Annex – Methodology for VCAP Community Vulnerability Assessments, CCA Plans & Participatory Engagement Tools

(Pictures from community vulnerability assessments and CCA activities that have taken place at VCAP sites in 2015)

Introduction

This annex report captures and describes the various community engagement tools and approaches utilized while facilitating community based vulnerability assessments and CCA Planning activities for the project "Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu" known as VCAP (Vanuatu Coastal Adaptation Project). V-CAP is a 5-year climate change adaptation project supported by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) managed by the Global Environment Facility. The Government of Vanuatu is implementing VCAP through partnership with UNDP.

Component 1 of VCAP, which consists of integrated community approaches to climate change adaptation, is the largest component of the project and will be implemented in all 6 provinces of Vanuatu. This component will focus at both the community and Area Council levels. In 2015, this component focused on implementation in three provinces: Tafea, Shefa and Penama provinces *(*see Project Board Meeting minutes from June 18, 2015 for more information).*

The VCAP Project Board Minutes from June 18th, 2015 contain reference to the Project Board endorsing vulnerability assessment and CCA planning missions with communities on Page 3: *"DG Napat states that in the interim, Request for Service from UNDP may be necessary to start initial engagement with communities, as the government has been preoccupied with early recovery efforts from TC Pam and political instability. When Project Implementation Unit is hired and functioning within PMU, it will be easier to take the lead in this NIM but it is important not to fall behind now".*

Missions to facilitate the community vulnerability assessments and CCA planning took place between late of September and December of 2015:

- **Community Vulnerability Assessments and CCA Planning (September 2015 – December 2015)** with VCAP took place with 32 communities, with 9 Area Councils from three of the six-provinces in Vanuatu. The purpose of this first phase of engagement was to mobilize communities and provincial authorities in preparation of VCAP implementing agencies by forming Village Development Committees; to facilitate the communities' self-identification of climate related vulnerabilities; to build capacity of provincial stakeholders to facilitate the community vulnerability assessment process; and to field-test participatory social engagement tools such as the vulnerability assessment that V-CAP implementation.

During these community engagement missions, a range of participatory tools, approaches and techniques were employed in order to both actively engage communities and collect useful and standardized information during the engagement process. These tools were carefully tailored prior to their use and each tool provided unique benefits.

The purpose of this report is to:

- Provide a summarised description of the participatory tools used to engage communities
- Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the various participatory tools employed in the VCAP sites

- Provide recommendations and approaches for the future use of participatory tools in project implementation

Table of Contents

Participatory Engagement Tools

Participatory Engagement tools cover a vast range of methodologies and approaches, yet each of these tools intends to utilize and elicit specific knowledge that community members hold internally and collectively among themselves. Participatory approaches are dependent on both communities contributing some desired inputs and the effectiveness of the facilitator to impartially and effectively elicit this information.

These approaches are considered highly valuable as they can facilitate the empowerment and ownership of rural communities to voice their unique opinions, beliefs and concerns and to even articulate a plan of action to address community level vulnerabilities and priorities for development within their own particular context. Participatory approaches allow for a "bottom-up" perspective, which is an essential perspective to consider and incorporate when proceeding with the implementation of any sustainable development project that is expected to deliver effectively on the community level.

Throughout the design and early stages of implementation for VCAP, participatory approaches have played an important role in the engagement of communities to:

- **Facilitate the identification of relevant baseline information pertaining to project components;**
- **To prioritize challenges and appropriate interventions to support development in the unique context of individual communities;**
- **And to ensure that the planning, implementation and achievement of VCAP objectives is practical, sustainable and agreeable to community stakeholders**

Each participatory tool was modified to efficiently derive the information required. The tools used in the design of V-CAP and are outlined in the following pages:

1. Community Vulnerability Assessments

Approach	*Community Vulnerability Assessments*
Description of approach	The term "Vulnerability Assessment" is sometimes used interchangeably with the term "Community Profile" within Vanuatu. Both terms refer to a participatory social engagement tool that elicits information in a group setting about communities in a comprehensive, multi-sector approach. Vulnerability assessments (or community profiles) allow for community members to identify for themselves any relevant vulnerabilities using their contextual knowledge (including those posed by climate change and natural disasters), contribute valuable baseline data about the community as well as define community priorities for development in a fairly short span of time.
	There have been multiple methodologies and templates utilized by various stakeholders to conduct vulnerability assessments and community profiles within Vanuatu, however, the Department of Local Authorities (DLA) is attempting to standardize this process. The DLA approved the use of the draft assessment tool and methodology used to collect the data contained within this report (version 2.3 of the "Komuniti Profael Form"). The vulnerability assessment tool utilized was designed using the pidgin language, Bislama, and is intended for use by non-technical Ni-Vanuatu facilitators (a generalist with a secondary level of education should be able to facilitate the assessment process with minimal training). The template for the assessment tool is currently in draft format and will be further refined by the DLA with the support of UNDP and other stakeholders throughout 2016.
	A structured approach using a comprehensive questionnaire that engaged entire communities through an open public meeting format to collectively identify relevant baseline data was used. This data contained within the vulnerability assessments will be used for measuring progress towards resilience to climate change throughout the implementation of VCAP.
	Vulnerability assessments were conducted in a community meeting format that was open to the general public. Data was collected from community members through the assistance of facilitators, who led the public meetings and encouraged active participation throughout the meetings by asking a series of questions and putting forth discussion points, as detailed in the "Komuniti Profael Form" version 2.3. The facilitators attempted to elicit data without influencing the results provided by the community. At times, the facilitator attempted to help community members arrive at a consensus or agree upon an approximate answer if there happened to be any disagreement or varying answers provided by the group.
	Provincial authorities such as provincial Area Secretaries, as well and VCAP Site Coordinators, took a lead role in facilitating the "Community Vulnerability Assessments".
	These community meetings are arranged through the relevant local governance systems that are active within the particular community, in most cases the traditional chiefly systems, provincial authorities or the church leadership are utilized to authorize and organize these meetings. Women, youth and other vulnerable sub-groups are

actively encouraged to attend and participate within these meetings and to contribute in providing content to the "Community Vulnerability Assessment". Chiefly representatives participated in the community profiling initiative at all communities consulted and were engaged throughout the entire community vulnerability assessment process and actively facilitated sessions at community meetings.

The results from these community vulnerability assessments often consist of estimations, provided by community members to the best of their knowledge. While the results within this report should provide relatively accurate information about a community's vulnerabilities and resources, there may contain within this report inaccuracies as reported by the communities themselves. Data within this report should be considered as approximations made by community members *(example - population figures)*.

The facilitators also utilized focus groups as part of the approach in completing the vulnerability assessments, allowing for further in-depth discussions regarding vulnerabilities and more inclusivity for local youth and women who sometimes face cultural limitations or inhibitions when expressing themselves publicly during community meetings. Key respondent interviews were also utilized to engage community leaders, including teachers, health workers, chiefly authorities, NGO representatives and woman's group leaders. Transect walks through the communities were also conducted by the facilitators before and after vulnerability assessments were completed. Photos were taken by the facilitator at these times. All of these approaches were used to supplement the public meeting and multi-sector questionnaire that was utilized by the VCAP / DLA team.

Notice was given to communities prior to each meeting where vulnerability assessments were conducted (public announcements were made and notices were hung on community notice boards) and the entire community was encouraged to attend, including women, youth and disabled persons, etc. Meeting attendance was encouraged regardless of land ownership claims, ethnicity, education, religion or gender. Although the entire community was encouraged to attend and participate in the vulnerability assessments, attendance was voluntary and some chose not to participate due to work or personal commitments.

The "Community Vulnerability Assessment" can be administered to a small or a large quantity of participants, depending on the size of the community and the availability of the participants. The reliability and quality of the results will depend substantially on the participants themselves and their collective representation of the various sub-groups found within their particular community and the effectiveness of the facilitator in eliciting results from the participants. Validation of the data acquired through the "Community Vulnerability Assessment" can be further examined through the administration of other social participatory tools such as "Focus Groups" and "Guided Assessment Tours" as well as technical assessment to be conducted by VCAP implementing agencies.

The facilitators carefully planned the administration of a "Vulnerability Assessments" according to the context of the particular community or communities at hand. A large village or community (500+ people for example) may benefit by dividing the community stakeholders to perform multiple "Questionnaires" with various community subgroups. With smaller villages (less than 50 people), located in close

proximity to one another, it may be possible to engage multiple communities in the "Community Vulnerability Assessment" in a single joint session.

Detailed questions and points for discussion regarding the various sectors of village life are presented to the participants by the facilitator during the "Community Vulnerability Assessment", who interprets and records the answers provided by the community. While the questionnaire is normally recorded digitally or on paper, oral discussions are facilitated among the participants. This is especially important to note for potential communities with low or poor literacy rates, there is no reading or writing requirement from community stakeholders throughout their participation in this participatory exercise.

This participatory tool utilized by the VCAP team in coordination with the DLA is vast and comprehensive; however, like any tool it may be employed by the facilitator to meet the specific task at hand and it may be customized to deliver the desired data subsets more effectively. Should the facilitator already have extensive information regarding a sector (such as demographics data from the Statistics Department), then it is possible that only verification of this data would be necessary rather than proceeding to duplicate previous data collection efforts. Should the facilitator decide that certain sections of the "Community Vulnerability Assessment" do not necessarily pertain to the desired data subset required and are irrelevant, then it is the choice of the facilitator to complete, revise or omit these sections of the questionnaire.

Often, estimates or approximate quantities for data subsets are solicited from participants while using "Community Based Questionnaires" and this is encouraged as long as the approximate data provides value for the facilitator. For example, general estimates for livestock quantities are included inside of the "Community Baseline Questionnaire" so rather than go through a meticulous and time-consuming process of counting individual livestock specimen, villagers are encouraged to estimate between quantitative ranges (0 – 50, 50 – 100, 100 – 150, etc.). The facilitator should review the survey instrument and decide which data subsets should be estimated and which require exact quantities before engaging in this exercise with participants.

Should a community not possess the knowledge required to answer a specific question (or provide an estimate with confidence) inside of a questionnaire, the facilitator should note this in his or her findings and move on to the subsequent question or section. The facilitator should make it clear to the participants that they are not expected to have the answers to every question and that it is acceptable to abstain from answering any specific questions. Subsequent use of other participatory tools may prove useful in these situations to acquire the data in question (such as "Community Mapping", "Guided Assessment Tours" and "Focus Groups").

Should participants disagree strongly over a certain answer contained with a "Community Baseline Questionnaire" and should the facilitator not be able to derive a consensus among the participants, this should be noted by the facilitator and the failure to obtain a consensus may or may not be indicative of further conclusions at a latter time (such as potential divisions within the community). Further investigation of a community's potential disagreements by means of other participatory tools may prove useful in these situations (such as using "Community Mapping", "Guided Assessment Tours" and "Focus Groups").

It is important to note that even though the community may have a spokesperson (designated by the group or self-designated), or a select few individuals who contribute actively (more than others) during the "Community Baseline Questionnaire", the facilitator must attempt to engage the entire audience of participants to obtain a more representative sample. Direct attempts to engage women, youth and other vulnerable

	subgroups in the open public discussion format may prove valuable depending on the particular context of the community. In the VCAP / DLA's experience, to engage community members effectively and thoroughly while conducting these "Community Vulnerability Assessments" along with other participatory tools, the facilitator is required to possess cultural sensitivity, familiarity with the community, familiarity with the subject matter or the context of village life, an open and non-dismissive demeanour and even a sense of humour when appropriate. In many cases, further "Focus Groups" in addition to the "Community Baseline Questionnaires" may be required to fully engage communities in a fair and representative manner. The "Community Vulnerability Assessment" survey instrument employed by the VCAP DLA team advocates for the complimentary use of "Focus Groups" in order to effectively and fairly engage communities, as well as detailed consultations with specific community leaders such as chiefs, health workers, teachers and various committee members.
Use in VCAP planning	The vulnerability assessments were used to identify standard information across each of the communities as climate change is a cross-cutting issue affecting multiple sectors and aspects of life for rural communities. This information included within the assessment, but was not limited to: • Demographics by: population, disabled persons, gender, age • Social: chiefly system, village committees, religious affiliations • Income Generation: markets, exports, tourism, banking • Land: allocation, disputes, usage, commercial leasing • Education: schools, preschools, rural training centres • Agriculture: upland management issues, variety of crops, food security • WASH: water supply systems, sanitation, hygiene • Infrastructure: access to roads, wharfs, airports, communications • Climate Resilience / DRR: effects of climate on various sectors in village • Health: medical facilities, traditional medicines, diet, health conditions • Environment: terrestrial & marine conservation areas, protected species • Service delivery: as provided by government line agencies, NGO's • Community development priorities: as identified by gender and youth segregated groups This information can be referenced by VCAP implementing agencies to serve as baseline data and to make plans to address relative CCA vulnerabilities and foster community based resiliency.
Rationale for approach	Unfortunately, basic sector information on communities in rural Vanuatu is often not readily available to national & provincial stakeholders. This participatory tool may serve as a first step in the process of identifying community needs and aggregating useful multi-sector data for communities. It is a part of a DLA driven initiative to produce "Guidelines for Sub-National Governance" which seeks to standardize the approach for: • Enabling the collection of clear and consistent multi-sector data set across all communities • Providing a baseline to measure change over time • Providing a "snap-shot" of situation at a point in time • Providing an opportunity to develop consensus on issues and development challenges in the community While important baseline information was gathered during the design phase of VCAP, approximately 2 years had passed since the VCAP design team performed similar assessments with provincial authorities and baselines had shifted significantly, especially considering impacts of major events such as TC

	Pam.
	A majority of VCAP communities were not assessed during the design phase due to time and travel limitations placed on the design team. Central Pentecost 2 Area Council, Erromango, Aneityum and Futuna islands were not assessed during design phase of VCAP in 2013 but these VCAP community engagement missions in 2015 allowed for an opportunity to engage these communities.
Preparation required	• Comprehensive design of questionnaire to ensure that it meets the needs of DLA and provincial authorities took place after a period of months of consultations with DLA and provincial authorities • Consultation with DLA supporting initiative known as PRRP and consultation of provincial authorities in Tafea Province prior to field-testing survey instrument • Training of team members (provincial authorities) in use of questionnaire: familiarity with the questionnaire instrument (thorough review), experience or observation in facilitating similar participatory exercises to ensure unbiased and effective collection of data, consistent interpretation and recording of answers provided by different communities • Desk review of relevant and available information pertaining community to be engaged prior to use of this participatory tool • Acquisition of reliable translator for facilitator if necessary (in areas where Bislama was not frequently used) • Printing or provision of questionnaire forms along with stationaries / equipment required to record the data
Strengths and weakness	**Strengths** • Facilitated by provincial Area Secretaries who have context and knowledge regarding the local areas where they live • Designed for a generalist to facilitate and not a technical specialist who may not be readily available to travel to rural communities. Technical specialists may supplement or verify information provided by communities as needed. • Inexpensive method to collect multi-sector data • Common information is collected for each of the sites • Standard indicators identified for evaluating change across each of the sites • Identifies challenges and information gaps of existing census data / reports / national / local statistics • Provides an overview of the key issues and climate related vulnerabilities to be addressed at each site • Allows comparison between each of the sites • Provides reliable estimates quickly (quicker and less costly than household surveys) • Allows for bottoms-up communication and identification of needs as described by the particular communities • DLA / VCAP designed draft template of participatory tool (questionnaire) using Bislama, the national language of Vanuatu, so that it could be scaled up and adopted by Ni-Vanuatu stakeholders as part of the DLA's "Guidelines to Sub-national Governance". • Specific questions that are relevant in the context of Ni-Vanuatu communities: (such as agriculture questions regarding specific Vanuatu crops, traditional chiefly systems prevalent in rural Vanuatu, etc.) • An easy to follow check-list has been created for Community Vulnerability Assessment facilitators with written explanations in simplified pidgin explaining how to perform certain parts of the assessment **Weaknesses** • Community vulnerability assessment tool still requires extensive consultations with line agencies and NGO partners, preferably in a workshop format, to ensure the design meets the needs of an extensive range of stakeholders

	• Takes several hours to complete a vulnerability assessment in detail and to assemble community members to meet together • Some of the information collated may not be fully accurate and needs verification, or there may be disagreement between community members • Need to ensure full participation of women and youth, which can be difficult in some communities • Requires fluency in pidgin language and efficient communication • Must ensure impartiality and no leading questions by the facilitator • Not as accurate as a House to House Survey • Unable to include technical specialists representing every sector to confirm or negate information provided by communities

2. Formation of Village Development Committees (VDC's)

Approach	Formation of Village Development Committees (VDC's)
Description of approach	For the creation of community-level CCA plans, VCAP is utilizing and strengthening existing structures and leadership mechanisms present at the grassroots level. There is an emphasis on building capacity of these existing bodies located within project sites rather than inventing new systems that may not be sustainable after the life of the project. Common village organizations are directly engaged in the community planning process for creating CCA plan, such chiefly councils, women's groups, youth groups, school committees, health committees, church leadership, Community Disaster Committees (CDC's), water committees and any other functioning bodies deemed important by the community such as committees established by INGO's. By VCAP gathering together the leaders (or nominated representatives) from these existing community sub-groups, this will allow for a diverse and inclusive range of community level stakeholders to take part in the CCA planning process. This body comprised of leadership from existing community sub-groups aggregated together has been labeled a **Village Development Committee (VDC)** by the DLA / VCAP. It is important to understand that while the term VDC may be new, it is actually only grouping together leadership from all existing and functional community based organizations to serve as stakeholders in the community planning process. VDC's are voluntary technical working groups comprised entirely of locally-based membership that address community oriented, multi-sector development issues and attempts to utilize representation from all existing organizational structures present within a community- such as chiefly systems / NGO's / FBO's / CBO's / Committees, such as those listed in previous tables above. VDC's are often used for planning or monitoring and evaluation purposes. VDC's are flexible, voluntary working groups whose membership comes from existing organizational structures. VDC's should not be viewed as an additional organization within a community but rather as a collection of representatives from a community's existing structures, providing a wide-range of skill sets and the knowledge base necessary to create an informed technical working group familiar with local context and conditions. VCAP Site Coordinators and provincial Area Secretaries helped facilitate the vulnerability assessments, where a list of every community based committee and organization, faith based organization, NGO and traditional chiefly structure was recorded. During these meetings awareness regarding VDC's was conducted and each group was requested to select a representative to serve on

	the VDC and take part in CCA planning activities.
Use in VCAP planning	VDC's were consulted exclusively in the development of community CCA plans contextualized within the range of possible VCAP project interventions aimed at promoting community based resilience to climate change. While community vulnerability assessments were conducted first with the entire community, VDC's were utilized to facilitate smaller discussions with focused groups of leaders / representatives from a diverse range of organized groups in each community. VDC's will also be relied upon to provide monitoring and evaluation functions on the community level during VCAP implementation while coordinating with the Site Coordinators and provincial Area Secretaries.
Rationale for approach	• Provides representation for all existing groups within a community, including women's and youth groups • Consists of technical, community level resource people – example, water committee representative, disaster committee chairman, etc • Smaller technical working group, easier to facilitate discussions than general public meetings with hundreds of people • Flexible group with no formal standing orders, can be utilized outside of VCAP by other projects or initiatives that require community planning, monitoring or evaluation • Builds capacity of existing groups rather than creating a temporary committee for VCAP
Preparation required	• Vulnerability assessment conducted and list of existing community-based organizational structures provided from which to gather representation for VDC • Awareness regarding role of VDC given to community by provincial Area Secretary or Site Coordinator
Strengths and weaknesses	• Utilizes a community's "resources", technical knowledge base • Includes sub-groups representing women, youth and disabled people • Flexibility- VDC's may add and drop representatives as required and as the status of various community organizations changes over time • Assembles existing representatives that have already been selected and empowered by chiefly authorities rather than starting a debate over the formation of new committees or groups to conduct planning, monitoring and evaluation activities for VCAP ***Weaknesses*** • If a community does not have well-organized committees or groups representing a certain sector, that community's VDC may lack diversity or representation from that particular sector • Some communities have limited organized groups representing women and youth • Some communities have multiple divisions of chiefly councils (disputes), churches, etc that can lead to challenges within VDC • Technical knowledge limited by most VDC's present in rural communities • Confusion with various other groups such as Community Disaster Committees or Community Development Committees

3. Community CCA Plans & Identification of Priorities for Resilience

Approach	*CCA Plans & Priorities for Resilience*
Description of approach	First, a meeting of VDC members is arranged by provincial Area Secretaries working in coordination with VCAP Site Coordinators. The VDC is then briefed by VCAP / DLA team regarding possible VCAP interventions in regards to Component 1 and strengthening community-based resilience to climate change. Possible climate vulnerabilities should have already been identified by community members themselves through the "Community Vulnerability Assessment" and this information is referenced extensively by the facilitator. **Managing community expectations is an essential part of this process.** Communities are never promised that a particular activity will take place during project implementation. They are informed that a range of activities may possibly address the previously identified climate vulnerabilities but will depend on further technical assessments and budgetary constraints Possible VCAP interventions relating to Component 1 were broken down into the following sectors and VDC members discussed in-depth possible actions that could be taken with their communities to address climate resilience, depending on any of their identified needs: - Infrastructure climate resilience – access to services, including vehicular roads, footpaths, and bridges - Agriculture- food security, pests, diseases, invasive species - Water Resources – water security and protection of water catchment areas - Forestry- use of soft measures to counter erosion, nursery - Environment- protection of water catchment areas, mangrove eco-systems, protected species, sustainable management plans for resources - Climate related disaster- vulnerabilities to storm surge, coastal and upland erosion, flooding, cyclone, drought and measures to protect human security - Coastal resources- inshore fisheries, Marine Protected Areas - Livestock- possible environmental affects posed by livestock practices, sustainable resource management and food security VDC's were discouraged in speculating overly technical details regarding potential CCA activities such as costing and timelines for implementation, etc as these details are determined externally, outside of the community's control. Example, if a community identifies that a water supply project is a priority and a VDC wishes for an assessment of their water source, they cannot control the availability of the government water specialists to make the assessment, therefore they cannot set a time frame for implementation. Also, they cannot set a budget as they lack the technical expertise. Therefore a range of potential activities was suggested by VDC's with the knowledge that technical specialists would ultimately verify or negate their suggested actions. After listing a long range of potential activities, a final exercise was conducted with the VDC to prioritize by sector the various potential activities. Each VDC member was allowed to submit a ranking of 1 to 8 of the various sector: Infrastructure, Agriculture, Water Resources, Forestry, Environment, Disaster, Fisheries and Livestock. These rankings were tallied and a final collective ranking was made by the VDC. A rank of 1 was considered the highest

	It was explained that this prioritization of potential CCA activities for the community was just an exercise to gauge priorities in each of the communities. Individual VDC members often did not agree on exact vulnerabilities, but most often, VDC members built consensus during thorough rounds of internal discussion. Consideration of current projects or planned project activities by non-VCAP related initiatives was also considered while communities made these priority rankings. For example, if a major food security initiative was planned by an NGO working externally from VCAP, this would have affected the community's priority ranking for agriculture, as it would have been perceived as less of a priority for VCAP to undertake as food security was already in the planning stages of being addressed. VDC's were explained that if a certain sector ranked lowest among the available priorities- it did not mean that these potential CCA activities could not take place. Also, if a VDC indicated a certain activity was their highest prioritized potential CCA activity, this did not mean that communities could assume that it would take place. Proposed CCA activities would be contingent on project budget restrictions, availability of resources and technical specialists verifying the need and approach of interventions.
Use in VCAP planning	CCA Plans should be considered by VCAP implementing agencies as a community-specific, range of potential activities for building community resilience to climate change. These plans should be referred to when formulating technical, site-specific plans, so that technical plans may compliment CCA plans whenever practical for villages, communities and Area Councils. While technical details must be supplemented for these community based CCA Plans and not all potential CCA activities from the range of potential activities may be fully addressed – it is important to maintain a simplified community based CCA plan to maintain a grassroots sense of ownership in VCAP and ensure that project outputs align with community needs.
Rationale for approach	• Every government line agency is unable to travel to VCAP sites at the same time to facilitate the process of creating a community based CCA plan, as it is impractical due to travel logistics to remote communities, expense of travel, availability of community member, etc. This approach allows for DLA and provincial authorities to utilize VDC's to identify a range of potential CCA activities and flexibility for technical specialists to supplement later with technical details
Preparation required	• Formation of VDC • Creation of Community Vulnerability Assessment, general background knowledge of identified climatic vulnerabilities
Strengths and weakness	• It allows for in-depth discussions regarding CCA vulnerabilities among VDC members • Diverse representation and technical resource people from community involved in planning process • Easier to facilitate smaller VDC group meeting than entire community / public forum ***Weaknesses*** • Some CCA activities proposed may be impractical due to budget limitations or technical reasons

	• Little details regarding responsible parties for implementation, timeline and costing
	• Without an effective facilitator to describe possible range of VCAP interventions, VDC's may have difficulty prioritizing potential CCA activities

4. Focus Groups

Approach	*Focus Groups: gender, youth and social inclusion; technical groups*
Description of approach	Focus group discussions engaging women, youth and other groups with special needs were facilitated by VCAP / DLA team in conjunction with the Community Vulnerability Assessment. The results of these focus group discussions were useful in the identification of climate related vulnerabilities to include in the assessment results, specific suggestions by community members of interventions to address the needs of these subgroups and contextualized priorities for development. These focus groups served to establish "counter factual" information as compared to data obtained from the general public in the Community Vulnerability Assessment or it served to validate the data.
	Focus group discussions employed throughout the VCAP consultation process most often did not cover the same expansive range as the "Community Baseline Questionnaire" but rather they were "focused" on the collection of specific data subsets. For example, a "Focus Group" comprised of women may focus on issues that the facilitator considers to be especially relevant to the group's needs, such as women's health, access to services, participation in the community development process, opportunities for education, etc. The facilitator should always ask for general comments or allow for open discussion, as participants may produce additional innovative concepts or feedback that that proves valuable outside of the introduced discussion points.
	The use of focus group discussions with technical groups was valuable as the amount of time required to delve into certain discussion points in detail is substantial, and time constraints experienced within the "Community Baseline Questionnaire" do not allow for a thorough and extensive exploration of the sector topics.
	Recognizing that in Melanesian culture, certain sub-groups such as women, youth and disabled persons may not fully engage in open discussion formats (such as those employed by participatory tools like the "Community Vulnerability Assessment") due to intimidation or cultural norms, the VCAP / DLA team found it necessary to facilitate "Focus Groups" to allow for an increased likelihood for subgroups to communicate more openly
	Often these "Focus Groups" were facilitated by the VCAP design team in comfortable locations that were not associated with traditional "taboos". For example, on many islands in Vanuatu, community development is traditionally only discussed by the men inside of the chiefly meeting building or "nakamal". On some islands, women are not permitted inside of these buildings; therefore they have no voice and little representation inside of community decisions. The VCAP DLA team intended to select open, non-threatening areas to hold these focus groups that would be appropriate for the intended demographic.
	It is always important to consider the attributes of the facilitator of the "Focus

	Group" and his or her selection should be appropriate for the subgroup at hand. For example, a focus group seeking to discuss women's issues may benefit from having a female facilitator. This may allow for a more open and less reserved conversation to take place, following the cultural norms of Melanesian society. It is certainly not always a necessity to have a facilitator's gender match that of the participants, but it may prove useful in select situations, depending on the subject matter of the intended "Focus Group."
	A local or Ni-Vanuatu facilitator may be able to elicit better responses from participants in some situations. In other situations, an international consultant may be perceived by the community as neutral and therefore might be able to elicit information more effectively.
Use in V-CAP planning	The semi-structured interviews with a focus on gender, youth and other needs for social inclusion were utilized as part of the village meetings and community consultations. This information included, but was not limited to: • Basic information on women's issues and challenges • Access to health care & social services, and climate related impacts on access to health and social services • Food scarcity and challenges in provisioning the household • Access to education for children and associated financing costs • Access to markets and banking facilities • Youth and associated issues • Provincial and Area Council capacity building and service delivery challenges • Coastal resource management vulnerabilities • Upland terrestrial resource management vulnerabilities
Rationale for approach	• Enabled the clear identification of women's and youth and disabled persons' issues in the project design • Ensured a different perspective on issues as experienced by subgroups with different shared experiences, knowledge and backgrounds • Allowed for the development of specific components to address women's, youth and disabled persona and social issues The results of these discussions were incorporated into *the Vulnerability Assessment Reports for VCAP, Pentecost, Tafea Outer Islands and Epi*
Preparation required	• Clear plans for the semi-structured interviews • Formed part of the Baseline assessment survey
Strengths and weakness of use of tool	*Strengths* • Enabled cross-checking of results from the Community Vulnerability Assessment • Ensured the development of a comprehensive understanding of women and associated gender issues • Enabled specific activities to be developed based on the needs of women and youth • Allows for more inclusive data collection as some sub-groups may not actively be engaged in larger community meeting settings due to cultural norms or societal pressures *Weaknesses* • Takes a moderate amount of time to complete in detail – between 20 minutes and 1 hour depending on the group size and the subject matter to be discussed • Additional time is needed to cross-check information – this will be completed

	in the more detailed assessment.
	• Requires multiple facilitators, and gender / youth sensitivity in engaging stakeholders to elicit responses

5. Community Mapping

Approach	*Community mapping*
Description of approach	The creation of community maps and participatory community mapping exercises was a helpful activity for the VCAP / DLA team in exploring, identifying and prioritizing resources, needs and vulnerabilities present throughout the various V-CAP sites. Community members actively took part in creating the maps in a group setting, creating a visual representation of the particular subject matter at hand.

Community mapping exercises are especially helpful in detailing a particular subject matter of interest to the facilitator in a visual manner. Often, a weakness of social participatory engagement tools is a lack of clarity when a multitude of people offer, at times, convoluted or conflicting information (such as during the "Community Vulnerability Assessment" exercise can provide clarity in some of these cases, as the community illustrates together the issue, which often leads to further discussions and deliberations that produce a group consensus or more reliable data.

For example, when a larger village discusses water security issues during a "Community Vulnerability Assessment", different data is often provided by various villagers regarding available water sources such as the quantity and size of cement rain tanks or condition and quantity of ground water wells. This is due to the fact that many participants' knowledge of the community's water resources is limited to their homes and their immediate surroundings. In such situations, it may be useful to rely on "Community Mapping" to effectively organize and elicit individual participant's responses to form a coherent data subset that represents the collective community.

Mapping tools can then stimulated proceeding discussions on possible solutions to identified climate vulnerabilities as reported by communities and a plan of action can be formulated communities or VDC's. |
| *Use in VCAP* | The mapping information was used on a regular basis by the V-CAP design team especially for communities to map out important resources and climate related vulnerabilities per community such as:
• The location of villages, population in respect to geographic features, distances
• Infrastructure- public access ways and river crossings
• Water supply- marking of supply points and sources
• Location of Climate Change / Disaster hotspots- flooding sites, landslides, sea-level rise, erosion sites

Scale of the maps was dependent on the type of mapping exercise undertaken, whether a village level map or area council-wide map was more appropriate. For example, mapping infrastructure such as roads or bridges located outside of the immediate village may be more appropriate for a island level or area council level map whereas a water supply map would most likely utilize a much smaller |

	village level scale.
	Often in coordination with the mapping exercises, community discussions were facilitated by the VCAP / DLA team to expand on the topic at hand. For example, with a mapping exercise of footpaths and river crossings in Ipota, Erromango- the villagers identified which particular public access ways were the most affected by climate variability and prioritized the river crossings and paths. This allowed for valuable data collection by the VCAP / DLA team in recording community opinion and documenting local knowledge that would have proved difficult if not impossible without the use of visuals.
Rationale for approach	• Enabled to capture a clear and consistent set of information by illustrating the subject matter in a visual representation in situations where the data was previously considered by the facilitator to be convoluted or conflicting • Helps to clarify quantities and prioritize challenges present due to geographical features and distance • Encourages group consensus and further discussion on the topic at hand
Preparation required	• Materials available such as large pieces of paper and markers or a chalk board or white board • Clear plan of what sector / issue needs mapping
Strengths and weakness of use of tool	**Strengths** • Engages visual learners and thinkers effectively • Helps the facilitator to overcome ambiguity due to language or conflicting or erroneous information provided by the participants • Facilitates further discussions by the community on the subject manner and often results in a group consensus that may not typically be elicited without the use of this visual tool **Weaknesses** • It requires a community member who is confident enough to take a leading role in being the "artist" or creating the map in front of others • Women, youth and other vulnerable people may be too intimidated to actively participate if the full community is engaged in the activity. It could be beneficial to perform community mapping exercises with various subgroups depending on the topic at hand to allow for more fair and inclusive results and representation.

6. Guided Assessment Tours

Approach	**Guided Assessment Tours of Site – Village, resources, infrastructure inspections with community**
Description of approach	Both before and after participatory meetings with communities, it was often helpful for the VCAP / DLA team to physically inspect the communities and their surroundings to gain insight into the climate related vulnerabilities and risks presented at VCAP sites. This was always coordinated and led by large groups of community members. The selection of the tour sites or the route of the "Guided Assessment Tour" was most often selected by the community members themselves after a short briefing by the facilitator, explaining any specific objectives of the tour such as the inspection of damaged or vulnerable infrastructure or the viewing of water storage materials.

| | These technically specific tours often required a greater length in time to conduct. For example, the inspection of a gravity-fed water supply system in Savat Village, East Pentecost took over 3 hours to complete as it entailed hiking up steep hillsides and wading through swamps and rivers.

At times, there was no highly specified or technical objective of the "Guided Assessment Tour" and the exercise was more of a general scoping mission of the community itself. These tours were led by groups of villagers who would guide the design team, explaining points of interest and fielding various questions from the design team throughout the process. Often, these general assessment tours did not have extensively pre-planned routes, but rather, the VCAP / DLA team was led in various directions around the community until a majority of the households and immediate living area of the target community had been observed.

Key community buildings and resources such at community halls, schools, health facilities, disaster shelters and water supply resources were viewed and inspected at each village by means of the "Guided Assessment Tours" throughout the VCAP consultation process. Photos were taken of community buildings and resources throughout the process, for future referral and inclusion in project documentation. Many of the findings and much of the data obtained (or verified) through the "Guided Assessment Tours" was incorporated into the VCAP Vulnerability Assessment Reports.

Although members of the community led the design team on these "Guided Assessment Tours" throughout the target sites, often the VCAP / DLA team members would make an observation and redirect the tour for further examination of a particular resource, vulnerability or key feature during the tour.

The composition of villages throughout Vanuatu varies across the islands. Some villages are densely populated within a small geographical area while others communities contain households distributed over considerable distances. However, typically rural communities in Vanuatu are generally small enough in size and distributed narrowly enough that an entire village can be observed through a general "Guided Assessment Tour" in less than 1 hour. For larger communities distributed over greater distances, "Transect Walks" may be a more suitable option, especially if there is limited time available.

For some "Guided Assessment Tours", the design team was entirely dependent upon local community members and their indigenous knowledge to select the most optimal route or site for the tour

The information captured from the "Guided Assessment Tours" is incorporated throughout the V-CAP Vulnerability Assessment Reports

The assessment tours often helped to verify results collected during the "Community Vulnerability Assessments." |
| *Use in V-CAP design* | The Guided Assessment Tours allowed for the VCAP / DLA team to observe first hand the challenges, risks and vulnerabilities related to climate as identified by community stakeholders, including but not limited:
• Infrastructure inspection- bridges, vehicle roads, footpaths, river crossings, wharfs, boat landings
• Land-based environmental tours- bush walks, terrestrial conservation areas, saw mill sites, dump sites, observation of protected species
• Marine-based environmental tours- walking along the coastline, snorkelling and boats used to observe coastal fisheries activities, coral-reef eco-systems, mangroves, marine protected species, fish reserves
• Water supply systems- rain catchment, gravity feed pipe lines and water |

	storage, • General village tours- inspection of home and general living conditions, The assessment tours were led by community groups along with key representatives from the communities
Rationale for approach	• Enables a background or general understanding of the issues at hand • Allows for the identification of issues and vulnerabilities perhaps not elicited in other participatory methods. • Allows for verification of results obtained from other participatory tools such as "Community Mapping" and "Community Vulnerability Assessments"
Preparation required	• Notification and permission from the community leadership, landowners, etc. • Possible "community mapping" exercise needed as a prerequisite if the assessment tour has very detailed and specific objectives; or if the size and the distribution of the village itself is considered by the facilitator to be extensive enough that community mapping will prove beneficial.
Strengths and weakness of use of tool	***Strengths*** • Allows for a first-hand look at the issues discussed and at hand • Explores the site to provide a general background on contextual issues • Allows different demographics to take part and occasionally lead the activity, such as village youth, who might otherwise only be engaged to a limited capacity due to traditional social norms. ***Weaknesses*** • Physical restraints of facilitators- very hard to access some locations such as water sources or snorkelling on coral reefs, etc. This includes a bias towards terrestrial resources, which are often easier to access than marine resources (but not always!) • Time-consuming process to execute thorough inspections / tours at each individual community

Annex produced by Matthew Hardwick