

Minority Rights Group – Citizens Constitutional Forum
Project on ethnic relations, ethnic minorities and
discrimination in Fiji

Project evaluation report

Steve Ratuva

Executive summary

1. This report is divided into 3 parts. Part A provides an overview of the project; Part B is a technical evaluation, based on a number of assessment variables (objectives, fulfilment of expectations, project design, capacity and resources, data analysis, findings, conclusions, recommendations and report); and Part C is based on quality assessment using other variables (relevance, inclusiveness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, media impact, engagement strategies, challenges and mitigation strategies, completion, participation and major lessons learnt).¹
2. The project on ethnic relations, ethnic minority groups (EMGs) and discrimination in Fiji was carried out through a partnership between the Minority Rights Group (MRG) and Citizen Constitutional Forum (CCF) with Conciliation Resources (CR) as associate partner. It was funded by the European Union.
3. The broad aim of the project was to contribute to improve inter-ethnic relations in Fiji and reduce the discrimination specific ethnic groups (such as the Indo-Fijians, the Rotumans, Banabans, Solomon Islanders, Tuvaluans, Kiribati, Chinese, Samoans and Tongans) experience on a daily basis in a country marked by a prolonged history of inter-ethnic conflicts and violence.
4. The project had two major components. The first was the research which led to a report titled *Fiji: the challenges and opportunities of diversity*. The second was the consultation in Suva based on the report by civil society organizations (CSOs), aid agencies and representatives

¹ Because these variables overlap, there is often an impression of repetition and duplication in the narrative as well as the recommendations. However, these need to be looked at in the context of the specific issues being considered.

of foreign embassies. This was followed by further consultations in Canberra and London.

5. The project took place from 2012 to 2013 when Fiji was going through a critical period of constitutional reform. It was also a time when certain political restrictions were still in place and CCF was going through some challenging relationships with the government and judiciary. These added extra pressure on the project.
6. The three day consultation in Suva was attended by more than 80 people representing different organizations, ethnicities, gender and political beliefs. The discussions revolved around the major issues raised in the report as well as issues raised by the participants themselves.
7. The consultations proved to be very successful, judging by the reports of the proceedings, evaluation by the participants and discussions with participants. Responses from the aid agencies and other international participants were very positive.
8. Discussions on EMG issues have often been overshadowed by the i-Taukei-Indo-Fijian ethnic issues. This was a unique opportunity to engage in deep discussions on the EMGs issues. EMGs constitute about 6% of the population and quite a significant number of them, especially those belonging to the Melanesian, Banaban and Tuvaluan ethnic communities are politically marginalized and socio-economically underprivileged.
9. Understanding the issue of discrimination is a challenging one since there are different ways in which discrimination is manifested and perceived. Some are more institutionalized while some are more subtle

and personalized, some are deliberate while some are unconsciously done, some are “real” while some are “perceived.”

10. Most participants said that the project was very useful in providing them with the necessary information to look at ethnic relations in a broader and deeper way. For many, it provided them with the opportunity to understand the plight of the EMGs, as well as listen to their voices and aspirations. Some have decided to incorporate the EMGs issues into their programs.
11. The report raises a number of issues relating to the design, partnership, resources allocation and relationships that needed to be addressed and these are reflected in the recommendations. The recommendations suggest ways in which similar projects in the future can be improved.
12. The aims of the project were quite ambitious, especially given the complexity of the political situation in Fiji and the means by which they were going to be achieved. While the short-term specific aims were achievable, the long term goal cannot be easily measured.

Of particular significance was the lack of involvement of the government, admittedly one of the major players in any discussions of EMGs because of the need to influence its policy process and position. This situation could have been avoided had there been a plan on tactical engagement with the Fiji government in place to win its confidence. The approach taken by CCF may have been based on the assumption that direct confrontation could make the government “see the light” and support the project. Historical experience in Fiji and elsewhere has shown that a much more sophisticated tactical approach is needed to influence policies of authoritarian states.

13. Despite some of the shortcomings, generally the project was well executed and the responses from the participants were encouraging.

14. There needs to be a follow up to the project to ensure sustainability in the future.
15. The report has a total of 29 recommendations which are framed both in terms of what could have been done and suggestions for the future.

PART A: THE PROJECT

1.0 Overview and context

1.1 The project on ethnic relations and discrimination in Fiji was a collaborative one between the London-based MRG and its local partner, CCF and Conciliation Resources (CR) as associate partner. It had a total budget of €94,189.56 provided by the European Union (EU). The project was first proposed to MRG at a meeting in London in 2010 with Ciaran O'Toole, who once worked for CCF in Fiji. O'Toole's initiative may have been influenced by his long association with CCF and other peace groups in Fiji.

1.2 The project largely focused on ethnic relations in Fiji and in particular the issue of discrimination against EMGs. The project was relevant given Fiji's complex history of ethnic turbulence and the need to address the issues of EMGs many of whom have been politically marginalized and voiceless as well as socio-economically disadvantaged. It was an attempt to contribute to improvement in inter-ethnic relations in Fiji, especially in relation to discrimination felt by minority groups. Fiji has had a tumultuous history with four coups associated in various ways to ethnic tension.² Over the years there have been a number of initiatives by government, civil society organizations, regional organizations and international agencies to address some of the emerging problems but with mixed success.

1.3 At the time of the project in 2012 to 2013, Fiji was going through a challenging period of constitutional reform, marred by political tension and controversy. Back in 2010 a Fiji Constitution Commission (FCC), consisting of five local and international members and headed by Prof Yash Ghai, an international constitutional expert, was appointed by the government to

² Ratuva, S. 2011. The Fiji military coups: Reactive and Transformative Tendencies: *Journal of Asian Political Science*. Vol. 19, No.1, pp 96-120.

produce a new draft constitution. The FCC carried out intensive nation-wide consultations and produced a very comprehensive draft totalling about 200 pages based on 7,000 submissions.³ The FCC's draft was rejected by government which then proceeded to produce its own draft in March 2013. An amended version was eventually assented by the President on 6 September at the time of the field evaluation of the project.⁴ However, debates about the legitimacy and viability of the new constitution continue.⁵

1.4 The project coincided with the constitutional process and it was hoped that the research and outcome of the round tables would contribute to the constitutional consultation process. CCF has been a leading Fiji civil society organization involved in public campaigns, civic education, advocacy and networking on constitutional issues in the country and its role in the constitutional consultation process was pivotal. With international partners such as MRG and CR, this was a great opportunity to internationalise the constitutional issues through global partnership and networking as well as deepen the impact of the local campaigns. Proposals were sent to the government regarding possible input into the new constitution but this was ignored by the government which had a total monopoly over the constitutional process.

1.5 In addition to its ongoing engagement in the constitutional process, CCF was also under a lot of strain as a result of government clampdown on some of its activities. The Director of Programs was arrested and taken up to the military barracks for questioning and the Executive Director was given a 3 months suspended sentence and fined \$20,000 for the publication of an article critical of Fiji's judiciary in the CCF newsletter, *Tutaka*. The political atmosphere constrained CCF's activities considerably and this may have had

³ See Fiji Constitution Commission. 2012. Suva: Draft of Constitution: Fiji Constitution Commission.

⁴ See Fiji Government. 2013. *Constitution of Fiji*. Suva: Fiji Government.

⁵ For instance, see Citizens Constitutional Forum. 2013. *An Analysis: 2013 Fiji Government Draft Constitution*. Suva: Citizens Constitutional Forum.

some impact on the project itself. In a way this was outside the project's control and perhaps in future projects, the local political context should have been factored into the project plan. However, CCF has had its share of confrontation and mutual relations with the government in the past so the relationship between the two occasionally fluctuates depending on the circumstances

1.6 In Fiji, the political discourse has largely been dominated by the iTaukei and Indo-Fijian ethnic and political relationship and this often overshadowed the significance and relevance of ethnic minorities which make up about 6% of the population.⁶ Since independence, minorities have officially been classified under the generic label of "others." Under the post-independence 1970 Constitution, two minority groups namely the Solomon Islanders and Banabans were classified as "Fijians" but they were later reclassified under the others category under the 1990 and 1997 constitutions.⁷ Apart from protecting the land rights of the Banaban, the 2013 Constitution is silent on the issue of minorities. Despite its attempt to strengthen democratic representation, there is concern that the open list single constituency proportional representation system may continue to drown out the voices of minorities.⁸

2.0 Project components

Research

⁶ Fiji's population under the 2007 national census showed that the iTaukei made up 57%, Indo-Fijian 37% and other minorities 6%. See Fiji Bureau of Statistics. 2008. *National census report for 2007*. Suva: Fiji Bureau of Statistics. The other category of "other minorities" consists of Europeans, Part-Europeans, Chinese, Part-Chinese, Banaban, Melanesians and other Pacific Islanders. The term "others" has always been problematic because it assumes a generic category when in fact it is a label which covers the small minorities.

⁷ See Fiji Government. 1990. *Constitution of the Republic of Fiji*. Suva: Fiji Government; also see Fiji Government. 1997. *Constitution of the Republic of Fiji*. Suva: Fiji Government.

⁸ While there are different types of open list systems, it is not clear yet as to what particular type will actually be used. This will be specified in the proposed electoral decree which is promised before December 2013.

2.1 The field components of the project were in two major phases: the first was the research on ethnic relations in Fiji; the second was consultations with regards to the research report.

2.2 The research was carried out by Prof Vijay Naidu and three research assistants from the University of the South Pacific, representing the three major ethnic categories (iTaukei, Indo-Fijian and other minorities) after a call for expressions of interests and vetting process. The final research report was titled *Fiji: The Challenges and Opportunities of Diversity*. The 40-page report was meant to “obtain information about how members of different ethnic groups felt about current inter-ethnic relations...” in Fiji.⁹ It involved interviews with representatives of local government and national government, ethnic and religious communities, local and international NGOs, academic researchers, representatives of donor agencies, diplomatic community and inter-governmental organizations.¹⁰

2.3 Based on the use of formal questionnaires the findings of the research were largely based on individual perception which were categorized and analysed under the following subheadings: current inter-ethnic relations; issues that contribute to inter-ethnic tensions and conflict; participation in decision-making; women’s participation in decision-making; impact of the 2006 coup on inter-ethnic relations; discrimination; relations between religious groups and between government and religious groups; human rights issues; and government policies. The views were then divided under the classifications of iTaukei, Indo-Fijian and other ethnic minorities to distinguish between the perceptions of different ethnic groups.¹¹

⁹ Naidu, V. 2013. *Fiji: The Challenges and Opportunities of Diversity*. Suva: Minority Rights Groups International and Citizens Constitutional Forum, p19.

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Ibid

2.4 Of the total sample of 86 participants, 33 were iTaukei, 20 were Indo-Fijians and 33 were from minority communities. The participants from the minority communities consisted of 15 part-Europeans, 5 Banaban, 3 Tuvaluans and Pacific islanders and 4 Chinese Fijian. It appears that no one from the Solomon Island community was interviewed. The sample was also disaggregated in terms of religion, gender, age and locality.¹²

The report provided 16 recommendations at the end, 15 of which were targeted at the government and 1 targeted at civil society and religious leaders. More than 300 copies of the report were distributed to organizations and individuals internationally and locally and electronic copies were also distributed widely.¹³ The report became the basis for public consultation, the second phase of the project.

Round table consultation

2.5 The consultation process took place from 9-11 April 2013 at the Tanoa Plaza in Suva and 193 people representing civil society organizations, aid agencies and inter-governmental organizations participated in the three day roundtable.

2.6 Day 1 was a pre-launch CSO briefing attended by 13 representatives of CSO organizations. The objectives of the first day were: (a) to build consensus around the report, selecting 3-5 recommendations to prioritise; (b) to look at media strategizing options and initiatives; (c) to identify strategies to engage with government.

2.7 In the initial discussions of the report 16 issues were raised and these were listed clearly in the MRG final report on the consultation. While most of the issues dealt primarily with research technicalities relating to methodology,

¹² Ibid

¹³ See list of distribution of copies of reports provided by MRG.

sampling and data analysis, five issues stood out in terms of their broader relevance to the project. These are reproduced below as they appeared in the MRG final report on the consultation:

- There does not seem to be any direct link between the findings and recommendations.
- The focus on democratisation tends to dominate and drown out the voices and the concerns of the EMGs.
- With the absence of a CSO with a specific agenda for the EMGs the voices of other vulnerable groups tend to diminish that of the EMG
- The report takes a human rights approach in its analysis of interethnic relations in Fiji
- The report is timely. The constitution-making process and the issues raised by the report clearly provide a space at the highest level to be discussed and included.¹⁴

2.7 In addition to these, 14 strategies were identified as crucial in taking forward some of the important findings of the report:

- Look at race without racism in a meaningful way.
- Identify land issue as a specific strategic topical area.
- Issue of affirmative action as an area to explore.
- Explore how the report can be utilised as advocacy information not only internally but also throughout the region as per MSG (Melanesian Spearhead Group, a subregional grouping consisting of the “Melanesian” states, Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Kanaky or New Caledonia and Vanuatu).
- Scholarship and the quota allocation to be revisited.
- To understand that the indigenous is not equal to minority in the Fiji context.

¹⁴ MRG Final Report on the Consultation, 2013.

- How to talk and discuss with government?
- How do you find a space to deepen discussion with the government on the key issues?
- How do you mobilise people who are in fearful spaces?
- How do you engage with your own constituents before even engaging with government?
- How do you translate policy and issues to the EMG languages so that you can communicate and inform your constituents better?
- How do you create democratic spaces where the people and the government can come and talk and listen to each other?
- How do you address the common issues of disparity such as land and scholarships?
- How do you deal with the challenges of identifying the best strategic approaches for changing policies which are different from the status quo?

2.8 Day 2 was a stakeholder roundtable discussion, attended by 20 representatives of CSOs, international organizations and other stakeholders and the objectives were: (a) to look for constructive outcomes; (b) author to make findings known (c) CCF to present recommendations (d) participants to present on specific themes.

2.9 The three major activities revolved around: (a) further clarification on the report by the author and CCF; (b) discussions on what the stakeholders have done well; (c) consolidation of discussion. The process was based on participatory group discussion and reporting to the plenary based on day one issues but framed under the following topics: (a) context of the issues; (b) the role of the state in addressing the EMG issues; (c) the issues of land; (d) education; (e) the role of civil society and faith-based organizations

2.10 Some issues which were identified and needed addressing included affirmative action for EMGs, nation building, national identity and EMG identity. Land was seen as a significant issue which had implications on the wellbeing and identity of EMGs. While the Rotumans and Banabans had land which was protected by state laws, the more marginalized EMGs such as the Melanesians and Wallisians did not. Education was also seen as a vehicle for social mobility for the more disadvantaged EMGs. In the absence of groups with specific focus on EMG rights, it was felt that civil societies and faith-based groups were in a good position to advocate for EMGs.

2.11 The Day 3 roundtable was attended by 86 representatives of CSOs and the focus was on “what needs to be done” as a way forward. Based on the discussions of the previous two days, the idea was to pull out some significant stands of issues, which could be the basis for forging the way ahead.

2.13 A variety of issues were raised by the three discussion groups and in a way these represented the diverse views and political positions of the participants. Some of these issues included democratization, land, constitution, leadership and governance, civic education, national policies, education, inclusivity of EMGs, role media in promoting EMG issues and more empowerment for EMGs.

3.0 Roundtable discussions in London and Canberra

3.1 The roundtable in Canberra took place on 16 April and the London round table was on 24 April. The project representatives to both report launches and round tables were Chris Chapman (MRG), Reverend Akuila Yabaki (CCF) and Prof Vijay Naidu (project researcher).

3.2 The report launch and round table in London was significant because “Fiji is of interest to UK media because of the former colonial links.”¹⁵ The purpose was “to hold one-to-one meetings with interested stakeholders including from the UK government to discuss in more detail the possible implementation of report recommendations and support these stakeholders can give to this process.”¹⁶ About 20 people participated in the round table.

3.3 Canberra was chosen as the second place for report launch because “The Australian government is a key donor in Fiji, and considers peace, stability, human rights, and economic development in Fiji as one of its foreign policy priorities.” The participants were decision-makers in government and opinion-leaders on Melanesian / Fiji policy within academia and civil society. About 30 people participated in the round table.

4.0 Value of the London and Canberra round tables

4.1 The launching of the report in London and Canberra was a good way of publicising research-based issues of discrimination and EMGs in Fiji internationally. It was an opportunity to engage with international voices, raise pertinent issues of ethnic relations in Fiji and establish networks.

4.2 However, the important question is, what value did the two round tables contribute to the project in terms of serving one of the specific aims of the project thus: “Increased understanding of all concerned stakeholders in Fiji and abroad of the grievances, needs and aspirations of the main ethnic communities in Fiji, and of the potential models for improved inter-ethnic relations.” While the justifications for the London and Canberra roundtables were spelt out, the actual aims and objectives were not. Furthermore, the outcome of the exercise is not very clear either.

¹⁵ Proposal p12

¹⁶ Ibid p12

Recommendation: See Recommendation 1.

5.0 Evaluation of the consultation process

5.1 From the variety of sources of information I gathered (report and interviews), the three-day roundtables appeared to have been very well organized, well facilitated and participants learnt a great deal from the discussions and proceedings.

5.2 The daily agenda was set out systematically with the aims and objectives of the discussions outlined clearly in the beginning as general guide. This ensured that the individual participants were aware of the process and their role as individuals and groups.

5.3 The process was participatory in the sense that a lot of time and opportunity was given to participants to express their views in group discussions and during the plenary. In fact it appears that the entire agenda revolved around the participants and issues discussed and the flavour of the discussions took were participant driven and took on a life and dynamism of their own and this helped to frame the shape of the roundtable in the end.

5.4 The wide range of views and suggestions provided from Day 1 to Day 3 was reflective of the commitment of the participants to the issues discussed and the diversity of political and ideological positions. While there were disagreements, there were also areas of consensus.

5.5 In terms of the entire project the roundtables provided the much needed democratic space for inter-ethnic, inter-religious and inter-group dialogue on the fundamentally important issue of ethnic relations. Of particular significance was the way in which the final day discussions began to converge

on the EMG issues. Although there was a danger that the EMG issue, which was central to the project, was going to be overshadowed by other national issues, the discussions provided a balanced approach to some critical issues in relation to ethnic relations and EMGs.

5.6 The roundtable was successful in a number of ways:

- (a) It was an opportunity to create consciousness about the often neglected and overlooked EMGs in the bigger context of ethnic relations in Fiji.
- (b) It helped to highlight the actual political and socio-economic conditions of marginalized EMGs such as the Solomon Islanders and Banaban.
- (c) It was an opportunity for EMGs, NGOs, religious organizations and other stakeholders to form alliances and networks with each other to share common problems and concerns relating to political rights, economic development, cultural identity and meaningful participation in the life of the nation.
- (d) It was an opportunity to bring the issues of minorities to the attention of the government in a direct and comprehensive way. However, this did not eventuate due to lack of government participation.
- (e) It provided an important forum to discuss ways of moving forward in as far as discrimination, marginalization and advancing the issues of EMGs are concerned.

5.7 While those interviewed expressed their appreciation of the process, it was not very really clear from the final report whether there was an attempt to synthesise and frame the range of very interesting suggestions by the three groups in Day 3 on “What needs to be done” into a series of more integrated, fine-tuned and applied policy formulations that could have been presented to government. Quite a number of suggestions were targeted at government and it would be a good strategy, despite the government’s often temperamental approach to civil society, to frame some coherent policy statements which can

be presented to government. This should be part of the engagement strategy to ensure that government is re-engaged after it pulled out from the project.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 2.

5.8 It does not appear from the report that there was a specific, practical follow up discussed and agreed to by the consultation. While CCF, MRG and some participant organizations have their own programs and policies on EMGs, it would have been a good idea to provide a long term framework of action to link the participants together in the future to ensure that the issues discussed were kept alive and sustainable. This is especially so given the lack of government policies on EMGs.¹⁷ However, this was not possible because the maximum period for the project as prescribed by the donor was short. Often projects of this type are funded for a limited time frame only.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 3.

6.0 Participant evaluation of consultations

6.1 The evaluation of the consultation process by participants took place in Day 3. Of the total of 22 respondents, 11 (50%) were male and 11 (50%) were females. Of these, 18 (82%) said they belonged to an EMG and 4 (18%) said that they did not. Five questions were asked and the participants were required to make their choice out of four options provided namely "very significant," "significant," "only a little," and "not at all."¹⁸

6.2 The first question asked was, "Do you believe that your understanding of the grievances, needs and aspirations of the ethnic communities in Fiji has improved as a result of your attendance at the roundtable and familiarity

¹⁷ Most of the NGOs interviewed stated that they did not have any specific programs or policies regarding EMGs.

¹⁸ Summary of evaluation sheet provided by CCF.

with the report.” The results were: very significant (50%), significant (32%), only a little (18%) and none at all (0%). In other words, 82% (50%+32%) stated that the consultation helped in their understanding of grievances, needs and aspirations of ethnic communities in Fiji.¹⁹ This is quite a commendable result.

6.3 The second question asked was, “Do you believe that your understanding of potential measures for improved inter-ethnic relations has improved as a result of your attendance at the Roundtable and familiarity with the report?” The results were: very significant (41%), significant (41%), only a little (18%) and none at all (0%). In other words, 82% (41%+41%) stated that the consultation helped in their understanding of potential measures for improved inter-ethnic relations. Again this is a very positive response.²⁰

6.4 The third question asked was, “Do you believe that the report and roundtable will contribute to the Fiji government's understanding of the measures needed to improve inter-ethnic relations?” The results were: very significant (43%), significant (24%), only a little (33%) and none at all (0%). In other words, 67% (43%+24%) were optimistic about potential for changing government's thinking and policies while 33% were not.²¹ The lack of government participation in the process may have impacted on people's perception of it.

6.5 The forth question asked was, “Do you believe that the report and outcomes of the roundtable will be useful for your advocacy work on behalf of advancing inter-ethnic relations?” The results were: very significant (36%), significant (59%), only a little (5%) and none at all (0%). In other words, 95% (36%+59%) stated that the reach report will be useful for their own advocacy

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

work and only 5% had doubts. This is indeed a very positive response to the effectiveness of the research.²²

6.6 The final question was, "Do you have any other comments, criticisms or suggestions?" The unedited responses, shown below, contained varied sentiments:

- Suggestions if there are more consultations and dialogue to be done between minority groups and minority groups with government.
- Please add women in decision-making as next strategies to engage with government.
- The report is well researched and a significant tool for the people of Fiji.
- Be the voice of the relevant institution and use it to other avenues.
- Look at the recommendations proposed by participants in the final session. There are a lot of things you can take up after evaluating the responses.
- Discuss with relevant government departments, NGOs, VSOs and media contacts.
- Lobby with government on people's behalf.
- Continue work on the Ethnic Minority issue. 2. Develop a programme within CCF specifically for minority communities addressing minority issues.
- Govt needs to return to democratic institutions - for social justice to be a non-negotiable determinant in development discussions. Need to engage with existing minority stakeholders and work our strategy.
- Able to disseminate information to the state and non-state actors for improvement of inter-ethnic relations and relinquish discrimination.
- Yes I do as it is the voice of the people and they are representing People of Fiji.

²² Ibid.

- Have strategies based on the recommendations from the report and workshop (CSOs) and submit to Government for consideration. Let's hope Govt will listen.
- Look at last session of Day 2 recommendations.
- Issues raised should be raised with international organisations eg UN.
- Specific roundtable discussions/dialogue with other stakeholders on specific issues that concern MRG.
- I would like in time to have a quantitative assessment around issues highlighted by the report eg - education/ women in decision-making/ intergration relationships etc....

6.7 These responses (6.6) were quite bold and full of optimism, a reflection of the confidence and satisfaction the participants experienced during the consultation. This positive sentiment should be encouraged and there should be follow up to some of these suggestions.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 4.

6.8 Noticeably, the questions were generally on "ethnic communities" (Q1), "inter-ethnic relations" (Q2), "inter-ethnic relations (Q3) and "inter-ethnic relations" (Q4) and there was no question specifically relating to EMGs or the specific issue of discrimination. These are two core themes of the project and it would have been important to raise them in the evaluation as the last activity of the three-day consultation.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 5.

PART B: TECHNICAL EVALUATION

7.0 Objectives

7.1 The broad aim of the project was to “contribute to improve inter-ethnic relations in Fiji and reduce the discrimination specific ethnic groups (such as the Indo-Fijians, the Rotumans, Banabans, Solomon Islanders, Tuvaluans, Kiribati, Chinese, Samoans and Tongans) experience on a daily basis in a country marked by a prolonged history of inter-ethnic conflicts and violence.” Admittedly, “improving inter-ethnic relations in Fiji and tackling discrimination” is a long term project which is “unlikely to be achieved in a short timescale.” Because of this, the project document states that the work is fundamentally “preparatory” in nature rather than exhaustive with a clearly defined visible outcome within a given time frame.²³ Again this was reflective of the constraints by the donor’s timetable.

As a way of achieving the broader goal of improving multi-ethnic relations, two specific objectives are identified:

(a) Increased understanding of all concerned stakeholders in Fiji and abroad of the grievances, needs and aspirations of the main ethnic communities in Fiji, and of the potential models for improved inter-ethnic relations.

(b) Increased engagement, coordination and exchanges between national and international-level decision makers, and representatives of ethnic communities, NGOs on issues of inter-ethnic relations and human rights.²⁴

7.2 The proposal claims that the project will “impact positively” on “target groups” listed as Fijian NGOs and CSOs, government officials, international decision-makers and community and religious leaders of the main ethnic minority communities in Fiji. It also identifies the proposed “beneficiaries” as “Ethnic communities in Fiji, especially the two predominant ethnic groups of Indigenous Fijians and Indo-Fijians, and also the ethnic minority communities of Rotumans, Banabans, Solomon Islanders, Tuvaluans, Kiribati, Samoans, Tongans and Chinese. In addition, MRG and CCF will reach out to faith

²³ Project Proposal, p2.

²⁴ Ibid.

communities, including Catholics, the various Protestant denominations, Hindus and Muslims, which in some cases coincide with ethnic communities, and in some cases cut across them.”²⁵

7.3 The broad aim of the project were quite commendable and addressed the issue of discrimination in Fiji and how positive inter-ethnic relations could be achieved. It appears that this had been thought out well, informed by CCF’s local experience and MRG’s international expertise.

7.4 The two specific objectives were very focused and, given the time and resources, very achievable. They were quite appropriate in addressing the broader issues of inter-ethnic relations in a country, which had experienced different forms of ethnic tension and fractured political relations.

7.5 There are, however, a couple of observations to be made. Firstly, the issue of “discrimination” was not well defined in the proposal and other documents, especially how it could be addressed. This was later addressed in the research itself. Discrimination is not an easy phenomenon to understand because it manifests itself in different way at different levels of society. Some forms of discrimination are more explicit while some are more subtle; some are more institutionalized while some are more personal; some are “real” and some are “perceived”; some are intentional and some are unintentional. The question of discrimination in Fiji takes diverse forms: inter-ethnic, intra-ethnic, religious, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc. Sometimes class or gender perception may take ethnic forms and it’s easy to make generalizations about ethnic discrimination if we are not fully aware of the complexities of the situation.

7.6 Secondly, the link between the two specific objectives and improving ethnic relations is not very clear. The implicit assumption is that carrying out the research and discussing the findings amongst selected participants will

²⁵ Ibid, p2

raise consciousness and somehow address the issue of discrimination. The question is, how will this enlightened consciousness filter down to the people on the street or in the villages and how will it be seen as different from the many other similar initiatives in Fiji? Often similar initiatives in Fiji tended to focus a lot on dialogue as if it was an end in itself rather than a part of a broader process with a bigger aim. How was the project different in this respect?

7.7 Thirdly, the distinction between the “target” group and the “beneficiaries” was not clear. This could have been made much clearer.

Recommendations: See Recommendations 6, 7 and 8.

8.0 Fulfilment of expectations

8.1 MRG had two major expectations. The first was the potential to contribute to the constitution drafting process by addressing critical issues which were important for the country. The second was to make concrete and actionable recommendations which would contribute to an understanding of what was needed to improve the situation of ethnic groups in Fiji regarding issues of ethnic discrimination and inter-ethnic harmony.

8.2 At the time of the project, the process of constitutional reform was taking place and the political situation was quite tense given the confrontation between the government and Constitution Review Commission which led to the rejection of the draft by the government. The government produced its own draft and after limited consultation produced the final draft. Events were unfolding unpredictably and it was not possible to make serious impact on the constitutional process because “the debate was taken over by forces much more powerful than us, we were not likely to make an impact on this debate,” although recommendations were submitted to the government drafting

process.²⁶ Regarding the second expectation the roundtables were very successful in identifying some key issues which communities were asking for in relation to inequality and diversity and what was needed to address these issues.²⁷

8.3 For CCF the project fitted well into their Pillar 3 of their program on Countering Racism and Promoting Multiculturalism. It was expected that the report was to provide CCF with the current state of affairs of the EMGs in Fiji in relation to state support, socio-economic status, their perception of government and state policies over the years including the policies of current regime. In addition was interest in the work of stakeholders and partners who work with the EMGs, in relation to socio-political and development issues. These were then expected to be addressed in CCF's advocacy and community education work in line with the objectives of Pillar 3. Another expectation was that the research work was intended to support CCF's capacity building in research in relation to research design, methodology etc.

8.4 The first expectation was fully met as the workshops and the round tables in Suva assisted CCF in capturing some important issues, which were used by the community education team to conduct civic education workshops with the group representing those of Solomon Islands descent in Ra. The workshops also helped to highlight the different locations of EMGs settlements in the Suva-Nausori corridor and other places around and outside Suva as well as introduced some emerging actors and leaders. Another positive result was identification of different agendas, activities and dynamics between the different organizations which provided CCF with the information and opportunities for further advocacy and community education.

²⁶ Interview with Chris Chapman, MRG.

²⁷ Ibid

8.5 CCF felt that some of its expectations were thwarted by their perception that their role was limited to being the implementation arm of the project in relation to MRG which seemed to have more leverage. Their expectation that the research component of the project would provide training opportunities for the CCF research team did not eventuate. This led to the project being shifted from the research team to the project team.

8.6 For many groups interviewed, the project provided a great opportunity to affirm their own work on ethnic relations and minority rights in Fiji over the years. It also filled in some of the gaps in their work on minority groups at a time when this was overshadowed by focus on the iTaukei-Indo-Fijian ethnic relations. For instance, a significant eye-opener was the fact that some minorities lived as closed and isolated communities in socio-economically deprived localities around Suva.²⁸ The project made minorities more visible, more valued and created more opportunities for addressing the minority communities in a more comprehensive manner.²⁹

8.7 Some felt empowered that they were given the opportunity to engage in dialogue with representatives of other ethnic groups. For the more marginalized minority groups, it also provided a forum to openly articulate their disadvantaged situations as well as the impact of the different policies of different governments in the past on their well-being. There was perception that, minorities were not considered a priority in development government policies.³⁰

8.8 Like other participants, the government expected to learn more about the plight of the minority groups to help in its policy formulation and engagement strategies. However, this expectation was not fulfilled because

²⁸ Some of those interviewed had no idea that there were pockets of EGM living in squatter settlements around and outside Suva.

²⁹ This view was quite prevalent amongst those interviewed.

³⁰ Most of those from minority groups interviewed held this view.

the government representative felt that there was an inherent anti-government bias in the program and the report. They were also not happy with what they saw as the disconnect between the research findings and the recommendations.³¹ They felt that they were looking forward to some new recommendations on minorities but they found that most of the recommendations, apart from constitutional reform suggested things they had already been doing in areas such as development, multi-culturalism and education. They also stated that there was no acknowledgement of the government's past policies in these matters.³²

8.9 There was no systematic mapping of the needs and expectations of the community and the government at the beginning of the project. This was perhaps due to the fact that the scale of the project did not permit this.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 9

9.0 Project design

9.1 It seems that the conceptualization stage was very much shaped by MRG and CR in response to the call for expressions of interests by EU. The CCF became involved as a "southern" partner at a later stage after their own application fell through. This stage in the project is often very crucial because this is where most of the initial "thinking" goes into the project proposal.

9.2 The proposal, designed according to EU specifications, was quite comprehensive. Like many other proposals seeking solutions to deeply entrenched social and political problems, it had ambitious aims. This was a commendable challenge, especially in relation to how it would engage with the real dynamics on the ground.

³¹ This was the view strongly expressed by the government representative, Eddie Tunidau.

³² Despite these strong feelings, they also felt that they were ready to re-engage any time.

9.3 The issue of discrimination in Fiji was not systematically analysed in the proposal, especially in relation to how the term itself was defined and how it is reflected in Fijian social and political life. Discrimination is a complex issue, which manifests itself in diverse forms at different levels of society. Also, the minority groups in Fiji are quite diverse in socio-economic status and political power with some being more privileged (such as Europeans and Chinese) and some being very marginalized (such as the Solomon Islanders and Banabans). The more marginalized groups perhaps demand more attention when we talk of minority discrimination.

9.4 Logistical issues such as the rush to beat the deadline for submission and problems of communication between two organizations located in opposite parts of the world with significant time difference were major challenges which had to be overcome. It would have been ideal if CCF, as the local partner with Fijian political expertise and experience, was given more time to provide input into the proposal. Minimal input by CCF to the proposal meant that at the outset, the concept of partnership came under close scrutiny. On the other hand, MRG staff were engaged with other projects around the world and despite their attempts to set up skype communication with CCF, the huge time difference became a major obstacle.

9.5 The research, being a major output was conducted professionally although there were concerns raised by some about the representativeness of samples, the broader focus on ethnic relations rather than specifically on minorities and the lack of connection between the recommendations on the constitutional reforms and minority discrimination. Despite these concerns, the research itself raised the issue of discrimination in a satisfactory way and provided a good basis for further research into the complex aspects of ethnic relations in Fiji.

9.6 The post-research consultation was meant to be the basis for dialogue and networking amongst participants. The three days were spent on extensive discussions on the various aspects of the research, the issues raised, how these issues applied to the situation in Fiji and possible suggestions for the future. The dialogue process brought out important issues which many participants believed helped to broaden their views on the situation of minority groups.

9.7 A factor which made the project design workable, despite the challenges were the quality of the individuals involved. Both MRG and CCF are highly respected organizations with a lot of experience and expertise with very competent individuals. In any organization individuals make things happen and in this case, the role played by individuals such as Akuila Yabaki and Rodney Yee of CCF and Chris Chapman of MRG played a crucial role in making the project design workable.

9.8 The allocated 18 months was sufficient to complete the actual project implementation but not long enough to realise the output in terms of policy influence. Raising people's consciousness and incorporating this into workable policies is a long term process.

9.9 The inclusion of the Canberra and London symposiums added depth and variety to the project but it appears that participants based in these places were more interested in the big picture issues such as the constitution than on the issue of minorities.

9.10 The major challenges relating to the project design included:

- (a) The issue of minorities and discrimination, the two key concepts, were not well defined in the context of Fiji and the definitions were taken for granted. MRG itself has a lot of expertise and has done a lot of work in these areas and no doubt there would be a lot of sources to draw from.

However, there was a view that providing technical definitions was probably not appropriate in such projects. Also there was no mechanism in place to ensure that these two key issues flowed through the project without being over taken by other issues;

- (b) There is ambiguity as to whether the project is targeted at ethnic relations broadly, EMGs more specifically or both. Different documents analysed and different people interviewed had different views and emphasis.
- (c) The design did not take into consideration the important issues of effective communication between the two partners, MRG and CCF, and this often led to misunderstanding. For an effective north-south collaborative project, the process of communicating the intentions and expectations of the different partners clearly is important to maintain coherence and trust.
- (d) Most of the factors identified as risks rightly identified the government as a major threat with potential to intervene and thwart the process given its tense relationship with CCF. However, it did not foresee the possibility of the government participating and withdrawing as a result of disagreement with aspects of the project. This threatened to undermine the project because one of the major “impact” factors for sustainability identified in the proposal was that “The project will aim to influence national and international policy in Fiji with regard to inter-ethnic relations and the human rights of members of the various ethnic groups. The most powerful stakeholder with regard to these issues is the Fijian government.”³³
- (e) There was no acknowledgement and identification of the range of skills and potentially innovative input by the local partner and local NGOs in the project design. Many local NGOs have extensive international, regional and local experience and expertise and it would have been appropriate if these were incorporated somehow into the

³³ Project proposal, p20

project design. This would have helped to diversify and democratize the process a bit more especially when the local CSOs are going to be the main players in the project. A quick appraisal of what's on the ground would have been a good idea.

- (f) The project design could have also considered provisions for how the partnership was to work, the risks involved and some mitigating factors. It is important to frame project designs around people and relationships rather than fitting people into a pre-existing technical template. This is one of the major differences between a "people-centred" design and a "program-centred" design.

Recommendations: See Recommendations 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15

10.0 Capacity and resources

10.1 Both CCF and MRG are well respected organizations with a lot of international, regional and local experience in issues relating to ethnic relations and EMGs. As organizations they are structured professionally with highly qualified and competent individuals. Some of the shortcomings of the project mentioned in this report are not due to lack of qualification or competence but to issues of communication and other rectifiable logistics and technicalities.

10.2 However, the capacity of both organizations could have been better harnessed through a more comprehensive division of labour. For instance, CCF felt that their participation and input was not fully utilized. A stocktake of the existing capacity should have been carried out and this should have been factored into the project design to ensure a more equitable division of labour.

10.3 A more equitable division of labour would have implications on financial resources distribution too. The project budget shows that of the total allocation of €94,189.56, a total of €44,406.74 (47%) was allocated for human resources. Of this amount MRG was allocated €37,943.74 (85%) and CCF was allocated only €6,463 (15%).³⁴ The disparity was obvious and this partly explained CCF's concerns as a lesser partner. However, on the other hand, it has to be emphasised that the main activity of the project was the research and publication, which MRG was responsible for. So a lot of resources was put into commissioning, commenting, editing, proof-reading and publishing. In addition the imbalance could also be attributed to the differences in the cost of living in London and Suva.

10.4 Perhaps more resources could have been put into capacity building and empowerment on the ground to ensure long term sustainability of the project instead of focusing only on a one-off exercise. Although there was extensive consultation of people outside Suva during the research, it would have also been a good idea if some rural-based organization were represented in the Suva consultations.

10.4 Resource control and allocation is always a contentious issue within an organisation but when two different groups are involved in a common project, care needs to be taken in advance through meticulous planning and proper consultation to ensure that none of the partners feels overpowered by another's decision. This has potential to cause tension and impact on the project. MRG said that it initiated moves to set up skype discussions but because of the time difference and CCF's engagement with other projects, some of these attempts fell through.

10.6 The person in charge of the research, Prof Vijay Naidu, was also a highly competent and well respected scholar in Fiji and the three research assistants

³⁴ Annex B Budget, p1

were all post-graduate students. The groups represented in the consultation were from CSOs and organizations which have been involved in trans-ethnic and intra-ethnic peace-building work at the grassroots level.

10.7 The two facilitators, Koila Olson of CPPB and Rodney Yee of CCF, both MA graduates, were very highly qualified academically, highly skilled in facilitating dialogue process and had extensive experience in dealing with complex issues of ethnic relations in Fiji.³⁵ Chris Chapman of MRG, who holds an MA and is a peace-building specialist and accomplished researcher/author had a lot of international experience and expertise. This wealth of expertise and experience was a great contribution to the success of the consultations.

10.8 At the same time, it would have helped if prior identification of grassroots-based expertise and experience had taken place as potential input into the consultation process in the project design. The approach in the project design tended to be “top-down” by suggesting that the project “will have a positive impact on the technical/management capacities of the target groups” and “also enhance their capacities for managing inter-ethnic relations and to be prepared for responding to tension.”³⁶ Perhaps an integrated approach, which incorporated both the top-down and bottom-up strategies would be a more empowering strategy. Again the limited time and scope of the project did not allow for the formulation of a bottom-up strategy.

Recommendations: See Recommendations 16, 17, 18

11.0 Data and analysis

³⁵

³⁶ Project proposal, p9

The research data collected was based on a formal questionnaire which had both closed and open questions. The analysis of data was based on the qualitative approach. For a research of this type which deals with people's perception and sentiments, this seems to be an appropriate approach to take.

11.2 There was a valuable synthesis of responses which would be a goldmine for sociologists and other social scientists looking to capture and analyse views and sentiments on ethnic relations in Fiji's multicultural context. The presentation of data was based on open-ended discussions of responses and it is left to the readers to make sense of them and put them in context. It is important to note that responses were based on a number of factors including personal experiences, generally shared views within a community, stereotypes and information through media.

11.3 Perhaps it would have been helpful if there was another chapter solely on synthesizing, contextualizing and interpreting the responses in the context of Fiji's ethno-political situation. This includes identifying broad patterns and pulling out some common strands which could contribute to the ongoing discussions.

12.0 Findings

12.1 Most of the findings reinforced what some scholars on Fiji have written about and would no doubt help enrich the debate on ethnic relations in Fiji. The empirical research captured individual views and helped discern views in the private domain.

12.2 The findings provided a deeper understanding of views by people who are not normally heard. Making public some of the private discourses is a significant factor in the findings. While the small size and representativeness

of the sample had been criticized, the views expressed did capture common perceptions and sentiments within the ethnic communities in Fiji.

12.3 Some of the findings were expected and some were new and became a good basis for the discussions in the consultation.

13.0 Conclusions and recommendations

13.1 The conclusions and recommendations of the report were not necessarily new. The concluding discussions were a bit too brief for a research of this type and there could have been a more comprehensive synthesis of the interesting findings. Some significant threads could have been pulled out and woven into a bigger framing of the Fiji situation while identifying areas of potential reconciliation.

13.2 The focus on diversity and differences in the project generally tended to overshadow any creative exploration of existing commonalities and peace-building initiatives to build on. Perhaps a bit more focus on some approaches to multiculturalism and minority issues which have been successful as models upon which future initiatives could be built on would have been relevant.

13.3 The recommendations were largely targeted at the government (15 out of 16) and were geared towards macro policies of the state. As mentioned earlier, the government's response to this was that the recommendations did not take into consideration some existing development initiatives which were already addressing some of the suggestions through the People's Charter and other development projects.³⁷ The government representative pulled out of the project because of they felt that the project had "pre-determined views" which tended to put the government in a negative light, even before dialogue

³⁷ Discussions with government representative.

started. This could have been avoided had there been serious thinking and discussion around engagement strategies as a critical part of the project design. A way of doing this is to carry out a political audit of the political situation in the country and the best way to engage with critical players during the early part of the proposal design. This must be lined to one of the outputs of the project, which is to influence government policy.

13.4 Some participants felt that it would have helped if the recommendations had focused specifically on the findings and how the communities themselves could address their own problems. The findings were rich in perceptions and sentiments and the project would provide a great opportunity in this regard. There was also the view that there could have been suggestions for engagement between the communities and the government as well as suggestions on how community organizations could develop the capacity to address interethnic relations at grassroots level.

14.0 Report

14.1 The report was useful in a number of ways. Firstly it reinforced and affirmed some assumptions about people's perception at the local level. This is more so in relation to the perception of various ethnic groups in relation to the coups, identity and human rights.

14.2 Secondly, often, studies on ethnic relations in Fiji have been based on macro analysis and the role of elites as the primary players in society and often fail to capture individual perceptions at the local level. The report provided an empirical study of views of individuals of different ethnicity, gender, age and social background at the grassroots level. In Fiji, the dominant views consisted largely of those of opinion makers such as academics, politicians and public officials while the report attempts to invert the process by bringing the views of those normally invisible to the fore.

14.3 Thirdly, the report contained a number of controversial aspects, which provided interesting debates during the consultation. Views were divided on some aspects of the report and there were also areas of consensus.

PART C: QUALITY ASSESSMENT

15.0 Relevance

15.1 There is no doubt that the focus of the project on improvement of ethnic relations was very relevant to the Fiji situation, given the country's history of ethnic turmoil and socio-political tension. All the participants interviewed felt that the project was very relevant to their organizations' as well as personal work and interests in ethnic relations in Fiji.³⁸

15.2 The two most relevant issues the respondents identified were ethnic relations and EMGs, both of which were seen to be related. For some, the issue of EMG was often ignored and was never a part of their programs but after the consultation, they saw it as a relevant component of how they would be operating in the future. Thus in some ways, the consultations made EMGs more relevant as a critical issue in the broader debate of ethnic relations in Fiji. It provided an opportunity for identifying some important characteristics of minorities and raising their profiles in mainstream political discourse and the need for deliberative policy framing which addresses their concerns.

15.3 As earlier stated, while the project theme itself was very relevant, the aims of the project could have been more sharply focused.

16.0 Inclusiveness

³⁸ Almost all the participants who were interviewed articulated this view.

Gender

16.1 In any project, the issue of gender inclusiveness is often determined by a number of factors including the gender composition of the participant organizations and stakeholders, the deliberate policy of gender diversity of the project design and the gender composition of the target group. Both MRG and CCF have very strong gender-conscious positions as reflected in their policies and activities and this filtered through the research and consultation process.

16.2 Two of the three research assistants were females. However, of the 33 iTaukei research participants, there was a preponderance of males with 63% and 37% were females. The proportion for the Indo-Fijians was more balanced with 50% male and 50% female while for the minority groups, the percentage was 63% for male and 37% for females similar to the Indo-Fijians.³⁹

16.3 The skewed gender sample may be due to lapses in consciousness about the sample by the research assistants rather than a deliberate attempt to under-represent women. There could other factors as well including the unavailability of female participants at any given time and place. Nevertheless, it would have been much better if the sample was more gender equitable, in line with a fundamental project philosophy.

16.4 The number of females who participated in the various other activities saw strong participation by women. During the CSO roundtable, of the 15 participants, 53% were females and 46% were males. Of the 50 who attended the report launch, 58% were females and 42% were males. Of the 21 who attended Roundtable 1, 57% were female and 43% were males.⁴⁰ The gender

³⁹ See Research Report, Appendix 1, pp36-37.

⁴⁰ See "Narrative report after activity implemented by partner."

representation for the Canberra and London roundtables were also reasonably balanced.

16.5 One of the reasons for the predominance of females is that most civil society organisations in Fiji are run and led by females. The project was very gender inclusive and this was indeed a commendable feature.

Other minorities

16.6 Interestingly, of the 22 who submitted their evaluation form, 81% said that they belonged to minority groups.⁴¹ The ethnic breakdown of the total number of participants in the 3 day roundtable are not available.

Fiji-wide representation

16.7 Most of the organizations represented were Suva-based and there was hardly any from the rural areas or other places outside Suva. Some of those who attended were already part of the “converted” and probably did not need to learn more about ethnic relations and EMGs while there were groups outside Suva which needed to be exposed to these issues. However, on the other hand most of the organizations represented, although Suva-based, have membership and carry out projects around the country and it was deemed cheaper and logistically easier to have Suva-based representatives. Also some organizations outside Suva which were invited by CCF failed to turn up.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 19

17.0 Effectiveness

⁴¹ See Summary responses of evaluation.

17.1 The different participant organizations felt that the project was effective but in different ways. The government representative thought that the project had potential and government would have gladly participated had it been more inclusive and less antagonistic in its view of the government. He felt that the project provided an opportunity for serious engagement with civil society on the important issues of discrimination, minorities and ethnic relations generally but this unfortunately slipped by.⁴² He mentioned that the government had its own projects and approaches which it was ready to share with other willing participants, but under favourable circumstances.

17.2 There was a general feeling that the project broadened the participants' consciousness and concerns for minorities in Fiji. The representative of the Fiji Media Watch who is also a leader in the Rotuman community stressed that the project provided them with the opportunity to forge new links with other minorities and would be ready to share their concerns through joint activities.⁴³ Some organizations such as Social Empowerment Education Program (SEEP) which had been carrying out community-based projects on iTaukei/Indo Fijian reconciliation talked about how the project expanded their views about minorities, outside the dominant agenda of their projects.⁴⁴

17.3 Some international organizations such as the EU and Ausaid do not have specific policies on minorities since their focus is on national or sectoral development and do not deal with ethnic minorities directly. They operate on a version of the chance trickle-down effect where resources put into development, governance, civic education, peace-building or human rights projects are expected to somehow find their way down to the minorities.⁴⁵ These organizations are often very cautious about direct ethnic engagement due to its political sensitivity but are keen on supporting peace-building,

⁴² Discussions with Eddie Tunidau, the government representative.

⁴³ Discussions with the Fiji Media Watch and Rotuman Association.

⁴⁴ Discussions with SEEPs representative.

⁴⁵ Discussions with EU and Ausaid representatives.

human rights and civic education initiatives which are related to promotion of multiculturalism.

17.4 Both organizations were “satisfied” and value their relationship with CCF whom they regard as a reliable and significant partner. For the EU, normally Brussels informs the Suva office of Fiji projects under the direct jurisdiction of Brussels and the reverse also happens.⁴⁶

17.5 Organizations such as the Fiji National Youth Council (FNYC), which do not have specific ethnic policies have the potential to engage the government and influence their policies on minorities. The FNYC representative said that the consultation was eye-opening because it alerted them to the plight of disadvantaged minority groups such as the Solomoni.⁴⁷ They are now aware of the need to be more inclusive of minority rights and situations in their programs. This was something they have often ignored because of the assumption that nation-wide policies are universally beneficial. FNYC is now in a position to incorporate minority interests into their programs such as the “seeds of success” project. Because it works closely with the Ministry of Youth and Sports, it would be in a position to influence government policies on minority youths.⁴⁸

17.6 The representative of Interfaith Fiji provided a very positive and optimistic view of the project saying that it reinforced Interfaith Fiji’s own position to address the issues of integration and multiculturalism. Interfaith is mostly concerned with religious minorities and does not often deal specifically with ethnic minorities although the two often coincide. The project has inspired them to put together a proposal for a minority project for next year. Some religious groups have been dealing with ethnic minorities (eg

⁴⁶Discussion with EU representative.

⁴⁷ Discussions with Fiji National Youth Council representative.

⁴⁸ Ibid

Anglican Church's support for the Solomoni community) and it is important to share these experiences with other religious groups.

17.7 The Methodist Church representative framed his views in an alternative way. His argument was that instead of accentuating differences by studying different groups separately, we should be identifying the commonalities and how these can be used to strengthen relationships. He added that the project focused too much on "artificial divides" and this tended to reinforce ethnic stereotypes and separation rather than integration. The reality on the ground, it was argued, tended to be based more on mutuality rather than tension as assumed by the project since ethnic groups in Fiji tend to have more in common than there are differences.⁴⁹ This was largely the same line of thinking of the Transparency International (Fiji) representative.⁵⁰

17.8 The UNDP representative stated that one of the useful aspects of the report was that it provided a "checklist" of minority groups to be covered in any minority program and although UNDP does not have an ethnic minority program on its own, its association with CCF and its involvement in the minority program has provided them with a good base for refining some of their own approaches to the Fiji situation.⁵¹

17.9 Peace groups such as the Pacific Centre for Peace-building (PCPB) also saw the value of the project in terms alerting people to the plight of the ethnic minorities. While the focus of PPBC's attention has been largely on gender and age, it now sees engagement with ethnic minority issues as something "to be more intentional" in their future programs.⁵²

⁴⁹ Discussion with Methodist Church representative.

⁵⁰ Discussions with the Transparency International (Fiji) representative.

⁵¹ Discussion with two UNDP representatives.

⁵² Discussion with Pacific Centre for Peace-building representative.

17.10 The invitation by the Attorney General to MRG to attend the launching of the new constitution came as a surprise, especially given that it was sent only a day before the launching on 6 September.⁵³ The invitation was significant because it shows that the government was well aware of the international status of MRG as well as the significance of the Fiji project.

18.0 Efficiency

18.1 Despite the problems of communication, unequal division of labour and resources, unfavourable political climate in Fiji and the distance between Suva and London, the level of efficiency was commendable. Most of the fund had been used, the major activities had been concluded and the participants had been satisfied with the learning experience.

18.2 When we talk about efficiency, the process is just as important as the final product. Had there been more dialogue in the beginning as well as effective and a clear understanding of expectations and division of labour at the outset, the level of efficiency of the project would have been much higher.

19.0 Sustainability

19.1 The limited nature of the project in terms of timeframe and resources did not allow it to be self-sustaining in the long run, although there was an understanding that it would be the first stage of a much bigger project. Despite this limitation, in as far as the local communities are concerned, it would be a good idea to continue discussions of the issues on their own given their available resources and capacity.

19.2 The long term sustainability of this type of project depends on a number of factors. Firstly, there should be a follow up program specifically on the core issues built into the proposal. This entails providing a framework for different

⁵³ Letter of invitation by attorney general to MRG, 21 August for 22 August launch of constitution.

phases for future activities and the central role of local participants in seeing it through. Secondly, the individual participants themselves may need to take up the challenge by devising strategies using their own resources for their own projects. Thirdly, there should be engagement with the government to ensure that the ideas are transformed into public policies for the betterment of the population. Fourthly, is planning for a similar project in the future using local participants and resources.

19.3 The second, third and fourth points are probably the most relevant. In relation to the second point, it appears that some of the organizations which participated have taken the EMGs issues on board and have incorporated them in different ways into their programs. For instance Inter-faith Fiji will soon set up a new program specifically on minorities and the Rotuman Association has been involved in discussions relating to EMGs.⁵⁴

19.4 The third point needs serious consideration because of the importance of influencing government policies on EMGs. CCF needs to continue its engagement with government to ensure this happens. This requires political tact and smart diplomacy to ensure that the government re-engages after its sudden exit during the consultations.

19.5 The third point is also worth examining in the light of the availability of local resources. A number of local CSOs have been involved in issues of ethnic relations, peace-building and minorities and some academics have done research on the issues. It would be relatively easy to organize a workshop on these issues based on expert presentations, panel discussions, role play by groups such as Women Action for Change (WAC) and other forms of artistic expressions. This could be accompanied by essay competition, debates and oratory contest for students and even the public. It

⁵⁴ Discussions with Fiji Interfaith and Fiji Rotuman Association representatives.

could actually become an annual event and UNDP, EU, AUSAID and NZAID could be approached to help with funding.

19.6 The sustainability of the partnership between CCF and MRG has a lot of promise despite some tension during the project period. Both are committed to their respective ideals and they share a lot of historical and political links which are above personality differences.

Recommendations: See Recommendations 20 and 21

20.0 Impact

20.1 It is not easy to assess the immediate impact of such a project especially when the aim of contributing to improved multi-ethnic relations in Fiji is long term. However, we can distinguish different types of outcomes and impacts. The first was the report itself, which was a tangible manifestation of one of the components of the project. The second was the result of the consultations, in particular how it has benefitted the participants. The third was in terms of how it influenced the constitutional process and policies. The fourth was how it influenced the thinking and policy position of various participating organizations. The fifth was how it helped to enrich public consciousness about the issue through media publicity. The last and ultimately is how the project has helped to change the situation in Fiji for the better. This is a long term impact which is difficult to measure.

20.2 For most participants interviewed, the project provided a good opportunity to forge new links and hear the voices of minorities. For some it was the first time they had heard firsthand of the situation of many marginalized groups.⁵⁵ For some representatives of minority groups, the mere exposure to the issue of minorities allowed them to think more critically

⁵⁵ Discussions with representatives of some participant organizations.

about their own situations and how they can link up with other groups as a way of strategizing about achieving empowerment.⁵⁶ Some minority groups such as the Rotuman Association prefer that they remain autonomous while maintaining cultural links with other minority groups rather than being assimilated totally into the dominant iTaukei culture.⁵⁷

20.3 The feedback from international organizations such as AUSAID, UNDP, Amnesty International, Commonwealth Secretariat, Australian High Commission, British High Commission and others was very positive. The project was seen as a good learning experience and a useful tool for improvement of ethnic relations in Fiji in the future.

20.4 For CCF, project created a lot of the golden opportunities to explore with the members and representatives of the EMGs CSOs who work with them. It reaffirmed CCF's commitment to the EMG issue in a significant way.

20.5 A Fijian Solomon Islander scholar who read the report felt that it did have a profound impact on her. She stated that one way of empowering the marginalized Solomon Islanders is to reclassify them as iTaukei "because they have a traditional relationship with the iTaukei, and as such they should be assimilated into the iTaukei community. They cannot maintain their identity as most of them have no sense at all about the Solomon Islands culture and language." Other issues which need addressing relate to scholarships, landownership, housing, infrastructure and public utilities.⁵⁸

21.0 Media impact

21.1 An analysis of the media coverage showed that the international and local media coverage of the project was quite extensive. Understandably,

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Discussions with the representative of the Fiji Rotuman Students Association.

⁵⁸ Discussions with a Fijian Solomon Islander scholar.

many of these focused on selected aspects, which journalists considered “newsworthy” and in quite a lot of cases, the same news story was reported multiple times. Some of these are shown below.

- a) Pacific Islands Report: Pacific Islands Development Program, East-West Centre.
With Support From Centre for Pacific Islands Studies, University of Hawai'i <http://www.pidp.org/pireport/2013/April/04-11-04.htm>
source: Radio Australia
- b) 10 April 2013: Fiji National TV: Panel of launch event filmed and broadcast on TV
- c) 11 April 2013: Islands Business:
<http://www.islandsbusiness.com/news/fiji/844/report-calls-for-improved-inter-ethnic-relations-i/> FIJI
- d) 12 April 2013: <http://crosbiew.blogspot.co.uk/2013/04/news-and-comments-friday-12-april-2013.html> UK
- e) 10 April 2013: FBC - <http://www.fbc.com.fj/fiji/9379/ccf-launches-new-report> FIJI
- f) 17 April: Radio Australia – PIRP
- g) <http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/international/radio/program/pacific-beat/fijis-democratic-future-remains-in-doubt-report/1117324> 17 April 2013 on Radio Australia
- h) <http://www.thefijinews.net/index.php/sid/213758359/scat/7b9fd5fd3be1c082> Fiji
- i) <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/WO1304/S00107/fiji-government-must-open-up-constitution-process.htm> New Zealand
- j) <http://www.pina.com.fj/index.php?p=pacnews&m=read&o=14139260505165deb648403b1ad535> Fiji
- k) <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-04-10/report-calls-for-improved-inter-ethnic-relations-in-fiji/4621352> Australia network news

- l) <http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/pacific/radio/program/pacific-beat/ethnic-divisions-still-a-problem-in-fiji/1114214> Australia Radio
- m) <http://www.pidp.org/pireport/2013/April/04-12-03.htm> PIR
- n) <http://www.radioaustralia.net.au/pacific/2013-04-17/rights-group-slams-fijis-constitution-process/1117366> Australia Radio
- o) <http://fijilive.com/news/2013/04/ethnicity-not-an-issue-psc/53528.Fijilive>
- p) <http://fijimuse.wordpress.com/tag/minority-rights-group-international/>
- q) <http://www.islandsbusiness.com/news/fiji/844/report-calls-for-improved-inter-ethnic-relations-i/>
- r) <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-04-10/report-calls-for-improved-inter-ethnic-relations-in-fiji/4621352>
- s) <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/cap-events/fiji-challenges-and-opportunities-diversity-%E2%80%93-report-launch-and-workshop#.UleA2aP2-Uk>
- t) <http://crosbiew.blogspot.co.nz/2013/04/news-and-comments-friday-12-april-2013.html>

22.0 Partnership

22.1 Generally the relationship between the project partners has been good. However, both are fully aware of the stresses and challenges associated with the project. The differences in interpretation of issues and of each other's intent, the different approaches and expectation are often expected in joint projects and how the emerging issues are dealt with is part of the ongoing challenges of relationship building.

22.2 CCF felt that it played minimal role in the development of the overall concept design. The role it played was limited to commenting on a completed project draft and there was no real input or consultation on input at the thinking stage of the project design. It appears that Ciaran O'Toole, a former project manager for CCF had made arrangements with MRG about the project

and “in fact placed pressure for CCF to undertake the project without much real discussion.”⁵⁹ Similarly CCF felt that the management of the project role would have been best discussed beforehand because they felt that in the end they played a bigger role on the field and very little control and input into the budget which showed that there was an unequal distribution of funds with about 85% of the human resources allocation spent in London and only 15% in Suva. CCF would have liked more allocation to their staff costs. From CCF’s view, it “was a partnership of unequals and placed a huge burden on CCF on the administrative end.”⁶⁰

22.3 From MRG’s point of view, the relationship seems to be “generally, very good.”⁶¹ However, undeniably there were some problems of communication and consultation which may have caused some misunderstanding. MRG discussed with Ciaran O’Toole in 2010 about the possibility of partnering with CCF on the project and given the limited time of 6-8 weeks to put together the proposal, things were a bit rushed. This had some impact on the partnership process because this did not allow for pre-proposal initial dialogue.

22.4 This lack of initial consultation was of concern to both CCF and MRG and this may have impacted on the occasional breakdown in communication between the two partners. Many Skype meetings for instance were called off due to CCF’s failure to participate. From MRG’s point of view, they had invested considerable time and effort trying to salvage the relationship. The relationship became tense at one point and MRG sent Nicole Girard, the Asia programs officer, to visit Fiji to help plan for the forthcoming events. This may have improved relations a bit.

⁵⁹ Discussion with CCF representative.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Discussions with MRG representative.

22.5 The lack of initial dialogue for the project concept undermined the sense of partnership from the beginning. For two organizations which are strong advocates of dialogue, it would have made a lot of sense if initial discussions on the project had taken place prior to the proposal stage. Given the tight schedule and the demanding input required by the EU proposal process, it would have been sensible to have these done quite early. As mentioned earlier, there should also have been some division of labour in terms of input into the proposal depending on the availability of expertise on both sides and more communication throughout the proposal drafting process. These could have been more systematically outlined and agreed to by both sides in the beginning. This ideal situation may not be realistic given the complex reality of the situation. Both CCF and MRG were busy drafting and submitted their respective proposals and the demands of the proposal drafting and the limited time did not allow the division of labor to happen.

22.6 Organizations are often protective of their sense of identity and independence and there is a need for sensitivity in this area especially when dealing with fiercely independent and politically-inclined organizations such as MRG and CCF. It is often a good idea to agree on the terms of the partnership in the beginning to ensure that both organizations are operating on the same wavelength. This is to avoid perception of being dominated or marginalized in the partnership.

22.7 The timing of the project was also a concern because it was at a time when Fiji was going through the constitutional review process and CCF was a major civil society player in the civic education program, campaign and activism. Much of CCF's focus and resources were already targeted at the constitutional reform issue and the advent of the project meant that they had to divert part of their focus away. While it can be argued that the project could have contributed to CCF's own constitutional campaign project, the

extra layer of responsibility may have put more pressure on its already expanded capacity.

22.8 The project would have provided some valuable lessons for future partnerships and it is important for both organizations to identify where they have gone wrong and try to avoid the same mistakes in the future.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 22

23.0 Engagement strategies

23.1 Engagement with other participants was based on a number of strategies. Firstly was the use of pre-existing CCF networks with CSOs as well as with government. Some of these networks are ongoing and have been around for some time. The second was through a more formal approach, especially when dealing with international aid agencies and foreign embassies, many of whom were already aware of CCF's work as well as have in the past been involved with CCF as project partners. The third was engagement with the public through the media. This was important to raise public consciousness and also to provide accountability for the CCF and MRG project.

23.2 The research was also a form of engagement because it involved talking directly to people and gathering their views. The publication and distribution of the report was an extension of this. This was followed by the three day consultation.

23.3 In some ways the project complemented some existing projects on public dialogue and engagement initiated by the Dialogue Fiji, Transparency International (Fiji), Pacific Centre for Peace-building, Femlink, InterFaith Fiji and others. The peace-building programs in Fiji have been quite active over

the years in response to the emerging problems of ethno-political tension and as a way of engaging contending groups and with the population at large.

23.4 Engagement with the international agencies was particularly significant because it was a good way of mobilizing international exposure and support.

23.5 Perhaps the only missing link was engagement with the rural communities. While people from outside Suva were also participants in the research, there was minimal participation through the consultations which were largely Suva-based.

Recommendation: Recommendation 23

24.0 Challenges and mitigating strategies

24.1 There were a number of challenges faced by the project.

- (a) The first was the political environment in Fiji at the time of the project. Since the coup in 2006, the military regime passed a number of decrees which limited political expression, public gatherings and media freedom. Although there had been some relaxation to facilitate the constitutional review process, the regime still maintained a tight control on politics and they maintained a very close surveillance system of political developments around the country. Because of CCF's public advocacy role, it sometimes found itself in direct confrontation with the regime. One of the most prominent cases was when CCF and the executive director were fined \$20,000 for publishing a report which criticized the legal system in Fiji. A government representative was invited to the consultations but left after he disagreed with some of the issues in the research report.

Despite the occasional tension, CCF has always tried to engage with the government through person to person engagement with various government officials and this has kept the windows of opportunity open. CCF should be encouraged to continue with the dialogue with representatives of the government as a way of influencing the government's policy thinking and policy direction.

- (b) The differences and miscommunication between CCF and MRG may have caused tension at some point in the project. This was a major challenge because the success of the project depended fundamentally on the way the two organizations were able to pull their resources and goodwill together. However, both organizations were able to overcome the problems through continuous dialogue and commitment to the project because both knew that their credibility rested with the success of the project. Both parties had the goodwill and the professional experience to rise above the tension.
- (c) An important challenge was to put into full application the principle of partnership through mutual participation in the project plan, distribution of resources and sharing of responsibilities. It would have been ideal if all the organizations involved (CCF, MRG and CR) were involved together in the thinking and designing stages. The EU's strict time deadline probably did not allow this to happen. However, in the future, there should be ample time provided for the project concept even at the pre-proposal consultation stage.
- (d) The challenge of creating consensus on the issue of EMGs was not going to be easy given the diversity of political positions and experiences of the participants. The professional facilitation and the sense of common purpose amongst the participants overcame the barriers and in the end, there was broad agreement that the project was a success.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 24

25.0 Completion

25.1 Most of the activities were completed successfully and on time. This included the research project, the consultation, the London and Canberra consultations and the follow up meetings. CCF had carried out 3 face to face meetings with EMGs and was in the process of organizing another 4. The government did not allow face to face meetings but negotiations are continuing.

26.0 Participation

26.1 For a project of this magnitude and on the basis of the objectives and resources, the level of participation during the consultation was highly commendable. Those participants interviewed expressed their gratitude for being part of the discussions which they thought enabled them to articulate both their institutional and personal views frankly without fear. The organizers provided a safe democratic space for everyone to participate on equal terms.

26.2 Many expressed the view that their participation was meaningful and empowering because they learnt a lot in terms of the issues of EMGs and ethnic relations generally. Being able to bring together diverse strands of thinking and experiences was a great learning exercise which helped a lot in re-thinking their own positions as well as encouraging them to focus more on EMG issues. The participation of representatives of EMGs played a very important role, especially as they drew attention to the issues of their respective communities. This was crucial in relating the actual marginalized experiences of some underprivileged EMGs in Suva and Fiji generally.

26.3 There was a general view that while some of them have participated in many projects and initiatives on ethnic relations in Fiji, the issues of EMG was always overshadowed by the focus on i-Taukei and Indo-Fijian tension.

26.4 The consultations were deliberately designed to be participatory by the CCF team with help of Koila Olsson, an expert facilitator from the Pacific Centre for Peace-building.⁶²

26.5 Perhaps the biggest disappointment was the lack of participation by the government. The representatives from the Prime Minister's office, Eddy Tunidau, did not stay for long and did not return for the rest of the consultation.

25.6 As in Suva, the participation in Canberra and London was "very active and vocal" and "also critical when it was needed."⁶³ For instance, there was criticism of the methodology and MRG had to post a document on their website on the page where the report features, explaining the methodology.

Recommendation: See Recommendation 25

27.0 Some major lessons learnt

27.1 The participants learnt a lot of important lessons from the project. Most of those interviewed said that all the lessons they learnt were positive and it was important to keep an open mind all the time about other people's plight. Also, it was felt that despite differences, it was not difficult to learn from each other and arrive at a consensus.⁶⁴

⁶² Discussions with the facilitators.

⁶³ Discussions with MRG representative.

⁶⁴ Discussions with representatives of participant organizations.

27.2 Both CCF and MRG learnt important lessons regarding organizational matters. A lesson which CCF learnt was the need for early active engagement in the “project concept design and the development of the project proposal so that CCF can insert its own expectations and needs met.”⁶⁵

27.3 For MRG, there were a number of critical lessons learnt. Firstly, during the stakeholders meeting, it would have been tactically sensible if discussions as to the most workable approach should have taken place to ensure that the government, one of the key players, was not alienated. In retrospect, an important chance to engage the government was missed. Secondly, to avoid confusion, the methodology of the research could have been explained more effectively and by avoiding the impression that reliable large-N data that would be representative of entire communities was being presented. Thirdly, maintaining good communications with the partner is paramount and initial meeting with partners was crucial. For instance, given the distance, Skype meeting would have been appropriate.⁶⁶

Recommendations: See Recommendations 26, 27 and 28

28.0 Conclusion

28.1 This evaluation suggests that the project, despite some initial problems was quite successful. The participants’ responses showed that they had benefitted immensely from the consultations. Although the broader goal of improving ethnic relations in Fiji cannot be realized within a short time, the fact that the consultations have helped to heighten the consciousness and knowledge of the participants is quite significant.

⁶⁵ Discussion with MRG representative.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

28.2 The partnership between MRG, CCF and CR has a long history and the project has consolidated this international connection further. These organizations should continue to engage and work together in the future but learning from the lessons of this project. Dialogue at the very early stage of project conceptualization is needed.

28.3 The recommendations below are meant to be a guide for any similar projects in the future, based on the lessons learnt from this project.

29.0 List of recommendations

1. The aims and objectives of the London and Canberra roundtables as well as their outcomes and value to the project should have been clearly identified and articulated.
2. Two or three coherent policy statements, which synthesised the recommendations of the three-day roundtable on EMGs should have been framed and presented to government. This should be part of the re-engagement process.
3. A framework of action regarding EMGs should have been established after the consultation to ensure that the EMG issues are kept alive and sustainable in the long run.
4. The suggestions in 6.6 should be seriously considered and if possible, there should be appropriate follow up on some more immediately relevant ones.
5. The participant evaluation questions should have also included questions on EMGs and discrimination, two key conceptual components of the project.
6. The link between the two specific objectives and the bigger goal of improving ethnic relations should have been made much sharper and clearer.
7. Perhaps a statement on why this project was different from the other initiatives on ethnic relations in Fiji needed to be made much sharper and clearer.
8. The distinction between the “target” group and the “beneficiaries” could have been made much clearer.
9. If the time and resources had permitted, it would have been a good idea to carry out a brief initial mapping of the expectations of the participants and stakeholders before the project design stage to inform the project design.

10. The issues of minorities and discrimination, two key concepts in the project could have been more clearly defined at the outset in the proposal.
11. There should have been clarity also as to whether the project was targeted at ethnic relations broadly, EMGs more specifically or both to avoid ambiguity.
12. The design could have taken into consideration the important issue of effective communication between the partners, MRG and CCF, to avoid misunderstanding and tension (Also see Recommendation 28).
13. There should have been a strategy in the project regarding engagement with the government as one of the major players in Fiji that takes into consideration its often unpredictable attitude (Also see Recommendations 2 and 26).
14. There should have been acknowledgement and identification of the range of skills and innovative input by the local partner and local NGOs in the project design and how these could have contributed to the project.
15. The project design could have been framed around the people involved rather than fitting people into a pre-existing template.
16. In such a project which requires partnership between two or more groups, there should be a more equitable distribution of division of labour and resources to ensure that relationship is amicable.
17. Care should have been taken to ensure that funds are seen to be equitably distributed (Also see Recommendation 16).
18. More resources should have been put into making the project more nationally representative by having consultations outside Suva where the rural poor see the world differently from those who live in middle class urban settings.
19. There should have been more non-Suva participants in the consultations to ensure more inclusiveness (Also see Recommendation 18).

20. Re-engagement with the government is a priority to ensure that it can be influenced to take in some of the suggestions in the consultations on EMGs in Fiji (Also see Recommendation 2).
21. As part of future sustainability, CCF, in partnership with local CSOs can organize an annual symposium on EMGs based on expert presentations, panel discussions, role play by groups such as Women Action for Change (WAC) and other forms of artistic expressions. This could be accompanied by essay competition, debates and oratory contest for students and even the public. UNDP, EU, AUSAID and NZAID could be approached to help with funding.
22. In similar projects in the future, it is important for partner organizations to consolidate their relationship even at the pre-proposal stage by agreeing to a terms of reference on the nature of the partnership, timing and division of labor through dialogue. Dialogue and consultation should be an integral part of the process from beginning to end to avoid miscommunication and tension (Also see Recommendations 16 and 17).
23. There should have been more engagement with the rural population (Also see Recommendation 18 and 19).
24. Mitigating factors, apart from just risk factors, should be included in such a project plan as a way of responding to emerging challenges which threatened to undermine the project.
25. The participation of the government was critical in as far as influencing policies was concerned. Care should have been taken to ensure that the agenda, program and proceedings did not alienate any participant, in this case the government while at the same time ensuring that principles and issues are not compromised. This requires a smart tactical approach to ensure that the government supports the issues raised by the project (also see Recommendations 2 and 13).

26. Early discussions should take place between the project partners regarding the project concept, design and planning to avoid differences.
27. There is a need to maintain a good communication system between the partners as a way of ensuring mutual understanding and a well-balanced relationship (Also see Recommendation 12).
28. The presentation of data and methodology of the research could have been done in a clearer way to participants in the consultations to avoid confusion.

Annex 1: People consulted in the evaluation

Adam Janseen – EU;
Agatha Ferei – Fiji Media Watch;
Akuila Yabaki – CCF;
Annawaite Matadradra- Research assistant;
Apisalome Tudreu - Methodist Church Fiji;
Arishma Nandini - Interfaith Search Fiji;
Ashwin Raj - USP/CCF;
Chris Chapman-MRG;
Ciaran O' Toole – Conciliation Resources;
Edward Tunidau - Prime Minister's Office;
Emily Erasito - National Youth Council;
Eseta Mateiviti-Fiji Solomon Island scholar
Henry Ivarature - International IDEA;
Janet Ikomono-Banaban scholar;
Jo Mani-Nadi resident;
Joel Nilon – Australian National University;
Josaia Osborne- Research assistant;
Justine Marawi – Social Empowerment Educational Program;
Lauretta Ah Sam-Fijian-Chinese NZ resident;
Maria Sahib- Research assistant;
Mere Vakawaletabua-NZ Fijian resident;
Nicholas Hercules- UNDP;
Paterisiou Nunu – ECREA;
Rodney Yee – CCF;
Bob Dau-Nadi resident;
Savenaca Nacanaitaba-Transparency International (Fiji);
Simone Troller - UNDP Suva;
Teresia Teaiwa-Banaban scholar
Timothy Gill – AusAid;
Tudra Vuki-Ba resident;
Tomasu Valu-Nadroga resident;

Vijay Naidu - Author of the report;

Waisea Vota-Ba resident;

3 other people interviewed in the western division did not want their names revealed.