This is a two-day training that will provide an overview of REDD+ and the role of the FGRM as a dispute resolution system. The outcome of the training is for all participants to understand how the FGRM operates, their role and responsibility in the process, and how to properly use the reporting and recording forms for the submission of all grievances into the FGRM.

Day 1: Opening, Introductions, and Overview of REDD+ and FGRM

Registration @8.00 AM – Closing @4.30 PM

START TIME	SECTION	ACTIVITY DETAILS
8.00	Registration	
8.45	Workshop Opening	Official Welcome, Opening Prayer, and Opening Remarks
9.00	Day 1 Opening	Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FGRM Team and of participants and the purpose of the training. • Workshop Objectives • Workshop Expected Outcomes • Overview of Agenda • Setting Ground Rules
10.00	Tea Break	
10.20	REDD+ Overview	REDD+ Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation to ensure understanding of what is “REDD+”.
11.00	FGRM Consultancy Overview	FGRM Overview <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure of the FGRM Consultancy • Reviewing and sharing key findings from the institutional capacity and potential risk

		assessments conducted by the FGRM Team.
12.00	Lunch	
1.00	FGRM Consultancy Findings	Summary of FGRM Findings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-level summary of findings from both of the assessments and from community consultations that helped to frame the design of the FGRM, as well as the challenges it may face.
2.00	Tea Break	
2.20	GRMs Structures in Fiji	Current GRM Structures in Fiji that are Relevant to REDD+ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A discussion and presentation on the informal and formal systems that exist in Fiji and how they operate currently.
3.20	FGRM Function	How and Where the FGRM for REDD+ Operates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion on where FGRM should function, who will operate it, and how it will complement existing systems.
4.00	Feedback	
4.15	Day 1 Closing	

ATTACHMENT 5: CASE STUDIES

Garden Village

Garden Village is located in the beautiful Twilight Zone Mountains and is adorned by native trees, which are highly sought after by logging companies. The land is owned by the people of Garden Village, according to tribes (*Yavusa*), clans (*Mataqali*) and sub-clans (*Tokatoka*) and members of two clans in Garden Village have had their native forests logged by the Yum Yum Logging Company.

A dispute on land boundaries has recently occurred between the two clans. One clan (**Clan A**) claims that the other clan (**Clan B**) has encroached onto their land. Clan A claims that they own a larger land area than Clan B; Clan B disagrees with this claim. Both parties have informed Yum Yum Logging Company accordingly of the dispute. Yum Yum had to stop operations as both Clans blocked the loggers' access to the forest a week after the dispute occurred.

Community members from both Clans are seeking resolution and have approached the Village Headman, Mr. Waisea Gunu, two weeks after the dispute for advice and intervention.

Clan A is represented by Mr. Tomasi Vueti, Clan B is represented by Mr. Taniela Lutu, and Yum Yum Logging Company is represented by Mr. Jack Smith.

Answer these questions and follow directions to resolve the dispute using the large paper sheets provided:

1. What is the “type” of grievance faced?
2. How would you address the grievance in terms of:
 - a) STEPS taken
 - b) STAKEHOLDERS involved
 - c) RESOLUTION TYPES reached
 - d) TIMEFRAME sought to resolve grievance
3. Please draw a flow diagram to illustrate your answers in Question 2.
4. Any other comments?

Bird Village

Bird Village is located in the highlands of Sunset Island. The Ministry of Forests recently conducted a biodiversity survey of the islands native forests, identifying several endemic terrestrial and marine species. Following the survey, it was determined that a part of Bird Village contained rich and diverse flora and fauna and a decision was made by key Ministries and the respective landowners to protect the forestland by declaring the location a conservation site. Logging is now prohibited on the site and conservation regulations are set in place.

The area that is now deemed as “protected for conservation” is owned by Clan A (headed by Mr. Simone Toga). The other Bird Village Clans (Clan B headed by Mr. Rusiate Rasiga, and Clan C headed by Mr. Lemeki Ralulu) are adjacent to the newly protected site and are logging trees. A community member from Clan A believe that they have seen that the logging presents a threat to the conservation area via encroachment and environmental degradation.

The member has approached the Village Council (Bose Vakoro), but they have not been able to resolve the dispute.

Answer these questions and follow directions to resolve the dispute using the large paper sheets provided:

1. What is the “type” of grievance raised by the community member from Clan A?
2. How would you address the grievance in terms of:
 - a) STEPS taken
 - b) STAKEHOLDERS involved
 - c) RESOLUTION TYPES reached
 - d) TIMEFRAME sought to resolve grievance
3. Please draw a flow diagram to illustrate your answers in Question 2.
4. Any other comments?

Paradise Village

Paradise Village, with the assistance of key partners (government ministries, non-government organizations, etc.) has declared 7,000 ha of its native forests protected and have designated the land to be used for REDD+. The land area is owned by three (3) sub-clans (tokatoka) of 1 clan (mataqali) of a tribe (yavusa).

The four sub-clans (A-1, A-2, A-3) all agreed to include their native forests under the terms of a conservation lease. It was just discovered by sub-clans A-1 and A-2 that sub-clan A-3 have cut down several trees within their REDD+ designated area. Sub-clan A-3 claims that they had no choice and had to remove some of the trees because they needed to build homes for the increase of many young people in their community that had married and now had several small children. No land use plan was set in place for any of the sub-clans of Paradise Village.

Answer these questions and follow directions to resolve the dispute using the large paper sheets provided:

1. What is the “type” of grievance faced?
2. How would you address the grievance in terms of:
 - a) STEPS taken
 - b) STAKEHOLDERS involved
 - c) RESOLUTION TYPES reached
 - d) TIMEFRAME sought to resolve grievance
3. Please draw a flow diagram to illustrate your answers in Question 2.
4. Any other comments?

ATTACHMENT 6: SURVEYS

Pre-Training Evaluation Survey

This survey will help the FGRM Team better understand knowledge of participants prior to the training regarding dispute resolution processes. This form will be used for evaluation purposes only and may be kept anonymous. This information will also help the trainers make sure that we address any areas of concern or interest relevant to the participants.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability:

- 1. What is your understanding of REDD+?**

- 2. Have you come across a grievance concerning REDD+? Yes or No. If Yes, please explain the type and nature of the grievance.**

- 3. Was the grievance resolved? If so can you explain how?**

- 4. Please define and explain the purpose of a “Grievance Redress Mechanism”**

- 5. What system(s) exist in Fiji that resolve disputes related to:**
 - a. Land use**

 - b. Land management**

 - c. Resource rights**

d. Benefit-sharing?

- 6. Which stakeholders are involved in the above stated systems?**

- 7. Do you think the above stated systems are effective at resolving grievances? Please explain why or why not.**

- 8. Have you ever filed a grievance? Yes or No. If yes, describe how you filed the grievance?**

- 9. Have you ever filled or completed a form to register a grievance? Yes or No. If yes, describe the situation and type of form completed.**

- 10. Was the form effective (easy to use, purposeful)? Please explain why or why not.**

- 11. What suggestions do you have to improve grievance resolution processes in Fiji?**

Post-Training Evaluation Survey

This survey will help the FGRM Team better understand knowledge of participants following the training regarding the FGRM processes and procedures, and most importantly their ability to complete the two FGRM dispute forms. This form will be used for evaluation purposes only and may be kept anonymous. This information will also help the trainers make sure that we addressed any areas of concern relevant to the participants that may be used to improve the forms of FGRM communications strategy.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability:

1. Do you believe the training adequately addressed its objectives listed below?

- Improved your understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder in the FGRM process.

Yes No

- Increased your understanding on the FGRM procedures and process.

Yes No

- Increased your understanding on how the two FGRM dispute forms fit into the dispute resolution process.

Yes No

- Trained iTaukei Village Headman and the MoF Forest Officers on how to report and record grievances using the two FGRM dispute forms.

Yes No

****For any “No” answer please provide explanation.***

2. Do you feel that the FGRM is capable of addressing and resolving grievances for REDD+ as it is currently designed? Please explain.

3. Do you feel comfortable on the usage of forms to register grievances? Yes or No. If “No” please explain.

4. Is the iTaukei translation on the forms clear and easy to understand?

5. Are the directions on the forms easy to understand? Why or why not?

6. How do you assess the effectiveness of the training?

Poor ____ Fair _____ Good _____ Very Good ____ Excellent _____

Please, explain your choice:

7. Any other comments?

ATTACHMENT 7: REVISED REPORTING AND RECORDING FORMS



INFORMAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REPORT / *RIPOTE NI VEIVOSAKITAKI NI WALI NI VEILETI*

This is a guide for the iTaukei Village Headmen (*Turaga ni Koro*)⁷, transcribed by Village Councils, to use for recording any grievances at the local-level. Should a REDD+-related grievance be submitted to the FGRM then this will be collected if available. / *Qo e ivola dusidusi vua na Turaga ni Koro, me dau vakaleweni mai ni dua na kudru ni REDD+ e kau mai ina bosevaKoro.*

Notes / <i>Me volai matata mai</i>
Parties to the Dispute / <i>O cei e veileti:</i> 1. Initiator(s) / <i>O cei e kudru –</i> Representatives / <i>Nona mata –</i> 2. Respondent (s) / <i>O cei e kudruvaka –</i> Representatives / <i>Nona mata –</i>
Details of Dispute / <i>Vakamacala ni Veileti</i> (e.g., approximate date that dispute started, what happened in chronological order) / (<i>m.v., tiki ni siga e tekivu kina, na veitarataravi ni veika a yaco</i>)

⁷ Recently change from “Headmen” to “Administrator” and as such the person responsible for filling out these forms may need to reconsidered. The change in title also reflects a change in how the position is filled; “Administrators” can be appointed and therefore may not necessarily be iTaukei.

Resolution or Solution Proposed / *Na iwali ni veileti e a vakaturi.*

If resolved, provide details of resolution or solution. / *Ke sa wali rawa na veileti, vakamacalataka e a wali vakacava.*

If unresolved, provide next steps proposed. / *Ke sebera ni wali, na cava na vakasama se ituvatuva tarava me na qaravi.*

Signature of Parties / *Nodratou saini na mataniveileti*

Print Name(s) / *Vola na yacamu:*

Signature(s) / *Saini:*

Date / *Tikinisiga:*

Witness to the Report (Signature of Roko or authorized representative) / *Vakadinadina ki na Ripote qo (Me sainitaka na Rokotui se o nona Talai)*

Print Name(s) / *Vola na yacamu:*

Signature / *Saini:*

Date / *Tiki ni Siga:*



COMPLAINT REGISTRATION FORM / VOLATUKUTUKU NI KUDRU Fiji REDD+ PROGRAM

This form is to be completed by the designated feedback grievance and redress mechanism (FGRM) representative – Forest Officer of REDD+ Liaison Officer. / *Na fomu qo me vakalewena mai na vakalesilesi ni REDD+ se o koya e qarava na veikau.*

Section 1: Complainant please complete as much of the information as possible or leave blank if you wish to remain anonymous* (the Officer may fill this in for the Complainant). / *Me kerei vei koya e kudru me vakalewena na fomu qo. Me tu vakarau ena kena vakaleweni matata, na ivakalesilesi ni REDD+ se o koya e qarava na veikau.*

Complainant's Contact Information / <i>Sala ni veitaratara kei koya e kudru</i>	Landowning Unit Information / <i>Tukutuku ni iTaukei ni Qele</i>
Name / <i>Yacamu:</i>	Clan / <i>Mataqali:</i>
Email / <i>Imeli:</i>	Sub-Clan / <i>Tokatoka:</i>
Telephone Number / <i>Naba ni talevoni:</i>	Family / <i>Vuvale:</i>
Address / <i>Sala ni veitaratara ena meli:</i>	

**Officer, if the Complainant wishes to remain anonymous inform them that they will not receive communication of the progress of the complaint, unless they contact the recording Officer and ask for the case number (once it has been logged into the database). *Me vakamacalataki vei koya e kudru ke sega ni volai na yacana ena wase ni fomu e cake, ena sega ni wili ena vakasavui ni ituvatuva ena vakamura na valenivolavola ni REDD+. Sa rawa vua me qai veitaratara ga kei na vakalesilesi qarava na isovanitukutuku e valenivolavola.*

Representative* / Mata*

Submitted on Behalf of Complainant (Yes or No) / Soli itukutuku ena vuku ni ito ni kudru (io se sega):

If yes, then who is Representing the Complainant(s) / Ke io, vola na yacamu:

If yes, is there Verification of Consent and Authorization of Evidence of Representative Capacity* (must present documentation). / Ke mata, ia me laurai na ivola ni nona digitaki mai na ito ni kudru* (me ivakadinading).

** Consent must be proven – LOU membership must account for 60% in order for this to be acceptable. * Na Veivakadonui me vakadinadinataki – Me laurai ni veivakadonui e 60% na iTaukei ni Qele.*

Section 2: The following section must be completed by the uptake Officer. / Me vakalewena na ivakalesilesi talai na iwase ni fomu qo.

Officer Information / Ivakamacala ni vakaillesilesi	Dates / Tikinisiga
Ministry and/or Department / Tabacakacaka se Tabana:	
Name / Yacamu:	Date Grievance Received / Tikinisiga a ciqomi kina na kudru:
Position Title / Nomu itutu:	Date Grievance Review Conducted / Tikinisiga a veivosakitaki kina na Kudru:
Telephone Number / Naba ni talevoni:	
Email / Imeli:	

Case Number / iTaukei:

Section 3: Officer, please complete the following section after speaking to the Complainant. / *Kerei me vakalewena mai na ivakalesilesi talai na iwase ni fomu qo ni sa tauri oti na itukutuku mai vei koya e kudru.*

REDD+ Site Location / Yalava cava ni REDD+	
All Parties Involved / Na ito era oka ena veileti	

Section 4: Officer, complete this section only if the complaint was addressed in the customary system of redress. / *Kerei na vakailesilesi talai me vakalewena na iwase ni fomu qo kevaka sa veivosakitaki oti na kudru ena salavakavanua.*

Please ask the complainant to provide any written documentation from the Village Council and attach to this form, if appropriate. Also record the complainant's answers to the questions below. / *Me kerei vei koya e kudru me soli ivolatukutuku mai na bosevakoro ka me culavata kei na fomu qo; ke veiganiti; me volai mai na wase ni fomu e ra na nona isau ni taro.*

Record of Grievance Process / Ivolatukutuku ni salamuri ni Kudru
Location of the grievance / Vanua e yaco kina na kudru:
Date of the grievance / Tikinisiga yaco kina na kudru:

Case Number /
iTaukei:

Record of Grievance Process / Ivolatukutuku ni salamuri ni Kudru

What was the decision made and detail the steps taken towards resolution? / *Sala cava sa veivosakitaki me wali kina na kudru?*

What assistance is now being requested? / *Veivuke cava e sa gadrevi/kerei?*

Case Number /
iTaukei:

Section 5: Officer, please have the Complainant sign and date, unless they wish to remain anonymous. / *Me kerei vei koya e kudru me vakalewena mai na wase e ra, ke lomana.*

Signatures / Saini	
Complainant / Koya e kudru:	Uptake Officer / Vakalesilesi talai:
<i>Print Name / Yacamu:</i>	<i>Print Name / Yacamu:</i>
<i>Signature / Saini:</i>	<i>Signature / Saini:</i>
<i>Date / Tikinisiga:</i>	<i>Date / Tikinisiga:</i>

Section 6: Officer, please check the applicable sections after speaking to the Complainant to determine if this is a REDD+-related grievance. Common examples have been provided below. / *Me vakalewena na wase ni fomu qo na vakalesilesi talai ni oti na nona vakatarogi koya e kudru. Qo me vakadeitaka na veiwekani ni kudru ki na REDD+. Sa volai toka e ra e so na vakaraitaki ni vunukudru.*

N ^o	Nature of the Complaint	Na cava e Kudruvaki	REDD+ Related? / Veiwekani ni Kudru ki na REDD+?
Land Disputes for REDD+ Sites / Veiletitaki ni Qele ni REDD+			
1	Boundary description for REDD+ site is not clear and conflicts with oral evidence of community members or other LOU recorded boundaries	<i>E sega ni matata na iyalayala ni qele lavaki ni REDD+, veileti kei na veivosaki katonu ni leweni vanua se o ira na taukei ni qele e so me baleta na nodra iyalayala</i>	
	Conflicting interest of (member) over engagement in land for REDD+ purposes	<i>Veileti ni gadrevi me vakayagataki na qelelavaki ni REDD+ ena dua tale na inaki</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	
Property Disputes / Veileti ni Ka e Taukeni			
	Destruction of property (individual) or community asset	<i>Vakacacani ni dua na ka e taukeni duadua se taukeni vakalewelevu</i>	
	Illegal logging in REDD+ site	<i>Ta kau vakatawadodonu e na vanualavaki ni REDD+</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	
REDD+ Conservation Lease Terms and Enforcement / Veika e lavaki ena Lisi ni REDD+ / Se Lisi ni Vanua Maroro kei na kena Yadravi			
	Lease terms for REDD+ site is not fit for purpose or is not being executed properly	<i>Sega ni veiganiti na veika e lavaki e na lisi ni REDD+; sega ni cakacakataki vakavinaka</i>	
	Land use plan was not put in place and or is not being followed as intended	<i>A sega taumada na ituvatuva ni vakayagataki ni qele, se sega ni muri na ituvatuva ni vakayagataki ni qele</i>	
	Disputing process of lease renewal without grant of member's consent (FPIC)	<i>Sega ni vakamuri na ituvatuva ni soli veivakadonui se FPIC (Free, Prior & Informed Consent) ena kena vakavou ni lisi</i>	

--

N ^o	Nature of the Complaint	Na cava e KudrUVaki	REDD+ Related? / Veiwekani ni Kudru ki na REDD+?
	Dispute related to (un)authorized activities allowed on customary land	<i>A sega ni vakadonui vakabose e so na ka e yaco ena qele vakaiTaukei</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	
Environmental Impacts / Vakavuleqa ena iTikitiko			
	Activities from REDD+ are impacting the environment resulting in degradation and/or damage of surrounding areas.	<i>So na cakacaka ni REDD+ e vakavuleqa ena itikitiko ka vakavuna na vakadravudravuataki kei na vakacacani ni vanua veitikivi</i>	
	Poor site maintenance of REDD+ site(s)	<i>Sega ni qaravi vinaka na yalava ni REDD+</i>	
	Water, air, and land surface pollution	<i>Vakavuna na benuci ni wai, cagi, kei na qele</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	
Communication and Rights / Vakadewataki ni Tukutuku kei na Dodonu			
	Disagreement by community and REDD+ on details of project implementation	<i>Sega ni duavata na itaukei ni qele kei REDD+ ena cakacakataki ni tuvatuva ni REDD+</i>	
	Information on REDD+ project activities and processes were/are not transparent	<i>A sega tiko ga ni matata na ituvatuva ni REDD+</i>	
	Dispute regarding the extraction of forest products on REDD+ land (access to those resources and/or permissible use)	<i>Veileti me baleta na tamusuki ni vua ni veikau ena yalava ni REDD+ (vanua vakatarai kei na cava e vakatarai)</i>	
	Restriction of spaces to cultivate due to REDD+ project	<i>Vakalailaitaki na vanua ni teitei baleta na taurivaki ni porakaramu ni REDD+</i>	
	Lack of drinking water related to the project	<i>Vakavuna na REDD+ na macamaca se lailai ni wainigunu</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	
Benefit-sharing /Wasei ni Vakayaga			
	Unequal distribution of benefits	<i>Sega ni wasei vakatautauvata na ivakayaga</i>	

--

N ^o	Nature of the Complaint	Na cava e KudrUVaki	REDD+ Related? / Veiwekani ni Kudru ki na REDD+?
	Timeline for distribution and access to funds is not being followed	<i>Sega ni vakamuri na gaunisala kei na gaunasoli ni wasei na vakayaga</i>	
	Compensation issues	<i>Leqa ni veisosomitaki</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	
Social Inclusion / Vakaitavi ni tamata			
	Isolated or not included in decision-making regarding REDD+ activities or site management	<i>Vakatikitikitaki se sega ni wili ena lewa me baleta na cakacaka ni REDD+ se yalava ni REDD+</i>	
	Perceived discrimination or bias from REDD+ staff, government, or representatives	<i>Veivakaduiduitaki se veitotaki mai na vakaillesilesi ni REDD+ se Matanitu se vakaillesilesi talai</i>	
	Access and/or requests for information	<i>Vakarawarawataki na kena ciqomi na itukutuku kerei</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	
REDD+ Institutions and Staff / Valenivolavola ni REDD+ kei na kena Vakaillesilesi			
	Inappropriate staff behavior on site	<i>Leqa ni itovo mai vei ira na vakaillesilesi</i>	
	Nonresponsive to previous grievances submitted	<i>Sega ni saumi na kudru a laveti taumada</i>	
	Previous resolution not enforced or has proven inadequate to resolve conflict	<i>Sega ni yadravi me cakacakataki na iwali ni kudru se sa sega ni veiganiti na iwali ni kudru</i>	
	Other? Please describe:	<i>Dua tale? Vakamacalataka:</i>	

Case Number /
iTaukei:

If complaint does not fit into one of the categories above, but the complaint is likely REDD+ related please, briefly describe and then speak with the R+LO. / *Ke sega ni dua vei ira na vakamacalataki e cake e vunikudru, io vakabauti ni veiwekani ki na REDD+, ia me vakamacalataki mai ka veivosakitaki vata kei na vakaillesilesi ni REDD+.*

If complaint is determined NOT to be REDD+ related please, briefly describe why. / *Ke sa vakadeitaki ni sega ni veiwekani na kudru ki na REDD+ ia me vakamacalataki se cava e vuna.*



GRIEVANCE PROCESS TIMELINE / GAUNASOLI NI SALAMURI NI KUDRU

Fiji REDD+ PROGRAM

Officer, please include this timeline in-person or in the email or letter to the Complainant – walk through the timeline to ensure understanding and explain that this is an average, not a guaranteed estimate of time given for each step. Complainants cannot skip ahead in the process and it is important that they understand the process is progressive. / *Sa kerei na Vakalesilesi talai me vakamatatataka e matanavotu se imeli se ivola vua na ito ni kudru – lesuva vata kei ira na gaunasoli ni salamuri ni kudru. Me ra kila ni na gaunasoli e vakacaca. E sega ni rawa ni kalawaci na ituvatuva, ena veimuri na sala taucoko.*

Step 1. Uptake / Taurivaki	Timeframe / Gaunasoli
Point of Contact: Officer that recorded the grievance / Dauniveiqaravi: Vakalesilesi ka volaitukutukutaka na veileti	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest Officer or R+LO receives grievance from Complainant. / <i>Ciqoma na Vakalesilesi ni Veikau se REDD+ na kudru.</i> 	NA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest Officer or R+LO records grievance / <i>Vola na itukutuku ni veileti na Vakalesilesi ni Veikau se REDD+</i> 	1-3 working days / <i>1-3 na siga ni cakacaka</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forest Officer or R+LO inputs grievance into centralized database and a case number is assigned. / <i>Vakacurumi na ivolatukutuku ni kudru ina sova ni tukutuku ka vakanabataki va-kisi.</i> 	1-2 working days / <i>1-2 na siga ni cakacaka</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A copy of the resolution report (hard and/or electronic) is sent to Complainant, as confirmation of receipt. / <i>Vakau vei koya e kudru e dua na ilavelave ni tukutukunibose me ivakadinadina ni kena sa taurivaki na kudru.</i> 	1-2 working days / <i>1-2 na siga ni cakacaka</i>

Step 2. Evaluate / Railesuvi	Timeframe / Gaunasoli
Point of Contact: Officer you reported the grievance to and the R+LO / <i>Dauniveiqaravi: Vakaillesilesi ka tauri tukutuku kei na vakaillesilesi ni REDD+</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> R+LO will review all documentation provided for the complaint. / <i>Vakaillesilesi ni REDD+ me ilova na ivolatukutuku kece a vakarautaki.</i> 	1-2 working days / <i>1-2 na siga ni cakacaka</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the information provided is sufficient the R+LO will screen the case, make a determination of eligibility under the FGRM, and communicate that decision to the Complainant. / <i>Ke sa rauta vinaka na itukutuku volai me baleta e dua na kisi, e sa na cakacaka kina na vakaillesilesi ni REDD+, ka vakataulewataka na veika e rawa ni veisosomitaki. Sa nona itavi talega me vakadewataka na nona vakataulewa vei koya e kudru.</i> 	1-2 working days / <i>1-2 na siga ni cakacaka</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the information is not sufficient the R+LO will request that additional evidence be collected. / <i>Ke sebera ni taucoko na itukutuku volai, e na kerea na vakaillesilesi ni REDD+ me vakasokumuni tale na itukutuku gadrevi.</i> 	2-5 working days / <i>2-5 na siga ni cakacaka</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once eligibility is determined a relevant authority will be assigned. / <i>Ni sa vakataulewataka na veika e rawa ni veisosomitaki, e dua na tabana ni yadrayadravaki ena digitaki.</i> 	1 working day / <i>1 na siga ni cakacaka</i>

Step 3. Respond / Saumaki	Timeframe / Gaunasoli
Point of Contact: R+LO / <i>Dauniveiqaravi: Vakaillesilesi ni REDD+</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Selection of a proposed resolution approach by an Officer of the FGRM. / <i>Digitaki ni dua na iwali a vakatututaki mai vua na vakaillesilesi talai.</i> 	1-2 working days / <i>1-2 na siga ni cakacaka</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formulation and delivery of proposed resolution approach to Complainant. / <i>Kena buli, ka vakadewataka na iwali vakatututaki ki vei koya e kudru.</i> 	2-3 working days / <i>2-3 na siga ni cakacaka</i>

Step 4. Implement / <i>Cakacakataki</i>	Timeframe / <i>Gaunasoli</i>
Point of Contact: R+LO / <i>Dauniveiqaravi: Vakaillesilesi ni REDD+</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF – R+LO convenes an Independent Assessment Group (IAG) to conduct further assessment work and evaluate the grievance. / • KEVAKA – <i>E vakayaco bose na vakaillesilesi ni REDD+ me dikeva na veika me baleta na kudru e dua na matabose tuvakaikoya ni iloilovaki (Independent Assessment Group se IAG).</i> 	8-10 working days / <i>8-10 na siga ni cakacaka</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IF – IAG is unsuccessful in their evaluation, the issue is considered too complex, or the Complainant seeks an appeal, the grievance is elevated to determination by a majority vote of the National REDD+ Steering Committee (RSC) – who may ask for additional assessment work or a new IAG. / • KEVAKA – <i>E sega ni kunea rawa e dua na iwali na matabose ni ioilovaki, se kunei ni sa rui vereverea na vunikudru, se kerea tale na ito ni kudru me dikevi tale na taulewa ni veisosomitaki, me sa na laveti cake na kisi ki na REDD+ Steering Committee me ratou na laveligataka na ituvatua cava me na vakamuri. E rawa vua na RSC me kerea tale e so na itukutuku volai se me dua tale na matabose vou ni iloilovaki.</i> 	5 working days / <i>5 na siga ni cakacaka</i>

Step 5. Close / <i>iSogo</i>	Timeframe / <i>Gaunasoli</i>
Point of Contact: R+LO / <i>Dauniveiqaravi: Vakaillesilesi ni REDD+</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complainant may receive survey or other follow-up to support monitoring and closeout. / <i>E rawa vei koya e kudru me ciqoma na vatataro eso me vukea na railesuvi se na kena sogoti e dua na kisi.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA