
ADDRESSING WATER SHORTAGES

A catalyst for more resilient development in Fiji

This case study draws on fieldwork in two communities in Fiji that participated in the 2002–05 Capacity Building to Enable the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries (CBDAMPIC) project, one of the first adaptation projects in the Pacific that attempted to work at this community scale to build resilience to the longer-term impacts of climate change. In both communities, the project served as a catalyst for more resilient development, improving both absorptive and adaptive capacity with respect to water shortages. It provided an example of how addressing a locally defined problem can energize a community to take action to improve resilience. A key factor in these communities' resilience is their existing social capital. The project also points to the significance of building on previous and ongoing processes and initiatives.

With assistance from the Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies

Oxfam Research Reports are written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development and humanitarian policy and practice. They do not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

CONTENTS

Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
1 Introduction	6
2 Case Study Context	10
3 Project and Impact	14
4 Analysis	19
5 Conclusions	23
Bibliography	24
Notes	27
Acknowledgments	28

ACRONYMS

CBDAMPIC	Capacity Building to Enable the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries
CCA	climate change adaptation
CV&A	community vulnerability and adaptation action
DRR	disaster risk reduction
SPREP	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TC	tropical cyclone
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WAF	Water Authority of Fiji

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This case study draws on fieldwork in two communities in Fiji that participated in the Capacity Building to Enable the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries (CBDAMPIC) project. This research is part of a larger resilience program funded by the Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies and focused on building resilience and capacities for disaster risk reduction (DRR) in vulnerable communities in Latin America and the Pacific Islands. The research has gathered evidence on the impacts that such projects have on households and communities, the elements of such projects that make them more likely to succeed, and ways of defining and measuring “success” in resilience projects. The research gives particular attention to the elements of success associated with improved resilience outcomes and how these relate to six closely linked social change processes that, when integrated into our interventions, will enhance absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacities at different levels of society and across multiple sectors. These six social change processes are (1) empowering, (2) securing and enhancing livelihoods, (3) learning innovation, (4) flexible and forward-looking planning, (5) informing, and (6) accountable governing.

The Republic of Fiji is a small island developing state in the Melanesian region of the western Pacific Ocean. El Niño and La Niña events drive climate variability in Fiji, with El Niño patterns associated with less than usual rainfall and drought and La Niña events associated with unusually high rainfall and floods. Natural disasters in Fiji have far-reaching negative effects on agriculture, communications, housing, transport infrastructure, and tourism. The climatic changes already being observed in Fiji are consistent with global patterns. Projections suggest there will be continued increases in sea level, sea surface and air temperatures, and ocean acidification and that extreme rainfall days and extremely hot days are likely to occur more often and be more intense. Associated coral bleaching is also projected to continue. Current projections suggest that tropical cyclones may occur less frequently but that their intensity may increase.

When it commenced, CBDAMPIC was one of the first adaptation projects in the Pacific that attempted to work at this community scale to build resilience to the longer-term impacts of climate change. Field research took place in two of the three project sites: Bavu and Tilivalevu, in the vicinity of Nadi, Fiji’s international airport, in the west of the main island, Viti Levu. The CBDAMPIC project employed combined a top-down and a bottom-up approach to adaptation using participatory methods. The bottom-up community assessments revealed that both communities suffered from severe water shortages, and addressing them became the central aim of the community-level adaptation activities.

An important element of the CBDAMPIC project was the extensive community engagement. The project used the participatory community vulnerability and adaptation action (CV&A) approach to understand the extent of the communities’ vulnerability to climate change. This bottom-up approach promoted ownership and empowerment on the part of those whose voices were not usually heard—women and youth—and contributed to Oxfam’s change process of empowerment, which includes processes for promoting gender justice and enhancing voice, empowerment and participation, conflict resolution, and psychological resilience. When it was implemented, the project built on its understanding of the community context, including livelihood assets and social and cultural norms and systems. In particular, social assets such as collaboration and social capital were an important foundation for the project. Securing and enhancing livelihoods, including social and human assets, is another change process based on the sustainable livelihoods framework (Department for International Development, 1999).

Informing is a social process that develops information and knowledge to support decision-making and action leading to resilience. The project increased awareness of climate change at the national and community level through dissemination of climate information kits that were tailor-made for them. It also sought to use traditional and scientific knowledge to stimulate action.

Accountable governing by states and institutions is another important change process for resilience, and the project worked with the national government, communities, and all stakeholders at the planning stage to encourage ownership at all levels and to strengthen partnerships. This approach built linkages between national institutions and communities as both levels were given weight in local and national project plans and discussions.

Adaptive management was critical to the implementation of the project and to ongoing engagement with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), the regional donor, through formal and informal mechanisms. A greater commitment to monitoring would have revealed that the water tank in Bavu was at risk of failing and allowed for it to be rectified before it did so. A linked contributing factor to the successful execution of the pilot projects was the funding for practical adaptation actions, which engendered “learning by doing” actions on the ground that were fully recommended and supported by the communities.

This study draws conclusions about the project’s contribution to the absorptive, adaptive, and transformative aspects of resilience. In both communities, the work undertaken through the CBDAMPIC project served as a catalyst for more resilient development, in particular by improving absorptive capacity with respect to water shortages. It provided an example of how addressing a locally defined problem—in this case extreme water shortage—can energize a community to take action to improve resilience. In both locations, the actions taken to alleviate water shortages have led to greater adaptive capacity through either increased incomes (as in Tilivalevu) or access to other donor funds (as in Bavu). A key factor in these communities’ resilience is their existing social capital, especially their family and traditional kinship ties, which encourage collaboration and working together as one family to achieve common goals. This collaboration in turn fosters social solidarity, builds long-lasting relationships, and further strengthens communities’ social capital and economic potential.

Project implementation in Bavu and Tilivalevu—linked with important national initiatives—points to the significance of building on previous and ongoing processes and initiatives to keep a project’s momentum moving while avoiding duplication. Resilience, as exemplified in this research, is achieved not by implementing one climate change adaptation project alone, but rather by building on and drawing from commonalities and opportunities provided by projects that have been implemented in the same community. It ensures the continuity of capacity-building efforts so that communities can adjust and increase their adaptive capacity and achieve sustainable livelihood goals throughout the process, without being too ad hoc. Ultimately, communities need to achieve transformative resilience, and this is an ongoing process.

Other papers in this series

- *"Disaster is Nature Telling Us How to Live Resiliently": Indigenous disaster risk reduction, organizing, and spirituality in Tierradentro, Colombia*
- *Building Resilience Through Iterative Processes: Mainstreaming ancestral knowledge, social movements and the making of sustainable programming in Bolivia*
- *Learning from Hindsight: A synthesis report on Oxfam resilience research*

1 INTRODUCTION

The Republic of Fiji is a small island developing state in the Pacific Ocean. More than 60 percent of the nation's population lives on the main island of Viti Levu, with a further 20 percent on the neighboring island of Vanua Levu and the rest scattered across the country's 110 or so inhabited islands. The Pacific region, including Fiji, is one of the most vulnerable regions of the world to the risks of climate change and climate variability. Extreme weather events, including flooding, storm surges, droughts, and tropical cyclones, have had major impacts on Pacific peoples' social, economic, and ecological environments.

This case study draws on fieldwork in two communities in Fiji that participated in the Capacity Building to Enable the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries (CBDAMPIC) project. CBDAMPIC was implemented between January 2002 and March 2005 in the Cook Islands, Fiji, Samoa, and Vanuatu with funding from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This research project is part of a larger resilience program funded by the Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies focused on building resilience and capacities for disaster risk reduction (DRR) in vulnerable communities in Latin America and the Pacific Islands. The three-year project, launched in late 2014, took place in four countries: El Salvador, Guatemala, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu. The project focuses on the following key outcomes:

- Reduced vulnerability to natural hazards through DRR and climate change adaptation (CCA);
- Greater absorptive capacity for increased resilience to natural hazards; and
- Greater capacity to adapt to hazards, create change, and ensure basic rights.

As part of this program, Oxfam has produced three case studies examining completed resilience, DRR, preparedness, or CCA projects in Latin America and the Pacific that were thought to have created resilience to multiple hazards:

- A 2007–09 preparedness project funded by the Disaster Preparedness ECHO programme (DIPECHO) and implemented by the French Red Cross and Colombian Red Cross around the Nevado del Huila volcano in Colombia;
- A resilience project implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in Fiji in 2002–05; and
- An Oxfam landslide preparedness project implemented in La Paz, Bolivia, in 2010–11.

Examining these projects with the benefit of hindsight, we have sought to gather evidence about the impact of such projects on households and communities; what elements of such projects make them more likely to succeed; how we define and measure “success” in resilience projects; and the timeline, timing, and duration of resilience projects. The research is not an evaluation of the specific projects by any means, but a comparative research exercise to learn as much as we can from them about resilience, in order to inform future programming by Oxfam and other implementers. A synthesis report presents the common findings across the three case studies, together with relevant findings from a related Oxfam research project that evaluates a concluded CCA program implemented by CARE in Vanuatu.

OXFAM ON RESILIENCE

Oxfam's work toward a just world without poverty must address risk and its causes as well as the inequality in social relations that unfairly expose poor people and make them acutely vulnerable to shocks, stress, and uncertainty.¹ According to the Oxfam Resilience Framework, resilience is not the ultimate desired goal or outcome; rather, it constitutes a quality of the pursuit of sustainable development. We cannot achieve Oxfam's vision if we do not integrate a resilience approach into our thinking, ways of working, and all our interventions.

Oxfam defines resilience as “the ability of women and men to realize their rights and improve their well-being despite shocks, stresses, and uncertainty.” Oxfam’s approach to resilience is rights-based, long-term, process-oriented, a gender-justice approach, and a systems approach.

Rights-based: Oxfam believes that risk and its impacts on people living in poverty is “no accident,” (Oxfam International, 2013) but the result of inequitable and unsustainable development that fails to address poverty, creates vulnerability, and lets the burden of risk unfairly fall on the poorest and most vulnerable people. Growing inequality, unprecedented climate conditions, faster change, and greater uncertainty are new realities that require new knowledge and ways of working. The existing capacities of people living in poverty to prepare, cope, and adapt are stretched, and some existing strategies may increase vulnerabilities in the medium and long term. Therefore, existing absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacities need to be recognized, supported, and enhanced.

- Absorptive capacity is the capacity to take intentional protective action and to cope with known shocks and stress. It is needed because shocks and stress will continue to happen owing to, for example, extreme weather events, protracted conflict, and natural disasters.
- Adaptive capacity is the capacity to make intentional adjustments and incremental changes in anticipation of or in response to change, in ways that create more flexibility in the future. It is needed because change is ongoing and uncertain and because intentional transformation can take time and sustained engagement.
- Transformative capacity is the capacity to make intentional change to systems that create risk, vulnerability, and inequality. It is needed to influence the drivers of risk, vulnerability, and inequality and because social and natural systems are themselves being transformed by, for example, globalization and climate change (Béné et al., 2012).

Our approach affirms people’s right to determine their own futures by enhancing the capacities of people and institutions to address the causes of risk, fragility, vulnerability, and inequality.

Long-term: Resilience needs to be built continuously over time. It is not a fixed or end state but an ongoing process of social change.

Process-oriented: Oxfam considers six closely linked social change processes that, when integrated into our interventions, will enhance absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacities at different levels of society and across multiple sectors:

1. *Empowerment* includes processes for promoting gender justice and enhancing voice, empowerment and participation, conflict resolution, and psychological resilience.
2. *Securing and enhancing livelihoods* refers to processes for securing and building human, social, natural, physical, and financial capital and household assets based on the sustainable livelihoods framework.
3. *Informing* encompasses processes that develop information and knowledge to support decision making and action.
4. *Flexible and forward-looking planning* refers to processes that enable and enhance collective, forward-looking, and flexible decision making.
5. *Accountable governing* encompasses processes that secure accountable and enabling states and institutions.
6. *Learning* includes processes that enable people to learn together, support experimentation, and increase the potential for social and technological innovation.

A gender-justice approach: Oxfam puts women’s rights at the center of all of its programming, recognizing that promoting women’s rights is necessary to achieve gender justice. This is also critical if we want to achieve resilient development outcomes. Women and girls face daily and regular hazards in their life cycle as well as structural inequality through discriminatory gender norms and gender stereotypes based on patriarchal societies. These increase the exposure and vulnerability of women and girls and limit their ability to participate and exercise their agency and leadership capacity. We need to understand both the existing capacities of women and men and their specific and different vulnerabilities. And we need to understand how vulnerabilities are caused by inequality and exacerbated by risks.

A systems approach: A systems approach recognizes and works with the relationships between the complex causes of risk and poverty and avoids approaches that are siloed by sector, discipline, or organizational structures, which are likely to increase vulnerability. It recognizes the limitations of short-term, technical fixes and requires teams to adjust strategies based on feedback from monitoring, evaluation, and learning. Such an approach is necessary to address the causes of multiple risks, fragility, and vulnerability without causing new risks and vulnerabilities.

METHODOLOGY

Case Study Selection

The geographic focus of this research is based on the focus of the larger Oxfam resilience program funded by the Margaret A. Cargill Philanthropies on the Pacific and Latin America. We decided to conduct three case studies—two in Latin America and one in the Pacific—supplemented with findings from a recently completed climate change adaptation project in Vanuatu. We chose projects that were framed as either (1) resilience projects or (2) DRR, preparedness, or CCA projects thought to have created increased resilience within the beneficiary communities—that is, projects that were considered successful by the relevant Oxfam staff, external experts, and existing evaluations. They needed to have been completed at least three to five years ago (i.e., by the end of 2013) to allow sufficient time for reflection on the enduring impact. We also sought a mix of Oxfam and non-Oxfam projects.

We identified potential case studies through a literature review and scoping interviews with Oxfam staff working on resilience in country and regional offices in the two regions and with external experts. We then used the above criteria to narrow down the list to the three selected.

Research Methods

To address this report's objectives, the researchers used a mix of qualitative methods, including a literature review, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions. The research was organized around case study analysis. The three case studies followed a common methodology that was adapted to each particular context.

The literature review included a review of project documents, including needs assessments, project design and supporting documentation, MEAL (monitoring, evaluation, and learning) plan, interim and final reports, evaluations, findings of listening exercises and learning events; materials written about the projects, including journal articles, research reports, news articles, blog posts, and newsletter articles; any related materials produced by the communities, including resilience frameworks, news articles, and interviews; documents from related projects conducted in the communities, including needs assessments, interim and final reports, evaluations; assessments of the resilience of the broader region and country, including peer-reviewed articles, gray literature, white papers, government assessments, reports of donors, and reports of local, national, and international NGOs; and documents regarding Oxfam's framework for resilience.

The researchers engaged a broad range of stakeholders through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. They consulted project staff from the projects; project participants (i.e., primary change agents); government officials (relevant ministries and agencies across all levels of government); local and national NGO representatives; community-based organization representatives, including women's rights organizations, indigenous organizations, and organizations representing disabled people and youth; local civic leaders; members of communities, including men and women, members of social groups that might be affected differently, and informal groups; academics and researchers working in the communities or with national expertise; and multilateral organizations and international NGOs, at headquarters and in the field.

In this particular case study, key informant interviews and focus group discussions were conducted in two villages in Fiji.

The research was conducted according to Oxfam’s ethical guidelines. In terms of research subjects, we adhered to the standards of voluntary participation, informed consent, avoidance of risk of harm, and the practice of offering (and abiding by requests of) confidentiality.

SPREP reviewed the draft report and provided feedback, which has been incorporated into the final version.

Limitations

The projects selected as case studies are not intended to be representative of projects conducted in the respective countries but rather “success stories” offering lessons that could be applicable in other contexts within each country and ideally in other countries. The findings compiled in the synthesis report are those that occurred in multiple case studies; they are thus more likely to be applicable in some, but not all, instances globally.

Because time has passed since the projects in question ended, the researchers have had to rely on people’s memory recall when seeking to pinpoint the facts, timing, and impact of the projects. Also, community-initiated or external programming in the relevant communities before or after the projects in question may have catalyzed resilience. Consequently, the researchers have been as careful as possible to pinpoint the immediate and longer-term impact of the projects, while acknowledging the potential impact of such developments and programs on the resilient development of the community.

Finally, because Oxfam is known as a provider of humanitarian, DRR, and resilience programming and funding to local partners, there is a risk of aid recipient bias—i.e., interlocutors may have told the interviewer what they thought he or she wanted to hear and what would best position them for future assistance, funding, or both. The researchers explained that they were independent of Oxfam and that responses were not tied in any way to assistance. But these practices only partly mitigate this risk. As a result, the triangulation of information—conducted through multiple interviews with various stakeholders and desk research—was critical.

Additional limitations in this particular project include the fact that Bavu and Tilivalevu were already engaged in development projects during the time of the field research, and community members were thus constrained in the amount of time they could devote to the research. Also, since the project was implemented more than 10 years ago, staff from the national government were no longer working for the Department of Environment. The write-up of this case study was finalized by a different consultant from the one who completed the fieldwork, and we were unable to independently verify the fieldwork data. Ongoing input from research management staff, an internal and external peer review, and review of the draft by SPREP have minimized any risk.

STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

After detailing the research methodology, the report gives an overview of the case study context, including natural hazards, climate change risks, and the structures and efforts of the government of Fiji and of civil society. It then provides a summary of the project and its impact. Next an analysis presents the findings of the research in two subsections: one identifies the elements or activities that were positively associated with improved resilience outcomes, and the other discusses issues in the sequencing and duration of the project that were associated with positive or negative resilience outcomes. These two subsections are grouped according to the six change processes in the Resilience Framework. Finally, the report concludes with a brief summary of the findings with respect to the three resilience capacities of the Resilience Framework.

2 CASE STUDY CONTEXT

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXT

The Republic of Fiji is a small island developing state in the Melanesian region of the western Pacific Ocean. Fiji sits between Vanuatu to the west and Tonga to the east, and its archipelago of 330 mostly volcanic islands spans a territory of 2,000 square kilometers. Fiji is a lower-middle-income economy with a population estimated at 892,1452 people. It is one of the most developed economies in the Pacific: it is ranked 91 out of 188 countries on the United Nations Human Development index, compared with its near neighbor Vanuatu, which is ranked 134 (UNDP, 2016).

More than 60 percent of the nation's population lives on the main island of Viti Levu, a further 20 percent lives on the neighboring island of Vanua Levu, and the remaining population is scattered across the inhabited islands of Fiji. In 2015 about 46 percent of the population relied on agriculture and fisheries for their livelihoods, declining from about 65 percent in 1970 (World Bank, 2017). In 2007 roughly 50 percent of the population lived in rural areas and 50 percent in urban areas, although it has been noted that there would have been moves toward urban areas in the past decade (Government of Fiji, 2007a; Newland, 2016).³ The connection between God and the land is entrenched in the village system, in which more than half of the indigenous Fijian population continues to live. However, the distinction between rural and urban populations is not clear in Fiji; many indigenous Fijians move between the two zones and identify with their ancestral home even if not living or visiting there. Associations with the land are strong; communities are unified through kin ties and marriage rules, and connected to the land through *kava* ceremonies, agriculture, and death rites (Newland, 2016).

Indian indentured laborers were brought to Fiji from India in the 19th century to drive the sugar industry (Newland, 2016). When indenture ended in 1920, they established themselves through thrift and self-reliance on leased lands in scattered settlements in the sugar cane belts of Fiji (Lal, 2012). Estimates are that Indo-Fijians make up around 38 percent of the population, and the ethnic mix has driven some of the instability in Fiji (Government of Fiji, 2007a).

Fiji gained independence from the British in 1970 and was declared a republic in 1987. A series of coups and countercoups have since interrupted democratic rule in Fiji. After several years of delay, a democratic election was held on September 17, 2014, and the 2006 coup leader, Commodore Frank Bainimarama, was elected prime minister. The police and military retain extensive powers of detention, arrest, and search, and there are limitations on judicial redress for decisions made by authorities (Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2017).

Although Pacific island governments have made commitments to achieving gender equality at global, regional, and national levels, progress has been poor (UNESCAP, 2014). Violence against women in the Pacific is at alarming levels, and the Pacific region is the worst in the world in terms of women's representation in national parliaments. The number of women parliamentarians in Fiji is currently 14 percent (Parliament of the Republic of Fiji, 2017), higher than most other Pacific countries but still lower than the 2014 global average of around 20 percent (UNESCAP, 2014). Women constitute 87 percent of market vendors in Fiji, but only 19 percent of businesses are registered to women, and most of those are micro and small businesses. When household work is included, women worked between 26 and 31 percent more than men (UNESCAP, 2014). Violence against women is a serious manifestation of gender inequality and an abuse of fundamental human rights and is pervasive across the Pacific (UNIFEM Pacific, 2010; Fairbairn-Dunlop, 2009). A study in Fiji found that of women aged between 15 and 49, 64 percent reported experiencing physical and/or sexual partner violence in the previous 12 months. This is much higher than the global average of 33 percent (UNESCAP, 2014).

CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISKS IN FIJI

The Pacific region, including Fiji, is one of the most vulnerable regions of the world to the risks of climate change and climate variability. El Niño and La Niña events drive climate variability in the Pacific, with El Niño patterns associated with lower than usual rainfall and drought and La Niña events associated with unusually high rainfall and floods. Extreme weather events, including flooding, storm surges, droughts, and tropical cyclones, have had major impacts on Pacific peoples' social, economic, and ecological environments. Disaster-related economic losses in Pacific island countries, as a percentage of gross domestic product, are higher than almost anywhere else in the world, because the share of population and infrastructure exposed to disaster events is high in the Pacific, and a single event can affect the entire economic, human, and physical environment (World Bank, 2012; Barber, 2015).

Natural disasters in Fiji have far-reaching negative effects on agriculture, communications, housing, transport infrastructure, and tourism. Since 1980, disaster events in Fiji have resulted in average annual economic damage of about US\$16.5 million and affected about 40,000 people each year. In the same period, at least 186 people were killed by flooding and storm events alone (Government of Fiji, 2016). Between the late 1960s and 2010, 117 tropical cyclones have either formed in or passed through Fiji, which is equivalent to about 3 cyclones annually. In February 2016, Tropical Cyclone (TC) Winston struck Fiji, the first Category 5 cyclone to directly affect Fiji. TC Winston caused 44 fatalities; approximately 40,000 people required immediate assistance; and 30,369 houses, 495 schools, and 88 health clinics and medical facilities were damaged or destroyed. The combined value of destroyed assets and disruptions from TC Winston was equivalent to about one-fifth of the country's 2014 gross domestic product (Government of Fiji, 2016).

The climatic changes that are already being observed in Fiji are consistent with global patterns. Annual maximum and minimum temperatures have been increasing in Fiji since 1942; the number of cool nights is decreasing and the number of warm days increasing. Satellite data indicate sea level has risen in Fiji by about 6 millimeters (mm) a year since 1993, even more than the global average of 2.8–3.6 mm a year. Data also show that since the 18th century the level of ocean acidification has been slowly increasing in Fiji's waters. Available data show no clear trends in annual or seasonal rainfall in Fiji since 1942 because there is a high degree of variation from year to year. Most meteorological droughts are associated with El Niño events, and the most recent severe droughts occurred in 1987, 1992, 1997–98, 2003, and 2010. Projections suggest that increases in sea level, sea surface and air temperatures, and ocean acidification will continue and that extreme rainfall days and extremely hot days are likely to occur more often and be more intense. Associated coral bleaching is also projected to continue. Current projections suggest that tropical cyclones may occur less frequently but that their intensity may increase.⁴

NATIONAL RESPONSES TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISKS

The government of Fiji has long recognized climate change as one of the greatest barriers to the sustainable development of Fiji and the Pacific region. It has been active in Pacific-wide engagement with international climate change negotiations, culminating in Fiji's role as chair of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Bonn in November 2017.

The National Disaster Management Plan of 1995 and the Natural Disaster Management Act of 1998 describe the governance and institutional arrangements for disaster risk management in Fiji and the attendant operational systems and processes. Besides the National Disaster Management Office (NDMO), disaster preparedness and emergency operations are also coordinated and facilitated with the assistance of the National Disaster Management Council and disaster management committees that have been set up. Reflecting on the experiences with Cyclone Winston in 2016, the government of Fiji recommended increased action and diplomacy related to the more active roles of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and linkages between disasters, climate change, and sustainable development. Therefore it

suggests that the current NDMO governance arrangements could benefit from being updated, given the increasingly complex interrelations between and among agencies nationally, regionally, and globally (Government of Fiji, 2016).

The National Climate Change Division, which sits under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is responsible for the government's response to climate change. This reflects Fiji's active engagement with global negotiations to address climate change. The goal of Fiji's National Climate Change Policy is to reduce the vulnerability and enhance the resilience of Fiji's communities to the impacts of climate change and disasters. As such, Fiji is proactively creating and refining policies, institutions, and budgetary systems that can mobilize resources for climate change and disaster risk management activities. The government's efforts seek to enable communities to be more efficient in managing their livelihood resources and their resilience and sustainable development (Des Combes et al., 2012).

Climate change and disaster risk management systems and processes in Fiji have evolved significantly over the past three decades, with the aim of creating a more proactive and integrated approach to disaster risk reduction, response, recovery, climate change adaptation, and climate change mitigation. Underpinning these efforts is Fiji's Green Growth Framework (Government of Fiji, 2016). The government developed the Green Growth Framework (GGF) (2014) with the vision of "A Better Fiji for All," which is similar and complementary to two previous policy documents that have expired: the People's Charter for Change, Peace, and Progress and the 2010–2014 Roadmap for Democracy and Sustainable Socio-Economic Development. The goals of the GGF include

- Reducing carbon footprints at all levels;
- Improving resource use and productivity (doing more with less);
- Developing an integrated approach, with all stakeholders working together for the common good (the cross-cutting nature of issues relating to sustainable development requires harmony and synergy in the formulation of strategies);
- Strengthening sociocultural education related to responsible environmental stewardship and civic responsibility;
- Increasing the adoption of comprehensive risk management practices;
- Supporting the adoption of sound environmental auditing of past and planned developments, to provide support to initiatives that not only provide economic benefits but also improve the environmental situation;
- Enhancing structural reforms in support of fair competition and efficiency; and
- Incentivizing investment in the rational and efficient use of natural resources.

The government of Fiji has recognized the importance of integrating climate change and disaster-related policies, strategies, plans, and activities (INDC, 2015). In August 2014, a Joint National Platform for Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change was convened for the first time in Fiji's capital, Suva. It was the first forum of its kind where the two areas converged to discuss

- Progress toward the GGF;
- The development of a National Strategic Plan for Disaster Risk Management and climate change that is guided by the GGF;
- Inclusive collaboration of all stakeholders;
- Ownership at all levels of governance; and
- Review of the institutional arrangements for climate change and disaster risk management.

Moves to integrate disasters, climate change, and sustainable development are also happening at the Pacific regional level. In 2016 the two major policy frameworks for climate change and disaster risk management—the Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management: A Framework for Action 2005–2015 (RFA) and the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006–2015 (PIFACC)—were replaced by the Framework for Resilience Development in the Pacific (FRDP). Despite the Fiji government's commitment to integrating climate change and disaster risk reduction, there has not been a concrete outcome to date, and the governance structure in Fiji still facilitates separate work, tools, and networks with little room for collaboration. There is still a need for one policy and authority or entity that integrates the

two areas in practice. Financial resources to implement these policies are also lacking, so the policies are not backed with a financial mechanism in place. The budget for climate change is spread across the many government entities that play a role in climate change: the Climate Change Division under the Ministry of Economy; the Department of Environment under the Ministry of Local Government; and Urban Development and Environment, the Fiji Meteorological Services, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Fisheries, and the Department of Agriculture, all of which fall under the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forests. An ongoing lack of coordination and communication between these entities means that activities are not coordinated or integrated under a shared vision or framework.

WATER MANAGEMENT IN FIJI

Issues of water management are coordinated at the national level through the Water Authority of Fiji (WAF). In 2007, the president of Fiji issued a promulgation establishing the Water Authority of Fiji to manage water and sewage systems (Government of the Republic of Fiji, 2007b), a role that had previously been fulfilled under the Public Works Department (PWD). The WAF is responsible, among other things, for providing water infrastructure and facilities, ensuring the regular supply of water, and rationing water during water shortages and when the need arises (Government of the Republic of Fiji, 2007b). This promulgation was in line with the recommendation of Fiji's Initial Communication report (Government of the Republic of Fiji, 2005) to the UNFCCC, which identified the need for institutional development and the creation of such an authority in the water sector to build capacity for better management of Fiji's water resources as an adaptation option (Government of the Republic of Fiji, 2005). Water systems vary between rural and urban areas, with rural areas often relying on local systems such as water tanks and wells rather than piped water. Still, there are estimates that 92 percent of people in rural areas have some kind of improved water system rather than relying on free-running water that can be contaminated (CIA, 2017).

CIVIL SOCIETY AND COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION

Most villages have needs-based committees (e.g., water, development, and disaster committees) that all fall under the overall village council. Meetings are often convened within these committees on an ad hoc basis. There are also regular all-village meetings, and days are usually set aside for communal cleaning.

Social capital remains important in Fiji, based on strong cultural links, and it plays an important role in disaster response and recovery. Research on the 2009 and 2012 floods in Viti Levu found that social capital aided in post-disaster response and recovery (Yila et al., 2014). Important relationships are not limited to the family unit but extend throughout the village, involving clans and tribes, and include relationships at the provincial, district, and national levels (Gibson, 2012).

At independence, there was a long history of active civil societies fostering nonmarket socioeconomic relationships and the formation of social wealth within both the indigenous Fijian and the Indo-Fijian communities. For most of the post-independence period, state policy has been shaped by an elite, which has used ethnic identity as the basis for political mobilization in Fiji, and these ethnic divisions persist in Fijian civil society.

With respect to climate change, a National Climate Change Country Team has existed since 1997 with members from government, NGOs, civil society organizations (CSOs), and academic institutions. It was established to oversee work on Fiji's Initial National Communications report to the UNFCCC in 2005 and was inactive for some years after that. Revived in 2010, it is now recognized as the main platform for climate change information sharing in the country. CSOs that undertake work in climate change adaptation usually do so at the village level, where initiatives can range from community water storage management to planting climate resilient crops.

3 PROJECT AND IMPACT

Figure 1: Map of the case study locations, Viti Levu island, Fiji



Source: Adapted from Geographic Guide (n.d.).

This section presents the results of research into the Fiji component of the project Capacity Building to Enable the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries (CBDAMPIC). CBDAMPIC was implemented between January 2002 and March 2005 in the Cook Islands, Fiji, Samoa, and Vanuatu with funding from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The project was implemented through the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) with national implementation hubs in each focus country.⁵

The CBDAMPIC project aimed to improve the sustainable livelihoods of Pacific Island people by increasing their capacity to adapt to climate-related risks. Besides supporting national-level initiatives to raise awareness and commitment to mainstreaming climate change in national and sectoral politics, the project also worked to

1. Increase the awareness of pilot communities of the vulnerabilities associated with climate change and adaptation options available; and
2. Establish community pilot projects that reduced the communities' vulnerabilities to climate change risks, including through community assessments to identify solutions to be carried out.

When it commenced, CBDAMPIC was one of the first adaptation projects in the Pacific that attempted to work at this community scale to build resilience to the longer-term impacts of climate change. Other investments were focused on national capacity building or efforts to address short-term climate variability. Fiji's pilot adaptation projects were established in Bavu, Tilivalevu, and Volivoli villages. This case study does not look at the Volivoli pilot project, as it was extensively damaged when Cyclone Winston ravaged Fiji in February 2016.

Bavu and Tilivalevu are located in the vicinity of Fiji's international airport, Nadi, in the west of Viti Levu. Tilivalevu village lies in the province of Nadroga/Navosa, 10–20 kilometers from Nadroga's central business district of Sigatoka. Situated in the mountains, Tilivalevu is surrounded by steep slopes. Bavu village is in the district (*Tikina*) of Wai in the province of Nadroga/Navosa and is a 10- to 20-minute drive from Nadi town.

THE PROJECT APPROACH AND ACTIVITIES

The CBDAMPIC project combined a top-down and a bottom-up approach to adaptation. The project recognized that local solutions should be the basis for longer-term adaptation to climate change and that these must be developed and learned at the community scale. Thus the project used a bottom-up vulnerability assessment approach, which was quite different from a scenario-driven top-down approach. The bottom-up approach starts with community knowledge and then seeks to link this with scientific knowledge. In a top-down approach the starting point would be the global climate models (GCMs) and regional climate models (RCMs), followed by an attempt to drill down to a smaller scale. The project was carried out through existing national institutional channels, including collaboration with Fiji's Ministry of Local Government, Housing, and Environment, which handled the climate change portfolio at the time. Within six months of project launch, the project signed a memorandum of understanding to formalize the collaboration that was the basis of the project's implementation plans.

Central to the bottom-up vulnerability assessment approach was its ability to facilitate learning-by-doing through field implementation to empower the local populace using participatory methods. In addition to the assessments, the project carried out awareness activities in both sites included in this case study. A climate change information kit was assembled in English, Fijian, and Fiji-Hindi. Building on the awareness activities, community approval was sought and granted for project activities to be implemented once SPREP and CIDA had granted their approval. In all these deliberations, meetings, and community gatherings, climate change discussions were undertaken informally and community views were shared freely.

SPREP developed awareness materials for policy makers, and the Fiji implementation team complemented these with a climate change awareness kit for policy makers. Institutional mainstreaming activities included

- Developing climate change policies;
- Incorporating climate change adaptation into national and sectoral development policies and plans and strategic development plans;
- Incorporating climate change adaptation into environmental impact assessments; and
- Developing capacity on project management, participatory approaches, and awareness programs.

The bottom-up community assessments revealed that both communities suffered from severe water shortages, and addressing them became the central aim of the community-level adaptation activities. The following sections provide details of the implementation of the CDAMPIC project in Bavu and Tilivalevu villages.

Tilivalevu Village Pilot Project

Tilivalevu experiences periods of dry spells, which contributed to shortages in the village's water supply before the CBDAMPIC project was implemented. During rainy weather, travel to and from the village is a challenge owing to muddy roads, which can become slippery and dangerous for drivers. Not only is Tilivalevu vulnerable to droughts, but it is also exposed to cyclones.



Two water tanks installed in Tilivalevu by the CDAMPIC project. Photo: Nakalevu (2006).

Building on the awareness raising and community assessment, the CBDAMPIC adaptation pilot project in Tilivalevu was set up to address the water shortage issue. Two water tanks were installed with the assistance of Lautoka's Public Works Department, now known as the Water Authority of Fiji, with each household owning a water tap or faucet. The village has a dam that is connected to the two tanks from which piped water is drawn. The CBDAMPIC project also contributed to purchasing pipes to replace the old ones and to refurbishing the village dam.

Bavu Village Pilot Project

Bavu prioritized water shortages as the major climate-related vulnerability affecting their daily livelihoods through the community vulnerability and adaptation action process conducted by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) as part of the project. The problem stemmed from both climate and non-climate conditions. The village experiences seasonal droughts that are particularly extreme in El Niño years. In addition, its original water tank had only limited capacity and was unable to meet the needs of the growing population. At the time of the project, the community water tank had a capacity of 27,300 liters, which could serve a total of 20–25 households, but the village already had 50–55 households. Water from the local borehole was sometimes unavailable because the pump that drew the water would break down. Severe water shortages during the dry seasons already forced the community to ration water, and any future increase in drought conditions would lead to even more serious water shortages.

Building on the awareness raising and community assessment, the villagers decided that their adaptation action would be to increase the storage capacity of their water tank to 45,500 liters. Water was pumped to the tank from a borehole. The tank allowed the villagers to gain access to a greater volume of water. They also came up with the idea of putting gutters on a nearby church to harvest rainwater. Materials were bought and village carpenters installed the gutters. The effective roof area of the church is more than 200 square meters. Given a yearly rainfall of 1,500 mm, this innovation contributes 300 cubic meters (300,000 liters) of water a year to the community.

PROJECT OUTCOMES

Tilivalevu Village Outcomes

Even before the implementation of the CBDAMPIC, Tilivalevu villagers were experiencing an increased demand for water. During a participatory rural exercise conducted through the Development of Sustainable Agriculture Project (DSAP)—funded by the European Union and implemented through the Secretariat of the Pacific Community—villagers had highlighted the need for an adequate supply of water for agricultural production. The main purpose of the DSAP was to enhance farmers' food security and livelihood options. At the time, Tilivalevu was predominantly involved in livestock production and subsistence agriculture. The DSAP was innovative in introducing semi-commercial farming involving both seasonal and off-season vegetables.⁶ As part of the pilot project, family units set aside one acre for the project. Despite this success, farmers still had difficulty gaining access to water and finding means of watering plants, prompting the DSAP to purchase extra watering drums and plastic gallon containers. Thus this introduction of sloping agriculture in the area meant an increased demand for water, and the CBDAMPIC project was seen by the community as important in responding to the scarcity of water in the village and the extra burden imposed on women and youths who had to cart water from nearby streams in a mountainous, sloping area.

The CBDAMPIC project included drilling a borehole and enhancing water harvesting through new tanks (Kouwenhoven and Cheatham, 2006). Since the CBDAMPIC project, community members reported that they have not experienced any water shortages, but rather have an abundance of water. The only time they now experience water shortage is when a household pipe is accidentally damaged and water is shut down to enable repair work to go ahead. Women reported that the installation of the water tanks has also brought them relief because they no longer have to expend as much energy collecting water to meet the daily needs of their families and community.

The abundant water supply has enabled the villagers to expand their agricultural activities from farming fruits, root crops, and green leafy vegetables to planting a variety of vegetables, especially off-season ones. Vegetables from Tilivalevu are now sold at the local market and are sometimes sold to hotels and supermarkets. One of Fiji's well-known suppliers of major hotels and supermarkets recently ran out of vegetables and traveled to Tilivalevu village just to buy these off-season vegetables. While this surprised the villagers, it also brought them satisfaction and a realization of how economically productive they had become. In addition, freshwater prawns have recently been found in nearby streams, and these are now an additional source of income for the village. During the Methodist church gatherings in the province, Tilivalevu is now usually assigned to contribute prawn dishes, as they are well known for producing large prawns and for cooking tasty prawn dishes that include vegetables from their gardens.

The CBDAMPIC project was hailed as a success by the Tilivalevu villagers for having addressed the community's vulnerability not only to drought, but also indirectly to other hazards such as cyclones. The income generated by increased agricultural production has enabled villagers to build flush toilets and concrete houses, which are safer than their previous corrugated iron or wooden houses. During Cyclone Winston, people took shelter in their concrete homes.

We no longer worry about the dry spells. When our friends or relatives from the neighboring village appear, requesting to drink kava⁷ here, it is then that we realize that the drought season has started (leader of women's community group).

According to the Tilivalevu village chief, the CBDAMPIC pilot project has greatly influenced their social and economic lives. In fact, the abundant water they now enjoy has helped to trigger new ideas and projects. For example, the village has embarked on a mahogany tree-planting project as a source of income. The project was introduced by the Tilivalevu village chief, with funding contributed by the villagers themselves. This project also includes a mahogany nursery. With greater access to water, the tree nursery is running well and young plants can be easily watered.

In summing up what resilience means for Tilivalevu, the son of the village chief and member of the village youth made the following statement:

Water is our life. When we have access to water that is flowing freely, without drying, to cater for our essential household and community needs, we know that we are achieving resilience.

Bavu Village Outcomes

The research revealed mixed outcomes from the Bavu project activities. The gutters on the church roof were effective in collecting water during the rainy season and are still useful for water harvesting. As a consequence, women are walking less for water daily and during dry periods. However, the investment in a new large water tank was not successful:

The metal tank provided [in the project] was very helpful for us. However, our happiness was short-lived when the tank became useless within one year because of rust (men's focus group).

Focus group discussions in the research revealed the villagers' disappointment; they saw the failure of the water tank as a failure of the CBDAMPIC project to address their water needs and, consequently, their livelihoods. According to an independent water engineer who voluntarily worked on other projects in Bavu, the rust problem may have been caused by the high levels of manganese in Bavu. These high levels were found in the soil when tests were conducted by an independent entity at the project site many years before. When the researcher visited the site of the water tank, it was immediately obvious that the tank was not in use. According to Bavu's volunteer water engineer, it would have been appropriate for the CBDAMPIC project to work with the Water Authority of Fiji or other relevant entities at the project's inception to ensure that a feasibility study was conducted before the purchase of the metal water tank:

One year after the tank was installed, it became useless because of rust. It would have been great for someone to return to Bavu one year after tank installation to monitor progress (volunteer water engineer and water consultant for Bavu).

In addition, the size of the tank was already deemed inadequate to meet the increase in the number of houses being built. A 2006 economic assessment of the pilot projects found that, given the population growth and climate variation then facing Bavu, the village would need a larger water tank to meet people's needs, especially during the dry seasons (Kouwenhoven and Cheatham, 2006). These problems were not picked up in project reporting or evaluation, and as a result the project was largely seen as a disappointment at the local level.⁸

In focus group discussions undertaken in Bavu, villagers identified their vulnerability to drought as an ongoing issue. Since the tank's failure, women have taken the lead in their households in regulating the use of water, and children caught playing with or wasting water are disciplined:

We are teaching and emphasizing to our children to save the little water we have (young nursing mother).

Villagers increasingly recognize women's important role as facilitators of change, particularly in leading such autonomous adaptation.

Although water issues in Bavu are ongoing, internal safety nets enable the villagers to adapt to changing circumstances. As will be discussed below, these safety nets are rooted in their social capital. The resilience of the Bavu village community is summed up in the following words of a village elder:

Resilience is learning from what was done in the past and moving forward with our vision to ensure that we have water for the villagers. Although the CBDAMPIC project was not successful in the first year, we are still happy knowing that it has revealed the problem we have and has also provided leeway for other projects⁹ to build on and which have improved our access to quality drinking water. Our capacity compared with the past has improved and helped us to organize ourselves better in terms of planning and monitoring our own water usage (Bavu village chief).

4 ANALYSIS

ELEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH IMPROVED RESILIENCE OUTCOMES

This section presents some elements of the project that were found to be associated with improved resilience in the research. Oxfam’s resilience framework—in particular the six change processes that drive progress toward resilience capacities—is used to guide the discussion in this section and the following one.

Empowerment includes processes for promoting gender justice and enhancing voice, empowerment and participation, conflict resolution, and psychological resilience.

An important element of the CBDAMPIC project was the extensive community engagement, using the participatory community vulnerability and adaptation action (CV&A) approach to understand the extent of the communities’ vulnerability to climate change. Through this bottom-up approach, members of the communities identified and prioritized adaptation measures and ultimately formulated and confirmed the adaptation measures most relevant to them. Communities possess pertinent information on climate variability that is useful for the vulnerability assessment process, and people’s perceptions and contributions formed a central element of the project. This was in line with the project’s aim of ensuring that an enabling environment was created to build resilience to the current and future impacts of climate change.

This bottom-up approach promoted ownership and empowerment on the part of those whose voices were not usually heard: women and youth. Vulnerability assessment tools have been used in recognition of the differences in power relations at the household and community levels. In women’s focus groups held as part of the research, women recalled that they were separated from men during the vulnerability and adaptation assessments, although the participation of then pregnant or nursing mothers (or other groups of women less likely to engage in community workshops) could not be verified through the gender-disaggregated data for participation in the project.

A respected female program manager led the CBDAMPIC project, and this was, particularly at the time of the project, uncommon in the predominantly patriarchal society of Fiji. Oxfam defines resilience as the ability of women and men to realize their rights and improve their well-being despite shocks, stresses, and uncertainty. Oxfam puts women’s rights at the center of all its programming, recognizing that promoting women’s rights is necessary to achieve gender justice. This is also critical to achieving resilient development outcomes. Resilience programming should aim to develop win-win solutions that respond to women’s immediate needs, address the systemic causes of their vulnerability, and enhance their capacities, agency, and leadership.

Securing and enhancing livelihoods refers to processes for securing and building human, social, natural, physical, and financial capital and household assets based on the sustainable livelihoods framework.

The project built on its understanding of the community context, including livelihood assets and social and cultural norms and systems. In particular, social assets such as collaboration and social capital were an important foundation for the project. These social assets provided a support system for Bavu and Tilivalevu to work toward resilient development.

Social capital is an important element of resilience, including in villages like Bavu and Tilivalevu.¹⁰ Fijians in villages have close kinship and traditional ties; everyone in a village is considered one family. This means that resources are owned not by individuals but communally, and depend to a large extent on family and clan ties. The crux of social capital in Bavu and Tilivalevu is trust, which allows members of the village to work collaboratively on common goals.

Our collaboration as a village is an essential element of our resilience (village chief, Tilivalevu).

Social capital and collaboration are important for building villagers' capacity to work together when new technologies or projects are introduced in the village. In Tilivalevu, working together enabled the villagers to produce a sufficient and ready supply of vegetables to meet the high demand for vegetables from local consumers in Sigatoka town and as well as from hotels and supermarkets. Their competitive advantage has enabled them to control the price of their differentiated commodities and helped create a niche market.¹¹ In addition, Tilivalevu women collaborate to provide breakfast and dinner for their children attending boarding school by taking turns providing food.

The CBDAMPIC project team recognized and used traditional practices to build rapport and relationships from the outset of the project. In village settings like Bavu and Tilivalevu, it was important for the village chiefs or designated leaders to be consulted for their blessings prior to project execution, leveraging their support and assistance.

When government officials or visitors bring their sevusevu,¹² we embrace them because we are open to new ideas (men's focus group).

With support from the chiefs, the project could move ahead, because the chiefs could directly enlist the support of the villagers, who for the most part are obligated by tradition to cooperate. In the Fijian village, approval of the chiefs signifies approval of the people they represent. However, because Fiji is highly patriarchal and the chiefs are male, women and other marginalized groups, like people with disabilities, are typically less able to influence community decisions than men are.

Informing encompasses processes that develop information and knowledge to support decision-making and action.

The combination of top-down and bottom-up approaches contributed to the successful implementation of outputs at both national and community levels. It is increasingly well recognized globally and in the Pacific that communities possess qualitative, traditional knowledge that can help them adapt to climate change and build their own resilience. Integrating global, regional, and national scientific evidence with local knowledge through participatory processes sets the tone for including communities in understanding the potential risks they are exposed to and encourages their inputs in decision-making (Des Combes et al., 2012). The approach used in the project provided knowledge on the disconnect between policy and local practice and the need to connect them to enable the implementation of policies through local action.

The project increased awareness of climate change at the national and community level by disseminating climate information kits that were tailor-made for these communities. Armed with this information, communities could better identify adaptation measures relevant to their specific situations. After the awareness-raising activities, a simple survey found that the people of Tilivalevu and Bavu were well aware of climate change and adaptation issues and the vulnerabilities they face. Communities also discussed what actions they should take to reduce the adverse effects of climate change. These actions included a reduction in the cutting down of trees in the watersheds and the cultivation of steep slopes. An assessment by the CBDAMPIC project has also indicated a marked improvement in the climate change and adaptation knowledge of senior government officers collaborating closely with the CBDAMPIC project. These officers are representatives of mainstream government ministries whose capacity has been built by the project through seminars, reviews of community vulnerability and adaptation assessment reports, and the development of the climate change policy.

Accountable governing encompasses processes that secure accountable and enabling states and institutions.

The project's emphasis on collaboration between stakeholders at various levels facilitated resilient development. The involvement of the government of Fiji, communities, and all stakeholders at the planning stage was crucial to assuring efficient and effective implementation, encouraging ownership at all levels, and strengthening partnerships. This broad collaboration also gave the project coordinator leverage in obtaining the required formal approvals on time and in obtaining relevant technical advice, direction, and support from those who were going to implement the project on the ground.¹³ This groundwork was achieved through national institutional channels that already existed, particularly Fiji's Ministry of Local Government, Housing, and Environment, which handled the climate change portfolio at the time. This collaboration was an important step not only in establishing the institutional

arrangements for the project, which involved recruiting a project coordinator to oversee implementation, and the signing of formal agreements between SPREP and the ministry as the focal point for SPREP in Fiji, but also to ensure that the project built on national climate change initiatives and platforms that were active or completed at the time. Additionally, involvement of the Climate Change Country Team (CCCT) and the CBDAMPIC project core group as stakeholders was significant as these two groups included technical experts at national and regional levels in the country, including civil society. One indicator of strong collaboration among all parties at the commencement of the project was the signing of the memorandum of understanding within six months of project execution.

This approach also built linkages between national institutions and communities; both levels were given weight in local and national project plans and discussions. At the time of CBDAMPIC, the importance of such linkages was only beginning to be recognized. The CBDAMPIC's implementation approach of institutional linkages and awareness raising was highly innovative given that previous projects had used one or the other of these approaches but not both (Nakalevu, 2005). Within just three years, project activities worked to strengthen collaboration among different stakeholders, resulted in coalition-building across sectors, and helped strengthen integration both vertically and horizontally. This approach ensures the continuity of efforts on the ground and enhancement of capacity, especially within a community setting, and it exemplifies the importance of cross-sectoral integration at all levels. Resilience is not the result of achieving project outcomes from the CBDAMPIC project alone. It should involve integration at all levels, horizontally and vertically, through accountable institutions.

Learning includes processes that enable people to learn together, support experimentation, and increase the potential for social and technological innovation.

Adaptive management was critical to address project implementation and ongoing engagement with the regional donor (SPREP) through formal and informal mechanisms. A key input to such adaptive management should be monitoring and evaluation to track and validate project impacts. A greater commitment to monitoring would have revealed the issue with the water tank in Bavu and allowed it to be rectified before the tank failed completely.

A linked contributing factor to the successful execution of the pilot projects was the funding for practical adaptation actions, which engendered “learning by doing” actions on the ground that were fully recommended and supported by the communities. This is community empowerment: where communities have the opportunity to execute adaptation measures to develop resilience with respect to the daily challenges they face. Because these were pilot projects, there was always room to exercise flexibility and to create an adaptive learning environment that would improve people's living conditions and provide them with the satisfaction they yearned for.

SEQUENCING AND TIMING: A CATALYST FOR MORE RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT

Flexible and forward-looking planning refers to processes that enable and enhance collective, forward-looking, and flexible decision-making.

As an early example of adaptation at the community level in the Pacific, the CBDAMPIC provided an important foundation for subsequent projects. One project that the women's focus group in Bavu highlighted as a successful model for adaptation was the Climate Change Adaptation Project, which was implemented after the CBDAMPIC project with the advice and support of the Ministry of Local Government, Housing, and Environment. Funded by the Australian government and implemented through Fiji's University of the South Pacific from 2006 to 2009, the project left a positive impression on the women's focus group. They could still recall the types of questions posed to them by the university during the vulnerability and adaptation assessment as well as the full name of the project coordinator and her village. It took a while for the university to gauge community trust at project commencement because of the failure of the water tank under the CBDAMPIC project. But the Australian-funded project led to improvements in the water piping system resulting in one pipe or faucet per household and a new borehole water pump. This was a major boost to Bavu's water access to water. An improved water reticulation system was also built, with five additional water tanks placed at strategic spots in the village to collect rainwater, beginning with one by the village church. The CBDAMPIC project had begun raising awareness about climate change, and the CCAP project built upon this.

The Australian government project helped the village form a water committee and develop a community water plan. Mainstreamed into the traditional governance structure of Bavu, the water committee enabled collaboration on the management and monitoring of water issues in the village. To date this committee is still functional. Villagers are working on a five-year plan for the village, with the elders mentoring the youths and the younger married men on traditional leadership and protocols. Women have a working women's group, or *Soqosoqo ni marama*, that voices their concerns during monthly village meetings. They have been active in implementing village projects, such as the construction of the village bus shelter. The women work as a close-knit group and share water issues in village meetings because they are at the front lines of this problem (Dumaru et al., 2012).

Bavu villagers now have greater access to water, although their water problem has still not been fully resolved. Community discussions for this case study document recent water shortages and the need for ongoing water conservation efforts. Bavu villagers provide an example of a community that remains determined to improve their water situation despite the continued stresses and shocks experienced. The Climate Change Adaptation Project addressed the failure of the water tank under the CBDAMPIC project, and this has enabled people not only to survive but to strengthen their defenses. The survival of the village depends on the availability of water, and despite their ongoing water issues, Bavu has built safer, concrete houses with the assistance of an American NGO, Footpaths. The women's focus group confirmed that during Cyclone Winston, villagers took shelter in their own homes if they were concrete, or with relatives who owned a concrete house. With the additional water available under the CCAP project, households have innovated to use their limited water resources to generate an income stream. Women from five households in the village sell ice blocks and homemade fruit juice. Because the borehole has an electrical pump, each family is required to contribute US\$2.50 (5FJD) a month toward the village electricity bill. Income from the sale of ice blocks and juice has helped these women to contribute money toward paying this and other bills on behalf of their families.

The CBDAMPIC project was ambitious in its scope and aims, and during project execution community participation and consultation helped develop community-specific aims and objectives. The path to more resilient development for communities begins with the alignment of a project's aims and objectives with local development priorities and plans. In this way, communities will recognize the value of their participation and will likely draw attention to other projects for potential synergies. The commitment to participatory CV&As from the outset was essential to refine the wide scope of the project and address high-priority local issues—in this case, water availability. Notwithstanding the failure of the metal water tank in Bavu, the CBDAMPIC project laid important groundwork for subsequent projects that were able to address this issue. This sequence of development investments has catalyzed more resilient development in both locations, with improved water management, reduced time for gathering water, and new economic opportunities through agriculture and the sale of ice blocks. The scope of the initial CBDAMPIC project was recognized as ambitious and, as noted, it was one of the first of its kind in the Pacific so the implementers faced a steep learning curve. Being ambitious can drive change, but it can also be impractical when a range of activities must be implemented within a limited time, especially in situations of low capacity, distant locations, and limited resources. Learning from the experiences of the CBDAMPIC project can inform future projects to set ambitious yet realistic goals.

5 CONCLUSIONS

These conclusions reflect on the three resilience capacities identified in the Oxfam Resilience Framework: absorptive capacity, adaptive capacity, and transformative capacity

The work undertaken through the CBDAMPIC project catalyzed more resilient development in both communities, particularly by improving absorptive capacity with respect to water shortages. It is an example of how addressing a locally defined problem—in this case, extreme water shortage—can energize a community to take action to create more resilience. Compared with 2002 when the CBDAMPIC project began and water shortages were severe, both communities now have greater access to water through better water infrastructure, although Bavu's situation still needs attention. It is notable that some of those who left the two villages to gain access to water elsewhere have returned because of the improved situation. Bavu in particular demonstrates the power of absorptive capacity, one of Oxfam's three capacities for resilience. Despite the Bavu villagers' ongoing problems with lack of regular water supply, they continue to thrive in the face of hardship. When confronting difficulty (i.e., the failed tank), they showed their flexibility by focusing more heavily on water use efficiency and on getting other money for subsequent projects.

In both cases the actions to alleviate water shortages have led to greater adaptive capacity through increased incomes (as in Tilivalevu) or access to other donor funds (as in Bavu). Families in both communities have used water to meet other development objectives, such as enabling innovation and entrepreneurship, generating income, reducing the time women spend hunting for water or water sources, and including women in village decision-making forums. Those involved in agriculture are making better use of their land by diversifying their crops. Agricultural productivity has increased in Tilivalevu, with its improved position in the vegetable niche market. In addition, the community is engaged in sustainable practices in sloping land agriculture and forestry and has enhanced villagers' food security. Both communities are exposed to droughts and cyclones, and the provision of water tanks and guttering in Tilivalevu and Bavu, respectively, has helped reduce their exposure to such hazards and build resilience against them. Their improved economic circumstances also allowed them to build stronger concrete houses, which were put to the test during Cyclone Winston in 2016.

One key factor in their resilience is their existing social capital, especially their family and traditional kinship ties, which encourage collaboration and working together as one family to achieve common goals. Tilivalevu's social capital has contributed to the village's successes: The pilot project included the installation of two tanks, which are still working without any issues. The villagers cultivate a variety of crops, creating a buffer against shocks and stresses and providing a shield against pest and disease outbreaks. The economic advantage of Tilivalevu has enabled women to be key contributors to their children's education through collaborating to support their daily nutrition. Social capital also acts as a bridge between communication and collaboration. This bridge is built on a foundation of trust, equity, and recognition that each individual member is an asset to the community with his or her own unique capabilities. When these assets are pooled, they can generate the capacity to jointly and innovatively address vulnerabilities. This situation also promotes a culture of learning whereby communities can analyze any shortcomings encountered internally so that collaboratively they can act on lessons they have learned in the process. Collaboration fosters social solidarity, builds long-lasting relationships, and strengthens social capital and the economic potential of communities.

Project implementation in Bavu and Tilivalevu—linked with important national initiatives—points to the significance of building on previous and ongoing processes and initiatives to keep the momentum and cycle of the project moving while avoiding duplication. Resilience as exemplified in this research can be achieved not by implementing one climate change adaptation project alone but rather by building on and drawing from commonalities and opportunities provided by projects that have been implemented in the same community. This approach ensures the continuity of capacity-building efforts so that adaptive capacity and achievement of sustainable livelihood goals evolve and grow throughout the process without being too ad hoc. Communities need to achieve transformative resilience, and this is an ongoing process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Australian Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation). (2011). *Climate Change in the Pacific: Scientific Assessment and New Research*. Volume 2: Country Reports, pp. 75–92.
- Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2017). Fiji. Retrieved from <http://smartraveller.gov.au/Countries/pacific/Pages/fiji.aspx> (accessed May 7, 2017).
- Barber, R. (2015). *One Size Doesn't Fit All: Tailoring the International Response to the National Need Following Vanuatu's Cyclone Pam*. Save the Children Australia, CARE Australia, Oxfam Australia, and World Vision Australia.
- Bates, B.C., Z. W. Kundzewicz, S. Wu, and J. P. Palutikof, Eds. (2008). *Climate Change and Water*. Technical Paper of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Geneva: IPCC Secretariat.
- Bell, J.D., J.E. Johnson, A.S. Ganachaud, P.C. Gehrke, A.J. Hobday, O. Hoegh-Guldberg, R. Le Borgne, P. Lehodey, J.M. Lough, T. Pickering, M.S. Pratchett, and M. Waycott. (2011). *Vulnerability of Tropical Pacific Fisheries and Aquaculture to Climate Change: Summary for Pacific Island Countries and Territories*. Noumea, New Caledonia: Secretariat of the Pacific Community.
- Béné, C., R.G. Wood, A. Newsham, and M. Davies. (2012). *Resilience: New Utopia or New Tyranny? Reflection about the Potentials and Limits of the Concept of Resilience in Relation to Vulnerability Reduction Programmes*. IDS Working Paper Number 405. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.ids.ac.uk/publication/resilience-new-utopia-or-new-tyranny>.
- CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). (2017). The World Factbook: Fiji. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/fj.html>.
- Department for International Development (DFID). (1999). *Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance*. Retrieved from <http://www.enonline.net/dfidsustainableliving>.
- Des Combes, H., S.L. Hemstock, E.A. Holland, and V. Iese. (2012). *Integrating Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction at Local Level: How to Combine Modern Science and Local Knowledge to Reduce Communities' Vulnerability*. In Pacific Voices: Local Governments and Climate Change Conference Papers, University of the South Pacific (USP) Pacific Centre for Environment and Sustainable Development (Pace-SD), Commonwealth Local Government Pacific Forum, July 2012.
- Dumaru, P., V. Jeke, R. Simpson, and V. Ratukalou 2012. *The adaptive capacity of three Fijian village communities: Bavu, Druadrua and Navukailagi*. Commonwealth of Australia, under the Pacific Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning (PACCSAP).
- Elbehri, A., A. Genest, and M. Burfisher. (2011). *Global Action on Climate Change in Agriculture: Linkages to Food Security, Markets, and Trade Policies in Developing Countries*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Fairbairn-Dunlop, P. (2009). *Pacific Prevention of Domestic Violence Programme: Vanuatu Report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). (2012). *Building Resilience for Adaptation to Climate Change in the Agriculture Sector*. Proceedings of a Joint FAO/OECD Workshop, April 23–24. Rome: FAO.
- Fordham, M., S. Gupta, S. Akerkar, and M. Scharf. (2011). *Leading Resilient Development Grassroots Women's Priorities, Practices, and Innovations*. New York: United Nations Development Programme and GROOTS International.

- Furneaux, C., and K. Brown. (2007). Indigenous Entrepreneurship: An Analysis of Capital Constraints. In L.M. Gillin (Ed.), *4th AGSE International Entrepreneurship Research Exchange 2007*, February 6–9, Brisbane, Australia.
- Geographic Guide. (n.d.) Map of Fiji Islands. Retrieved from <http://www.geographicguide.com/oceania-maps/fiji-islands.htm>.
- Gibson, D. (2012). The Cultural Challenges Faced by Indigenous Owned Enterprises (SMTEs) in Fiji. *Journal of Pacific Studies*, 32: 2.
- Government of the Republic of Fiji (2005). *Initial National Communication under the UNFCCC*. Suva, Fiji.
- . (2007b). *Water Authority of Fiji Promulgation 2007* (No. 25 of 2007). Suva, Fiji.
- . (2013). *Republic of Fiji: Second National Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change*. Suva, Fiji: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- . (2015). *Intended Nationally Determined Contribution under the UNFCCC*. Suva, Fiji.
- . (2016). *Cyclone Winston Post Disaster Needs Assessment*. Suva, Fiji.
- . (2007a). *Census: Population and Demography*. Suva, Fiji: Fiji Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from <http://www.statsfiji.gov.fj/statistics/social-statistics/population-and-demographic-indicators>.
- . (2012). *Republic of Fiji National Climate Change Policy*. Suva, Fiji: Secretariat of the Pacific Community.
- Kahan D. (2013). *Market Oriented Farming: An Overview*. Farm Management Extension Guide. Rome: FAO.
- Kouwenhoven, P. and C. Cheatham. (2006). *Capacity Building to Enable the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries (CBDAMPIC) Economic Assessment of Pilots: Final Report to SPREP*. University of Waikato, New Zealand.
- Lal, B.V. (2012). Madness in May: George Speight and the Unmaking of Modern Fiji. In B.V. Lal (Ed.), *Fiji before the Storm: Elections and the Politics of Development*. Canberra, Australia: ANU Press.
- Nakalevu, T., P. Carruthers, B. Phillips, V. Saena, I. Neitoga, and B. Bishop. (2005). *Community-Level Adaptation to Climate Change: Action in the Pacific*. Proceedings of the Regional Workshop on Community-Level Adaptation to Climate Change, Suva, Fiji: 21-23 March 2005. Suva, Fiji: Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP).
- Nakalevu, T. (2006). *Capacity Building for the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries (CBDAMPIC) Project Final Report*. Suva, Fiji: Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and Canadian International Development Agency.
- Newland, L. (2016). From the Land to the Sea: Christianity, Community, and State in Fiji and the 2014 Elections. In S. Ratuva and S. Lawson (Eds.), *The People Have Spoken: The 2014 Elections in Fiji*. Canberra, Australia: ANU Press.
- Oxfam (2016). *Oxfam Framework and Guidance for Resilient Development: "The Future Is a Choice."* Retrieved from <http://oxfamlibrary.openrepository.com/oxfam/bitstream/10546/604990/1/ml-resilience-framework-guide-120416-en.pdf>.
- . (2013). *No Accident: Resilience and the Inequality of Risk*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/no-accident-resilience-and-inequality-risk>.
- Pacific Climate Change Science Program partners. 2011. Fiji Meteorological Service, Australian Bureau of Meteorology, and CSIRO (Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research

Organisation). *Current and Future Climate of the Fiji Islands*. Australia: Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning Program (PACCSAPP).

- Parliament of the Republic of Fiji. (2017). Members of Parliament. Retrieved from <http://www.parliament.gov.fj/members-of-parliament/>.
- Smit, B. and D. McFadzien (2002). Validation Mission of Capacity Building for the Development of Adaptation Measures in Pacific Island Countries (CBDAMPIC), a project of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) for Asia Branch Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). Apia, Samoa: SPREP.
- Smyth, I., and C. Sweetman. (2015). Introduction: Gender and Resilience. *Gender and Development*, 23 (3): 405–414.
- SPC (Secretariat of the Pacific Community). (2008). *Traditional Marine Resource Management and Knowledge Information Bulletin #24*, December 2008.
- . (2009). *Case Studies: Lessons from the Field: DSAP Experience*. Noumea, New Caledonia: SPC.
- . (2009). *Case Studies: Lessons from the Field: DSAP Experience*. Noumea, New Caledonia: SPC.
- . (2016). *Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific: An Integrated Approach to Address Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management 2017–2030*. Noumea, New Caledonia: SPC.
- SPREP (South Pacific Regional Environment Programme). (2003). CBDAMPIC Project Description. *CBDAMPIC Newsletter*, 1, no.1 (April).
- . (2017). About Us. Retrieved from <http://www.sprep.org/about-us>.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (2016). *Human Development Report 2016: Human Development for Everyone*. New York.
- UNESCAP (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia Pacific). (2014). Pacific Perspectives Policy Brief 01 2014. Bangkok.
- UNIFEM Pacific (United Nations Development Fund for Women). (2010). *Ending Violence against Women and Girls: Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography*. Suva, Fiji.
- UNISDR (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction) and UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (2012). *Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific: An Institutional and Policy Analysis*. Suva, Fiji: UNISDR and UNDP.
- UNOCHA (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs). (2016). Fiji Flash Appeal Tropical Cyclone Winston, February, 2016. Suva, Fiji: UNOCHA.
- WHO (World Health Organization). (2017). Global Health Observatory Data Repository. Retrieved from <http://apps.who.int/gho/data/node.country.country-FJI>.
- World Bank (2012). *Acting on Climate Change and Disaster Risk for the Pacific*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- . (2017). World Bank Data. Data estimates for 2015 accessed online at <http://data.worldbank.org/country/fiji>.
- Yila, O., W. Weber, and A. Neef. (2014). The Role of Social Capital in Post-Flood Response and Recovery among Downstream Communities of the Ba River, Western Viti Levu, Fiji Islands In A. Neef and R. Shaw (Eds.), *Community, Environment, and Disaster Risk Management*, Volume 14, *Risks and Conflicts: Local Responses to Natural Disasters*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

NOTES

1 This section is adapted from Oxfam International (2016).

2 Based on World Bank estimates for 2015 and accessed online at World Bank (2017).

3 WHO data suggest that 52 percent lived in urban areas in 2010 (WHO, 2017).

4 These data are drawn from the Fiji country-specific publication of Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning Program 2011.

5 SPREP has been charged by the governments and administrations of the Pacific region with the protection and sustainable development of the region's environment (SPREP, 2017).

6 This practice was semi-commercial because the commodities were used for both consumption and commercial purposes.

7 *Kava* is a traditional ceremonial drink derived from the plant *Piper methysticum*.

8 According to SPREP staff, the community in Bavu shares some of the responsibility for the project's failures. They point to a difference in the level of engagement in the two communities: the community members in Tilivalevu were enthusiastic and supportive, going out of their way to assist the team, while the community in Bavu was less engaged and even perceived as passive. SPREP staff argued that the community in Bavu know the context best and should have taken action to address the problem before the tanks rusted, but they did not (written communication with SPREP staff, July 2017).

9 This refers to the Australian Government Climate Change Adaptation Project, which is discussed further below.

10 According to Secretariat of the Pacific Community's (SPC) Traditional Marine Resource Management and Knowledge Information Bulletin #24 of December 2008, social capital is a set of values, such as the norms of reciprocity, and social relations embedded in the social structure of a society that enable people to act collectively to achieve their desired goals.

11 Differentiation is when farmers produce specialized crops for a limited niche market. A niche market is the result of the production of these specialized products, usually available only at certain times of the year, by a small pool of farmers (FAO, 2013).

12 *Sevusevu* is the presentation of *kava* to chiefs when visitors enter a village for the first time.

13 These implementers included, for example, the Public Works Department, now known as Water Authority of Fiji, and those at the village level.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Independent consultant Beverly Sadole conducted the field research and was the primary author of this report; she was unable to complete the report, however. Independent consultant Julie Webb served as editor and contributed valuable analysis to the report. Oxfam is deeply grateful to both of them for producing this report.

Many thanks to Rachel Dacks and the following Oxfam staff for their review of drafts of the report: Teresa Cavero, Kata Duaibe, and Haroon Khan. And we appreciate the copyediting, translation, and publication support of Heidi Fritschel, Tania Góchez, and Oxfam's Helen Bunting, respectively. Final thanks to the Oxfam Resilience Knowledge Hub for their support with the production and dissemination of the research. Tara Gingerich also served as the editor for the research series.

Above all, this report would not be possible without the openness and engagement of the community members and leaders in Bavu and Tilivalevu, as well as the other stakeholders with who contributed to our research.

Oxfam Research Reports

Oxfam Research Reports are written to share research results, to contribute to public debate and to invite feedback on development and humanitarian policy and practice. They do not necessarily reflect Oxfam policy positions. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of Oxfam.

For more information, or to comment on this report, email tara.gingerich@oxfam.org.

© Oxfam International August 2017

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB for Oxfam International under ISBN 978-1-78748-034-6 in August 2017.

DOI: 10.21201/2017.0346

Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK.

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 20 organizations networked together in more than 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty. Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or visit www.oxfam.org

Oxfam America (www.oxfamamerica.org)

Oxfam Australia (www.oxfam.org.au)

Oxfam-in-Belgium (www.oxfamsol.be)

Oxfam Brasil (www.oxfam.org.br)

Oxfam Canada (www.oxfam.ca)

Oxfam France (www.oxfamfrance.org)

Oxfam Germany (www.oxfam.de)

Oxfam GB (www.oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam Hong Kong (www.oxfam.org.hk)

Oxfam IBIS (Denmark) (www.ibis-global.org)

Oxfam India (www.oxfamindia.org)

Oxfam Intermón (Spain) (www.oxfamintermon.org)

Oxfam Ireland (www.oxfamireland.org)

Oxfam Italy (www.oxfamitalia.org)

Oxfam Japan (www.oxfam.jp)

Oxfam Mexico (www.oxfammexico.org)

Oxfam New Zealand (www.oxfam.org.nz)

Oxfam Novib (Netherlands) (www.oxfamnovib.nl)

Oxfam Québec (www.oxfam.qc.ca)

Oxfam South Africa (www.oxfam.org.za)