TERMS OF REFERENCE
End of Program Evaluation of the Fiji Community Development Program

BACKGROUND
The Fiji Community Development Program (FCDP) commenced on 16 May, 2012. FCDP is a five-year program worth AUD20.946 million that builds on Australia’s long history and experience of support to Fiji’s civil society sector and reflects Australia’s commitment to addressing the root causes of poverty.

FCDP’s overall goal is to deliver social and economic benefits to the people of Fiji through strengthened civil society organisations (CSOs). The program aims to achieve this through two objectives. The first objective is to mitigate social and economic hardship faced by poor, vulnerable and excluded communities in Fiji by funding the community development work of CSOs. The second objective is to strengthen CSO capacity to deliver relevant and efficient programs in these targeted communities.

The program has three office locations in Fiji: the head office in Suva (Central Division) and regional offices in Lautoka (Western Division) and Labasa (Northern Division). FCDP currently represents Australia’s most significant engagement with civil society in Fiji and is implemented by the managing contractor, Coffey International Development Pty Ltd. Phase one of the program spanned May 2012 to May 2015 with a value of AUD12.911 million. After a successful mid-term review in early 2015, phase two began in May 2015 and is scheduled to end in May 2017. Phase two has a value of AUD8.035 million.

FCDP has a Program Executive Committee (PEC) that is the main strategic decision making and monitoring mechanism and is responsible for approving the Program’s annual work plans and funding support to CSOs. The PEC includes eminent Fijian community members, DFAT and FCDP.

The mid-term review in 2015 recommended that FCDP continue to focus on rural and remote communities as the primary focus area for mitigating social and economic hardships faced by poor, vulnerable and excluded communities.

PURPOSE
The purpose of this end of program evaluation is to provide a systematic and objective assessment of the impact FCDP has made in delivering its two program objectives: mitigate social and economic hardship faced by poor, vulnerable and excluded communities in Fiji by funding the community development work of CSOs; strengthen CSO capacity to deliver relevant and efficient programs in these targeted communities. This includes an assessment of the direct and indirect causal contribution as well as unintended impacts of the program.

The evaluation also seeks to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of FCDP’s implementation approach, compile lessons learned, and, provide recommendations that will inform DFAT’s implementation of the Australia-Fiji Civil Society Engagement Strategy 2016-2019. The Strategy was finalised in August 2016 and articulates how Australia will engage with CSOs to deliver its aid program objectives in Fiji, as outlined in its Fiji Aid Investment Plan 2015-2019.

Australia’s support to Fijian CSOs from May 2017 will be channelled through the Fiji Program Support Facility which is scheduled to commence operations as early as December 2016.
The primary user of this evaluation is DFAT. The secondary users are the Australian public, civil society organisations in Fiji and Australia, the Government of Fiji and the Fijian public.

KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation should respond to the following key evaluation questions with a credible evidence base. The evaluation team will be expected to finalise and agree on more specific evaluation questions with DFAT when finalising the evaluation plan.

1. To what extent has FCDP mitigated the social and economic hardship faced by poor, vulnerable and excluded communities in Fiji, and strengthened CSOs capacity to deliver relevant and efficient programs in these targeted communities?
   i. Is the managing contractor model the most effective way to deliver FCDP’s objectives?
   ii. How effectively has FCDP used the existing knowledge and expertise of target communities and CSOs to deliver its objectives?

2. To what extent has FCDP delivered its objectives in a cost effective way?
   i. Are the Program’s governance and implementation arrangements appropriate and proportionate to the outcomes sought?
   ii. How has FCDP leveraged support provided by other DFAT programs, other donors, the Fijian government and the private sector to achieve program objectives?
   iii. How has FCDP’s monitoring, evaluation and learning arrangements affected the quality of outputs delivered and outcomes achieved?
   iv. Has FCDP sufficiently identified and managed social, political, economic and environmental risks?

3. What impacts (intended, unintended, positive and negative) has FCDP had and how sustainable are these?
   i. What impact has FCDP made in delivering social and economic benefits to the people of Fiji?
   ii. What impact has FCDP made in strengthening civil society organisations in Fiji?
   iii. What evidence exists to suggest that there is ownership of the results amongst program stakeholders, particularly amongst community beneficiaries and CSOs?

4. To what extent has FCDP met the needs of poor, vulnerable and excluded communities and strengthened civil society organisations in Fiji?
   i. Has FCDP responded to the identified needs of target communities, particularly the poor, disadvantaged and vulnerable?
   ii. Has FCDP met the needs of CSOs in Fiji and provided effective and targeted capacity strengthening support that meets these needs?
   iii. How relevant was FCDP to the Fiji Government’s efforts to increasing economic growth and reducing poverty in Fiji.
   iv. Was FCDP adaptive to changes to the local economic, social and political context during its lifetime?
5. To what extent has FCDP made a difference in gender equality and disability inclusion; child protection and disaster risk management?
   i. What are the results of FCDP’s approach to gender equality and disability inclusion, child protection and disaster risk management?
   ii. How has FCDP effectively influenced stakeholders’, including beneficiaries’, priorities and approaches to these issues?
   iii. Were sufficient resources and technical expertise allocated to implement appropriate strategies that are responsive to the different and individual needs of target beneficiaries?

**EVALUATION PROCESS**

DFAT will engage an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) to oversee the evaluation process and quality assure the deliverables of the evaluation team. The reference group will comprise of a civil society representative, a community representative and DFAT staff.

**Timeline**

The evaluation process is expected to commence by 20 February 2017 with the final report to be submitted to DFAT by 23 May 2017. The process is expected to include both desk-based activities and an in-country mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Team Leader (Days)</th>
<th>Team Member 1 (Days)</th>
<th>Team Member 2 (Days)</th>
<th>Indicative Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-23 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team (ET) prepares and submits first draft of evaluation plan by 27 Feb, 2017</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24-27 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG reviews and provides feedback on evaluation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET finalise and submits evaluation plan to DFAT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET travel to Suva, Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country briefing with DFAT and final team preparations for data collection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country field work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6-25 April 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data collection
- Team Discussions
- Preliminary data processing in country
**ET Aide memoire preparation and presentation to DFAT and selected stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ET drafts evaluation report</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1-10 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET submits draft evaluation report to DFAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG reviews draft evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-17 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG provides feedback on report via teleconference</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>18 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET Team Leader finalise and submits evaluation report</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected Outputs**

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following outputs:

1. **Draft Evaluation Plan by 27 February 2017. (No more than 10 pages excluding attachments)**

   The evaluation plan will be developed by the Team Leader in consultation with members of the evaluation team and approved by DFAT prior to the commencement of the in-country mission. The evaluation plan should comply with DFAT’s M & E Standards (Standard 5) and describe the appropriate methodology the team intends to use to answer the key evaluation questions, within the allocated timeline and resources. A list of communities, organisations and individuals that will be consulted should be identified. The team should as much as possible aim to consult with a diverse group that is representative of FCDP’s stakeholders.

   The evaluation plan should also describe the list of sub-questions developed from the key evaluation questions; the proposed data collection and analysis processes, including the sampling strategy and key informant categories. Ethical considerations for the evaluation should also be articulated along with an implementation and deliverables timeline, and a draft in country schedule of meetings and visits.

   Finally, the plan should also consider an approach to provide feedback to relevant groups and stakeholders of FCDP.
2. Final Evaluation Plan by 7 March 2017
   The final Evaluation Plan should address all comments and questions on the draft by the ERG.

3. Aide memoire by 27 April 2017 in country. (Maximum of 5 pages plus attachments)
   The aide memoire will present initial findings, seek verification of facts and assumptions, and discuss the feasibility of initial recommendations in the program and country context. The key audience for the aide memoire is DFAT. The aide memoire will also be relevant for stakeholders such as the Fiji Program Support Facility and the FCDP team and PEC members.

   The EPER should meet the DFAT M & E Standards (Standard 6), address the evaluation questions and targeted to the needs of intended users. The report should have a succinct and clear executive summary; written in plain English that can be read as a stand-alone document. Key achievements and challenges should be clearly presented in the executive summary, throughout the report and should be evidence-based. The conclusions and recommendations should be practical and strategic; judgements should be clear and unambiguous.

   The report will be reviewed by the evaluation reference group to ensure the evaluation findings are robust, applicable to DFAT’s operative environment and relevant for other stakeholders.

   The final report must incorporate comments on the draft report from DFAT.
   The final report will be published on the DFAT web-site in line with the Transparency Charter.

6. All documents must be delivered to DFAT in electronic word format.

EVALUATION TEAM

This evaluation will require a three-member team: one internationally engaged team leader and two locally engaged consultants. The team leader will be recruited first and is expected to be involved in the selection of the two local consultants. Members of the FCDP Program Executive Committee will also be involved in the selection process.

The Evaluation Team is required to collectively possess the following skills and experience:
   i. Impact assessment and monitoring and evaluation skills from relevant technical, social, economic and financial perspectives;
   ii. Critical thinking, broad evaluation, analytical and research skills;
   iii. Consultative skills and participatory research methods;
   iv. Comprehensive report writing skills.
   v. Strong knowledge of socio-economic issues and the role of CSOs in the development context and strong knowledge of gender and social inclusion issues;
   vi. Organisational capacity assessment and development;
   vii. Experience working in Fiji and/or the Pacific;
   viii. Sound knowledge and understanding of aid effectiveness.
Team Leader (37 days)

The Team Leader will be an internationally recruited Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist;

i. Leads the evaluation team and effectively uses the expertise of team members in meeting the Evaluation Terms of Reference and contractual obligations;

ii. Finalise and submits an Evaluation Plan that meets DFAT’s M & E Standards (Standards 5);

iii. Leads the evaluation process (including participating in an inception briefing; assigning tasks and responsibilities to team members; leading the mission in the field and ensuring mission efficiency and performance)

iv. Processes and analyses all data in consultation with team members;

v. Leads team discussions and reflections;

vi. Develops the aide memoire and leads the presentation of preliminary findings to DFAT at the end of the in-country mission;

vii. Delivers an EPER that meets DFAT’s M & E Standards (Standards 6); and

viii. Performs other duties in the TOR and as directed by DFAT.

Team Members 2 & 3 (25 days):

i. Team members 2 & 3 should be Fiji-based consultants;

ii. Provide intellectual and contextual insights to the Team Leader on the preparation and finalisation of: Evaluation Plan, Aide Memoire and the Independent End of Program Evaluation Report;

iii. Contribute towards writing the evaluation products;

iv. Liaise with local stakeholders and finalises in-country visits and consultation schedule:
   i. Participate in the in-country mission as directed by the Team Leader;
   ii. Finalise data collection tools and gather field data (interviews, focus groups, secondary data collection);

v. Act as language interpreters and transcribe field interviews and focus groups;

vi. Perform other duties as directed by the Team Leader.

DFAT Suva Post will also be part of the evaluation team. They will play an observer role and will help provide contextual information and advice on FCDP, DFAT’s policies and the types of recommendations that are feasible for DFAT.

ATTACHMENTS: KEY DOCUMENTS

1. Fiji Community Development Program (FCDP) Design Document June 2011
2. FCDP Achievements Report (Phase 1)
3. FCDP Mid-term Evaluation Report and Management Response
4. DFAT M & E Standard 5
5. DFAT M & E Standard 6