

ANNEX 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Mid-term Evaluation of the Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Agreement

1.1 Terms of Reference

1.1.1 Background

In the Solomon Islands, Australia's primary support to civil society is through the Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Agreement (SINPA). SINPA is designed as an A\$20 million, five year program that runs to 2014-15.

SINPA's goal is: "To improve the health and livelihood opportunities of Solomon Islanders particularly women and young people".

To support SINPA NGOs, the program has the following two objectives:

- To become more effective at empowering Solomon Islanders (especially women and youth) to improve their quality of life.
- To explore different models/approaches to development which suit the Solomon Islands context.

The program has four outcomes:

1. Substantive changes in the lives of men, women and families as a result of SINPA NGOs work.
2. Examples of approaches and/or models that are consistent with Solomon Islanders' 'ways of doing things' and have engendered developmental changes appreciated by Solomon Islanders.
3. Increased effectiveness of SINPA NGOs at supporting men and women in Solomon Islands to improve their quality of life.
4. Shared learning and insights about how to support effective Solomon Islander-led community development.

SINPA works by pairing an Australian NGO with a local Solomon Islands NGO to undertake an agreed program of work that contributes to meeting the above goal, objectives and outcomes. The program is overseen by a Steering Committee drawn from representatives of the six participating local NGOs and AusAID. The Australian partners of the local NGOs' are also privy to the discussions, but are not the primary decision makers. The Steering Committee acts as the governing mechanism for the partnership and is also the coordination point for the shared learning, monitoring and evaluation of the program. In this respect, the Steering Committee has the main responsibility in delivering on the program's two objectives stated above. The Steering Committee has a dedicated budget and a full-time coordinator chosen through an international selection process.

The main body of SINPA's work is through six programs implemented by the six Australian-Solomon Islands NGO partnerships as follows:

1. **Save the Children (Australia) works with Save the Children (Solomon Islands)** to encourage healthy lifestyles through non-formal education (life skills) and mentoring; construction of youth halls; and the enhancement of young people's participation in government policy formation.
2. **Anglican Board of Mission (Australia) works with Inclusive Communities Program (Solomon Islands)** to improve livelihoods opportunities and address youth marginalisation, gender violence and societal breakdown by providing

assistance in the areas of literacy, financial literacy, small-scale agriculture, and sanitation.

3. **International Women’s Development Agency (IWDA) (Australia) works with Live and Learn Environmental Education (Solomon Islands)** to work with communities affected by logging to encourage more equitable approaches to natural resource management, particularly in relation to gender. This includes through agriculture skills development, savings schemes and sanitation behaviour change.
4. **Oxfam (Australia) works with the Family Support Centre (Solomon Islands)** to provide counselling, legal advice and mediation services to women victims/survivors of sexual and domestic violence.
5. **The Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) (Australia) works with ADRA (Solomon Islands)** to encourage community action to the challenges of youth unemployment and marginalisation. Livelihoods activities include: sustainable revolving finance schemes; vocational support such as carving, cooking, and financial literacy development.
6. **Australian People for Health and Education Abroad (APHEDA) (Australia) works with APHEDA (Solomon Islands)** to support indigenous-managed Community Learning Centres which encourage basic small enterprise skills; awareness and behaviour change in sexual and reproductive health; basic first aid; sanitation behaviour change; and nutrition.

Two key elements of SINPA that distinguish it from other civil society programs are that it uses a strengths-based approach and that its work is done through a partnership of Australian and Solomon Islands NGOs.

Program partners have discovered that both elements are difficult and time-consuming, however, provincial coordination staff from NGOs report that working in partnership can help overcome the limited skills base and difficult logistical environment in the Solomon Islands.

Similarly, community project reports suggest that using a strengths-based approach can increase a community’s capacity to provide for its own needs, reduce the cost of development to donors and challenge an underlying ‘cargo-cult’ mentality that exists in some communities.

Given the centrality of partnership and the strengths-based approach to the outcomes of SINPA, this evaluation will examine whether working in partnership and using a strengths-based approach are worth the time and effort the partners put into it.

Australia’s bilateral program to the Solomon Islands is defined by an agreement called the **Partnership for Development**. This Partnership is an agreement to work in the four priority areas of services (health and education), livelihoods, infrastructure and economic and fiscal reform. Around 80 percent of bilateral funding is programed through the Partnership for Development agreement. SINPA is one program which technically sits outside the partnership. However, it complements the Partnership for Development by supporting NGOs to carry out community-led development in the areas of livelihoods and health; to work with the Solomon Islands Government Ministries where relevant; and to jointly explore what development approaches are effective in the Solomon Islands context.

The Australian Government strategy for the aid program to 2015-16, *“An Effective Aid Program for Australia”* encourages greater engagement with NGOs and civil society where this engagement provides clear benefits to the poor. Specifically, the strategy states that AusAID should strengthen civil society in order to help support more inclusive and transparent decision-making by government. In this context, AusAID must ask whether the work of SINPA is consistent with the aid program and relevant to development in the Solomon Islands. AusAID has limited resources that it can engage in the Solomon Islands

and it needs to be sure that the investment it is making in SINPA is worthwhile when compared to other potential investments. For this reason, AusAID must ask whether the actual and potential benefits of SINPA represent value for money and justify AusAID's continuing support.

1.1.2 Objectives

The primary focus of the evaluation will be to examine whether SINPA is improving the life of Solomon Islanders. The evaluation will answer:

1. To what extent is SINPA likely to achieve its stated goal, objectives and outcomes?
2. To what extent is working 'in partnership' improving SINPA's efficiency and effectiveness?
3. To what extent is it reasonable to conclude that the Strength Based Approach, as applied by SINPA, will lead to positive sustainable impacts in the Solomon Islands?
4. To what extent do the actual and potential benefits of SINPA represent value for money?

1.1.3 Scope

The Evaluation Team will look at:

- Assessments of the development needs in Solomon Islands.
- The development and implementation of the program from 2009 until the start of the Mid-Term Evaluation, including all relevant reports and quality reviews.
- Other NGO partnerships AusAID has engaged in, particularly in the Pacific.
- AusAID's past civil society programs in Solomon Islands.
- Reports on other civil society programs in Solomon Islands.
- An evaluation of AusAID's other programs in Solomon Islands.
- AusAID's Civil Society Evaluation.

1.1.4 Evaluation Method

The evaluation will run for 28 days over three months.

AusAID and the partners will agree on up to three members for the Evaluation Team. The AusAID Program Manager and a nominated representative of SINPA will also be observers to the Evaluation. At the beginning of the Evaluation, the Lead Evaluator will conduct a series of meetings, analyse key project documents and determine other information needed. Additional information will be sought and processed before the start of the in-country mission.

The Lead Evaluator will be formally qualified, with significant experience and be proficient in a range of evaluation methods. The Lead Evaluator will work with AusAID and SINPA partners to develop an evaluation plan to answer the questions posed above. The evaluation plan will describe the methodology for the evaluation and will meet the required quality standards (Attachment 1 of this document). The evaluation plan will be approved by the AusAID Program Manager and the SINPA representative on the Evaluation.

Information for the Evaluation may be collected:

- Through interviews with internal and external stakeholders
- By assessing program monitoring, evaluation, and learning information

- By undertaking field visits
- Through analysis of other relevant reports and evaluations
- Other methods identified in the Evaluation Plan that are possible within the resources allocated to this evaluation.

The evaluators will have time to process information in the Solomon Islands and will present their preliminary findings to the Steering Committee and AusAID before departing the Solomon Islands.

Once a draft report is developed, it will be submitted for peer review. The peer reviewers will include AusAID and representatives of the SINPA steering committee, and will be attended by the Lead Evaluator.

A final report will be drafted taking into account comments provided through the review process by the end of November 2011.

1.1.5 Evaluation Team

The team will consist of:

1. An Evaluation Specialist. This person will be the lead evaluator.
2. A Civil Society based Development Specialist, with understanding and experience at both strategic and operational levels and development programming approaches
3. An Aid Effectiveness Specialist, with skills to assess the relative significance of the program against AusAID's other programs in the Solomon Islands.
4. The AusAID Program Manager, as an observer.
5. A representative of the SINPA Steering Committee, as an observer.

The Civil Society based Development Specialist and the Aid Effectiveness Specialist will report to the lead evaluator. The Lead Evaluator may request that the observers not attend some or all interviews if, in their opinion, it is likely to interfere with the evaluation.

1.1.6 Review and Reporting Requirements

The Peer Reviewers will include:

- AusAID reviewers from:
 - Office of Development Effectiveness
 - NGO Section
 - Quality and Performance Systems
 - Solomon Islands Desk
 - Solomon Islands Post
- Six SINPA NGO representatives and the SINPA Coordinator

The Draft Terms of Reference have been reviewed by the Peer Review Panel for this review.

The Evaluation Plan will be tested against the Evaluation Plan Quality Standards listed below, and agreed on by the AusAID and SINPA representatives on the review.

The Evaluation Report will be tested by an evaluation expert in a one day technical review and against the Report Quality Standards below in a formal peer review.

1.1.7 Timeframe

The evaluation is currently scheduled to commence in September and conclude in November 2011.

An approximate timeframe with expected numbers of days input required to carry out each task is provided below.

Task	Approx. no. of maximum days input	Indicative Dates
Preparatory work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LE reads program design document and last QAI Report (1 Day) • LE meets with SINPA Steering Committee and AusAID (2 days) • LE recommends Evaluation Team members • Develops Evaluation Plan, including methodology and questions to be answered. (4 days inc review) • Requests and reviews further information. 	9 days out-of-country 2 day in-country	2nd week of September – 1st week of October
In-Country Mission: Briefing with AusAID	1 day	
In-Country Mission: Meeting with internal and external stakeholders	4 days	
In-Country Mission: Field visits	7 days	
In-Country Mission: Data Processing	3 days	
In-Country Mission: Discussion of Preliminary Findings	1 day	
Develop Draft Report	4 days	
Peer Review	1 day	
Revision and submission of Final Report	1 day	
Contractor Assessment	1 day	

1.1.8 Attachment 1 – Evaluation Plan Quality Standards

Standard
The evaluation design is based on a collaborative approach.
The primary intended users of the evaluation are clearly identified and their evaluation needs are described.
Limitations or constraints on the evaluation are described (e.g. time frame; resources; available data; political sensitivities).
The purpose and/or objectives of the evaluation are stated.
A broad investigatory framework is provided to orient the reader to the overall evaluation design.
More detailed evaluation questions are posed. These are based on the terms of reference, but provide AusAID with greater clarity in how the terms of reference a) have been interpreted; and b) will be met. They have been developed in consultation with AusAID and the SINPA Steering Committee.
It is clear which questions are considered to be of higher priority and are expected to provide the most important information.
The design is flexible enough to allow unexpected issues to emerge.
The methods to collect data are described for each question (or related questions).
The proposed data collection methods are appropriate for the questions posed.
Triangulation of data collection methods is proposed to strengthen the confidence in the findings.
The sampling strategy is clear and appropriate for the evaluation questions posed.
The approach to data processing is described and is consistent with the time and resources available.
Ethical considerations have been addressed where relevant (e.g. privacy and confidentiality).
It is clear who will be making the judgments.
Approaches to enhance the utilization of findings are outlined (if this has been requested in the terms of reference).
The evaluation plan provides guidance on scheduling. The final schedule (if attached) reflects adequate time to answer the posed evaluation questions.
The allocation of evaluation tasks to team members is clearly described (i.e. data collection, processing and reporting).

1.1.9 Attachment 2 – Evaluation Report Quality Standards

Standard
A background to the evaluation summarizes: the total value of the initiative; the number of years of the initiative; the stage of initiative delivery; key outcomes of the program; and the key issues identified in the terms of reference
A brief summary of the methodology employed is provided
Key limitations of the methodology are described and any relevant guidance provided to enable appropriate interpretation of the findings
The executive summary provides all the necessary information to enable primary users to make good quality decisions.
Findings and Analysis
The evaluation report clearly addresses all questions in the Terms of Reference
There is a full description of each of the issues identified so that the reader feels they have been given the full picture
The relative importance of the issues communicated is clear to the reader
There is a good balance between operational and strategic issues
The text clearly establishes that the evidence supports the arguments posed
Alternative points of view are considered where appropriate
Complex issues are fully explored and not oversimplified
The role of the context in program performance is explored
The text uses appropriate methods/language to convince the reader of the findings and conclusions
There is an adequate exploration of the factors that have influenced the issues identified and conclusions drawn
The implications of key findings are fully explored
The overall position of the author is clear and their professional judgments are unambiguous.
Conclusions and Recommendations
The conclusions and recommendations logically flow from the presentation of findings and any associated analyses.
Individuals have been allocated responsibility for responding to recommendations.
Where there are significant cost implications of recommendations, these have been estimated (financial, human and materials costs).
The recommendations are feasible

ANNEX 2 EVALUATION PLAN

To:

AusAID Management
SINPA Steering Committee, consisting of representatives of the Solomon Islands NGO partners and AusAID (at the request of the committee)
Representatives of Australian NGO partners

Mid-Term Evaluation of the Solomon Islands NGP Partnership Agreement
Draft Evaluation Plan – For Input and Comments by Monday 24th of October

1 INTRODUCTION

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) has selected three external consultants to carry out a Mid-Term Evaluation of the Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Agreement.

The three external consultants who will conduct the mid-term evaluation are:

1. Martine Van de Velde – Team Leader – Evaluation Specialist
2. Alice Aruheeta-Pollard – Civil Society Based Development Specialist
3. Steve Jones – Aid Effectiveness Specialist

The three consultants will be supported during the evaluation assignment by the following observers:

1. Siddhartha Chakrabarti, Second Secretary, Australian High Commission, Honiara.
2. Leonora Kukome, Representative of the SINPA Steering Committee
3. A representative of the Australian NGOs – Name to be confirmed

The Lead Evaluator may request that the observers not attend some or all interviews if, in their opinion, it is likely to interfere with the evaluation.

The in-country mission is scheduled to run from the 2nd until the 16th of November.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation are provided at Annex 1.

In line with the ToR, the purpose of this Evaluation Plan is to provide

- an overview of the emerging issues/challenges after the initial document review and conference calls held during the week of the 8th of October;
- a description of the methodology to be used;
- a work plan specifying the roles and responsibilities of each team member.

The draft evaluation plan was presented to AusAID, Steering Committee and Australian NGO partners for comments on 20th October. A final version of the evaluation plan was submitted on 24th October.

2 APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 Focus at Program-Level Achievements

As outlined in the TORs, the primary focus of the evaluation will be to assess whether SINPA is improving the life of the Solomon Islanders.

The main audience of this review will be AusAID and its partner NGOs in Australia and the Solomon Islands. The findings, conclusions and recommendations will be used to improve the effectiveness of the management and implementation of the SINPA program.

Given the centrality of partnership and strengths-based approaches to the outcomes of SINPA, this evaluation will examine how effective these approaches are and whether they are worth the time and effort involved.

The Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will focus on results against the two objectives and the four outcomes underpinning SINPA's goal.

SINPA's goal is:

"To improve the health and livelihood opportunities of Solomon Islanders particularly women and young people".

Supporting the goal, the program has two objectives.

To support SINPA NGOs:

1. To become more effective at empowering Solomon Islanders (especially women and youth) to improve their quality of life.
2. To explore different models/approaches to development which suit the Solomon Islands context.

The program has four outcomes:

1. Substantive changes in the lives of men, women and families as a result of SINPA NGOs work.
2. Examples of approaches and/or models that are consistent with Solomon Islanders' 'ways of doing things' and have engendered developmental changes appreciated by Solomon Islanders.
3. Increased effectiveness of SINPA NGOs at supporting men and women in Solomon Islands to improve their quality of life.
4. Shared learning and insights about how to support effective Solomon Islander - led community development.

2.2 Review at Project-Level

SINPA is implemented through six ANGOs, who work with six different Solomon Island partner NGOs to implement SINPA project activities at a community level, through local grassroots organisations (see table below).

	ANGO	Solomon Islands Partner NGO
1.	Adventist Development Relief Agency (ADRA) Australia	Adventist Development Relief Agency Solomon Islands (ADRA SI)
2.	Anglican Board of Mission – Australia (ABM)	The Church of Melanesia – Inclusive Communities Program (ICP)
3.	International Women’s Development Agency (IWDA)	Live and Learn Environmental Education (LLEE)
4.	Oxfam Australia	Family Support Centre - SI Oxfam - SI
5.	Save the Children Australia (SCA)	Save the Children Solomon Islands SC SI)
6.	Australia People for Health, Education and Development Abroad - APHEDA	APHEDA Solomon Islands

All six projects adhere to the program goal, objectives and outcomes. As they operate in different locations, through a number of different implementation strategies and focus on different sectoral activities, the aggregation of results will therefore be difficult.

This means that at activity and output levels, each ANGO project will have to be assessed individually. The evaluators will look at the contribution each project will make in support of the program level objectives and program outcomes. The focus of the in-country mission will be on gathering evidence of contributions made and changes achieved against the higher program level objectives.

Due to the limited time available the team will not be able to evaluate each project individually. If feedback is required on each individual project, it can only be based on reports provided by the NGOs and AusAID.

2.3 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will answer the following questions included in the TORs:

1. To what extent is SINPA likely to achieve its stated goal, objectives and outcomes?
2. To what extent is working ‘in partnership’ improving SINPA’s efficiency and effectiveness?
3. To what extent is it reasonable to conclude that the Strength Based Approach, as applied by SINPA, will lead to positive sustainable impacts in the Solomon Islands?
4. To what extent do the actual and potential benefits of SINPA represent value for money?

Following the initial document review and based on the information received during the conference calls, the evaluators agree that these questions capture the key issues the evaluation should address. During the in-country mission, the evaluators will develop more detailed questions to guide their enquiries and to obtain evidence to respond to the main evaluation questions.

Evaluation Questions	How judgement is formed	Likely sources and methods
<p>1. To what extent SINPA is likely to achieve its stated goal, objectives and outcomes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is there a shared understanding of the program goal and objectives among program partners? b. Is there a clear theory of change for the program and for each ANGO project? c. Are there clear illustrations of changes occurring due to the activities implemented? d. Are these changes being systematically documented and analysed? Is the attribution clear? e. What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? f. To what extent are the objectives of the program still valid? g. Are the activities and outputs of the six projects consistent with the program goal and the attainment of its objectives? h. Is there a clear M&E strategy in place (at project and program level) to capture the changes occurring in the communities? 	<p>Review of program documentation; review of M&E Frameworks and minutes of Steering Committee meetings; review of progress reports and key informant interviews with ANGOs and SI partners, AusAID.</p>
<p>2. To what extent it is working 'in partnership' improving SINPA's efficiency and effectiveness?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identification of synergies identified and cultivated by the implementing partners. b. Is SINPA implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? c. How far did the Steering Committee contribute to strengthening the partnership across SINPA? d. Are roles, responsibilities and resourcing of SINPA Steering Committee and SINPA Coordinator defined in a manner ensuring the best support is provided to SINPA? Are the Steering Committee and the SINPA Coordinator function in an effective way? e. How has AusAID altered its approach to partnership through SINPA? What has AusAID learned from the Program to date as an active and full partner on the steering committee? f. Does SINPA's partnership model play a role in utilizing inputs in such a way as to achieve certain specific outputs at the lowest cost? g. Evidence of active and open communication between the ANGO, SI NGOs and CBOs. h. Evidence of CBOs expressing views and opinions and these being responded to by ANGO. i. Evidence of local SI partners taking an active role in the development of their communities. j. Feedback from community members that SINPA approach is leading to more engagement in the community development processes. 	<p>Key informant interviews with ANGO and SI Partner NGOs. Focus group discussions with members of community CBOs. Comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs.</p>

Evaluation Questions	How judgement is formed	Likely sources and methods
<p>3. To what extent it is reasonable to say that the Strength Based Approach, as applied by SINPA, will lead to positive sustainable impacts in the Solomon Islands?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Understanding of the Strengths Based Approach (SBA) by each project and how this is translated at an operational level. b. Evidence of benefits from using a Strengths Based Approach? c. To what extent is the SBA approach likely to be used by communities after SINPA has finished (given that other donors use different approaches)? d. How is evidence gathered by ANGO and SI NGOs to capture changes in communities? e. Is there a clear exit strategy, ensuring project ownership by the communities/CBOs? f. To what degree are the interventions and activities adequately resourced? Have the CBOs been able to scale up their work, and what can be learned from experience to ensure financial viability in the future? 	<p>Visiting of project sites. Focus Group Discussions with community members. Comparison with other approaches used by NGOs in the Solomon Islands.</p>
<p>4. To what extent do the actual and potential benefits of SINPA represent value for money?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Understand the theories of change of project partners and how inputs are expected to lead to activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts, and the evidence that this is taking place. b. Understand the cost structure of the different projects (management and operational costs of ANGOs and their partners, the funds channelled to communities and the specific uses to which funds are put). c. Compare the value for money and relevance of (i) SINPA with other programs (ii) SINPA with other approaches (e.g., small grants schemes); and (iii) investing in different SINPA activities. Are AusAID and program partners likely to get better value for money by investing in other programs in SI or other activities with SINPA? d. Comparing value for money of SINPA over short, medium and long terms, and the issue of sustainability. Does the SBA offer a more sustainable model (e.g., by mitigating the maintenance issues associated with small grants schemes)? 	<p>Discussions with ANGOs and their Solomon Island partner NGOs. Examination of budgets, expenditure statements and audit reports. Discussions with staff implementing other relevant AusAID and donor programs in Solomon Islands and possibly other countries.</p>

Note: Ideally a counterfactual analysis should be undertaken to evaluate the results of a program like SINPA. This analysis would compare what happened with what would have happened in the absence of the intervention. Such an analysis would allow the evaluation team to assess the extent to which outcomes are directly attributable to the program. This will not be possible in this evaluation exercise because of time constraints and because counterfactuals were not built into the program's M&E strategy at an early stage. The evaluation team will explore with the partners if such an analysis would be relevant to SINPA

and the Solomon Islands context. Partners can then opt to integrate this method into the SINPA program framework.

2.4. Emerging Issues

The following issues have emerged from the review of documents provided to the team by AusAID and from the conference calls. This list is not exhaustive but it provides an entry point to the analysis.

2.4.1 *Identifying Strength Based Approach underpinning SINPA:*

Central to SINPA is its Strengths Based Approach, which is integrated into its design and implementation. This is an innovative approach, which is implemented in communities influenced greatly by a “cargo culture”. It will be important for SINPA to demonstrate that this approach is effectively changing, albeit slowly, the way communities engage in community development. Equally important is the need for SINPA to demonstrate that this approach contributes to sustainable improvements in the quality of life.

The evaluation team will assess the impact SINPA is having on community organisation and leadership as well as development.

2.4.2 *SINPA’s Theory of Change:*

SINPA does not have a logical framework and it is not clear how the current goal, objectives and outcomes statements above relate to each other. Also, the program does not yet have an agreed set of indicators to measure and assess progress. Instead of a logical framework, SINPA and its six projects use a ‘domains of change’ approach. While this provides flexibility to respond to community needs as they evolve, the lack of clarity on (i) the activities, outputs, outcomes, impacts, (ii) indicators and (iii) risks to the program (and its constituent projects), makes assessing and reporting on progress difficult. This has been recognised recently and initial steps have been taken to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for SINPA.

The need for an umbrella logical framework for the SINPA program (and possibly individual logframes for some projects) is being considered by a number of partners. A key concern is that this should not compromise the community driven, emergent and reflective nature of the program.

Logical frameworks, if used badly, can straight-jacket innovative programs of this kind. When properly used, they can provide (i) a forum/approach for agreeing the theory of change for the program/projects and (ii) a basis for joint assessment of progress against agreed indicators and risks.

Having a clear and agreed results framework with verifiable indicators is essential if the value for money/cost effectiveness of SINPA is to be assessed. During the evaluation considerable time needs to be allocated to discuss the various monitoring and evaluation approaches used by the various NGO partners and assess how far the different approaches allow for assessing and demonstrating changes and results occurring in communities as a result of SINPA.

2.4.3 *M&E Strategy:*

SINPA finds it difficult to demonstrate program-level results because the monitoring and evaluation framework is not yet fully developed. The evaluators will provide recommendations on how the M&E Framework can be strengthened, so that it can provide the information needed to manage the program effectively and for the final evaluation. It should be noted that the evaluation team will not have time to undertake a comprehensive review of the M&E strategies of SINPA partners, but it is may be possible to identify opportunities to adjust current M&E strategies to capture and report better on changes

occurring at program level. This will entail a review of the existing M&E framework for SINPA and the synergy with the M&E Frameworks used by SINPA partners.

2.4.4 Capacity Building

A key focus for the evaluation will be to assess the extent to which SINPA is succeeding in building indigenous Solomon Island organisations' capacity to work with communities. The evaluators will need to understand the capacity building approaches used by the different partners and how far this capacity building is allowing local partners to provide tangible development gains to their communities. It will also be important to get evidence that the strengths based approach used to provide these development gains has changed from the way development gains were provided in the past. Therefore the capacity building activities will be looked at as instruments supporting SINPA's strengths based approach.

2.4.5 Cost-effectiveness – Value for Money (VFM)

A value-for-money or cost effectiveness analysis assesses the cost of achieving development outputs/outcomes/impacts in a program. VFM is often assessed in terms of economy (getting the lowest prices for inputs); efficiency (how well inputs are converted to outputs); and effectiveness (how well outputs achieve the desired outcomes). Although neither AusAID nor other donors have yet settled on standard metrics or assessment methodologies for VFM analysis, simple indices (e.g. unit costs; the relative cost of achieving given outputs and outcomes) can be used to assess and compare VFM within and between projects and programs.

Given the lack of an agreed SINPA results framework, and associated indicators, it will probably not be possible for the evaluators to make definitive statements on the VFM of the program. However, some indicative findings will be possible (based on an analysis of detailed budgets and expenditure statements for the program and projects) and an approach will be recommended so that it should be possible to make definitive assessments at the end of the program.

2.4.6 Gender

Women and youth are mentioned directly in the goal statement of SINPA. The evaluation will identify gender and power relationships within the communities in which the SINPA is implemented. It will be important to assess how SINPA addresses identified gender gaps and how the program can potentially improve its engagement on gender. Other power relationships exist within communities and local partner agencies. For the future success of the program, it is important to identify these different power relationships and assess how effectively SINPA takes account of local power structures.

2.4.7 Conflict

The evaluators will seek further guidance from AusAID and partners on how far underlying tensions still prevail in the areas where SINPA is being implemented. It is important that if any underlying tensions exist that the SINPA ensures that a sensitive approach is undertaken to avoid adding to prevailing tensions and at best contribute to easing any underlying tensions. In a program like this it is important that beneficiaries are selected in a transparent and open manner to avoid causing conflicts in the communities. It is imperative that SINPA is implemented in such a manner that it minimises the risk of conflict.

2.5. Methodologies

The mid-term evaluation is an opportunity for all parties involved to ‘take stock’ and have an in-depth look at the achievements and challenges surrounding the SINPA program to date. The evaluators will prepare recommendations based on the lessons learnt and findings that will feed directly into the future implementation of the program. These recommendations, addressing the four central evaluation questions included in the TORs, are expected to contribute to influencing the way the SINPA program progresses in the future.

In order to address these questions the evaluators will aim to provide evidence-based findings and recommendations using the following approach and methodologies.

2.5.1 Consultation Process

At the start of the in-country mission, the evaluation team will undertake in-depth discussions with the Steering Committee and Solomon Islands implementing partners. Follow-up consultations will take place with individual Australian-based NGO partners by teleconference. Australian-based NGOs have also been encouraged to contact the evaluation team directly.

2.5.2 Project Site Selection

It will be impossible for the review team to visit all project sites given the length of the field visit. Project site visits should be structured in a way that these will allow the team to spend sufficient time talking to the beneficiaries and the local field staff as well as with regular community members who may not directly benefit from the SINPA funded projects.

The final selection of the exact field visit locations will be done together with AusAID and the Steering Committee closer to the dates of the field visit.

2.5.3 Data Collection Methods

Key informant interviews and observation in the field will be the main methods used in the evaluation. Data gathered through direct partner and community consultation will be cross checked with project documentation provided by ANGO and SI implementing partners.

Key informant interviews will be semi-structured and will allow the evaluators to tap into the knowledge and learning of those most closely linked to the program. This is a particularly appropriate method where capacity building and learning new skills is a major focus of the activities as the actual learning process of those interviewed is unlikely to have been formally documented. Focus group interviews with beneficiaries and local CBO staff are also expected to be a significant source of information. They will be supported by key informant interviews with ANGOs, their representatives in the Solomon Islands and SI partner NGO staff. All interviews will be conducted on the basis that nothing said will be attributed to the interviewee in any way that would allow them to be identified as the source.

Observation will also play a role in the data gathering, particularly for triangulating information from interviews. The team will use photography to capture any images that illustrate particular points.

Documents, including all project design documents, annual reports, will form another source of information on specific points. AusAID has already provided much of this documentation to the team.

The team will use a simple methodology to maintain a strong chain of evidence from the information gathered to the recommendations made. This is necessary to avoid one of the most common criticisms of evaluations, that recommendations are not based on conclusions, or conclusions on findings, nor findings on evidence.

2.5.4 Data Triangulation

The evaluation will use triangulation to improve the quality of information used to support the findings of the evaluation team. This means that where possible, three different sources of information will be used to support the evaluation findings. This cross checking of information should allow the team to build up an accurate picture of the information. The methods the team will use to achieve three different perspectives required for triangulation will be:

- **Using different sources of information** – cross checking of information with different people. This will involve talking to various people in the community, looking at the different perspectives of the stakeholders (AusAID, NGOs, Government), and comparing the situation of different communities or CBOs.
- **Using different methods of data collection** – mixing quantitative and qualitative techniques, or formal and less formal participatory methods generating different types of information but supporting a consistent picture of analysis.
- **Using different people to collect data** – the team is sufficiently large to allow different people to carry out a set of interviews. If there are similar findings across the interviews then this will build confidence in the reliability of findings presented by the evaluation team.

Data collection and analysis will be conducted by the external evaluation consultants so that an independent view on the evaluation of SINPA is maintained. The team leader will have the overall responsibility for data analysis but will be supported by two other team members in their field of expertise such as gender, CBO and NGO capacity building, value for money and results frameworks.

Throughout the evaluation the team will engage in discussions with Australian and SI based NGO partners. This process of engagement will ensure that data included in the evaluation report are factual correct and that NGO partners have the opportunity to provide feedback as questions may arise during the evaluation mission.

2.5.5 Document review

To arrive at its conclusions the Evaluation Team will look at:

- Assessments of the development needs in Solomon Islands.
- The development and implementation of the program from 2009 until the start of the Mid-Term Evaluation, including all relevant reports and quality reviews.
- Other NGO partnerships AusAID has engaged in, particularly in the Pacific.
- AusAID's past civil society programs in Solomon Islands.
- Reports on other civil society programs in Solomon Islands.
- Evaluations of AusAID's other programs in Solomon Islands.
- AusAID's Civil Society Evaluation.

3 WORK PLAN

3.1. Organisation of the Task

The external evaluation team members will carry out the following roles:

1. Martine Van de Velde – Team Leader – Evaluation Specialist
2. Alice Aruheeta-Pollard – Civil Society Based Development Specialist
3. Steve Jones – Aid Effectiveness Specialist

The Team Leader, Martine Van de Velde, is responsible to the client for the quality of the evaluation report, and she will coordinate the work of the team. Ms. Van de Velde will focus specifically on the Program and Strategic level of analysis for this evaluation. Ms. Van de Velde will also focus on SINPA's effectiveness in comparison with other AusAID community development initiatives.

Ms. Aruheets-Pollard will focus more on the organisational and capacity building assessment of the SI NGO and CBO partners. In addition to this she will focus on the integration of gender issues across SINPA.

Mr. Jones will focus on project level assessments for the six implementing partners. Mr. Jones will also concentrate on value for money assessment and cost-benefit analysis for the SINPA program as a whole.

The three external evaluation consultants will take the responsibility for writing sections of the evaluation report. The Team Leader will be responsible for ensuring consistency in the report.

It is understood that the evaluation team will be accompanied by:

1. Siddhartha Chakrabarti, Second Secretary, Australian High Commission, Honiara.
2. Leonora Kukome, Representative of the SINPA Steering Committee
3. (Add name of 3rd representative)

The review team are very appreciative of this as it will enable the preparation of a more cogent report and reflects the participatory and partner approach of SINPA. However the review team will make a judgement on an individual interview basis whether it is appropriate for them to be present or not.

3.2. Step 1: Inception: September – October

The aim of the first step in the review, served in the present Evaluation Plan, is to formulate the approach and propose a work plan which will be discussed with AusAID and SINPA Steering Committee. This process will allow for a crystallisation of the approach, identification of emerging issues and formulation of key evaluation questions.

The final evaluation plan will be returned to AusAID and the SINPA Steering Committee by Monday 24th of October.

At this stage an initial document review is carried out, as well as conference calls with AusAID, SINPA Steering Committee and ANGO representatives.

Conference calls have taken place with SI Implementing Partners and with Australian based NGO Head Offices. The conference calls allowed the external evaluation consultants to obtain an initial understanding of the progress, achievements and challenges occurring in SINPA.

The conference calls were an important element in allowing for a crystallisation of the approach and formulation of key questions.

3.3. Step 2: Field Work: 2nd – 16th November

The in-country mission will be carried out between the 2nd and the 16th of November. The evaluators will present their preliminary findings to the Steering Committee and AusAID prior to departing from the Solomon Islands.

The field work will be divided roughly as follows; this will be finalized during the week of the 24th of October. Mrs Aruheeta-Pollard will coordinate with AusAID in-country to finalize the field mission program.

Wed 02.11:	Arrival – afternoon meeting of evaluation team members
Thursday 03.11:	Briefing and interviews with AusAID Briefing and interviews with SINPA Steering Committee and SINPA Interim Coordinator
Friday 04.11:	Morning - Interviews with SI NGO Oxfam Afternoon - Interviews with SI NGO LLEE Meeting with other development partners
Saturday 05.11:	Morning - Interviews with SI NGO ICP Afternoon - Interviews with SI NGO APHEDA
Sunday 06.11:	Morning - Interviews with SI NGO ADRA Afternoon - Interviews with SI NGO SCA
Monday 07.11:	Morning – Evaluators’ review Departure for Field Visits
Tuesday 08/11:	Field Visits
Wednesday 09/11:	Field Visits
Thursday 10/11:	Field Visits
Friday 11/11:	Field Visits
Saturday 12/11:	Return from Field Visits
Sunday 13/11:	Data processing
Monday 14/11:	Data processing
Tuesday 15/11:	Presentation of preliminary findings to AusAID and partners
Wednesday 16/11:	Morning – Meeting of external consultants to discuss debriefing and report writing Afternoon – Departure of consultants

3.4 Step 3: Report writing

Once the in-country mission has been completed the evaluation team will follow the steps as outlined in the Terms of Reference.

A draft report for peer review will be submitted to AusAID by the external evaluation consultants. Based on the comments received the evaluation team will prepare a final version of the report.

Dates for the different steps will be agreed upon in consultation with AusAID.

ANNEX 3

List of organisations and persons consulted:

Australian High Commission

- HE Matt Anderson, Australian High Commissioner

AusAID

- Jane Lake, Development Coordinator, Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI)
- Peter O'Connor, Counsellor, Australian High Commission
- Tim Vistarini, Director, RAMSI Law and Justice Program
- Siddhartha Chakrabarti, Second Secretary, Australian High Commission

Australian-based NGO partners

Conference calls with:

- Chris Roche—Oxfam
- Peter Jensen – Apheda
- David Peedom - Save the Children Australia
- Heather Brown - IWDA
- Aletia Dundas - APHEDA
- Ken Davis - Apheda
- Chris Peters - ABM

Conference calls with:

- **Australian-based NGO partners**
- Joe Weber—Oxfam
- Peter Jensen - Apheda
- **AusAID**
- Peter O'Connor, Counsellor, Australian High Commission
- Siddhartha Chakrabarti, Second Secretary, Australian High Commission

In-country mission

Solomon-Island based NGO partners (Steering Committee)

- Lenora Kukome—ADRA
- Doris Puiahi—Live & Learn
- Merbilly Pitadonga—APHEDA
- Wilfried Zina—SCA
- Stephen Milford—SCA

- Josiah Maesua—ICP/ABM
- Chris—ICP/ABM (Australian NGO rep present at meeting)
- Joe Weber-- Oxfam

During in-country mission

SINPA Steering Committee

- Lenora Kukome – ADRA
- Joe Weber – Oxfam
- Josiah Maesua – ICP/ABM
- Wilfried Zina – Save the Children
- Selina Tefui – ICP
- Merbilly Pitadonga – APHEDA
- Doris Paiahi – Live and Learn
- Johnson Fangalasuu – Live and Learn
- Joe Haga – Save the Children
- Hickson George – SINPA Coordinator
- Patrick Messia - ADRA
- ADRA
- Patrick Mesia – Assistant Project Manager – Yelp
- Shadrach Sese – Field Coordinator Guadalcanal
- Leslie Kakai –Microfinance Coordinator YELP
- Lenora Kukome – Project Advisor

APHEDA

- Aletia Dundas – Pacific Project Officer (APHEDA Australia)
- Merbilly Pitadunga- Project Officer
- Wilton Laufiu- Capacity Building Officer
- Lute Onio - Small Grant Officer
- Jerome Emilliani – Provincial Learning Coordinator (West Guadalcanal)
- David Tau – Provincial Learning Coordinator (Western Province)

Family Support Centre

- Nairy Alamu – Interim Centre Manager
- Daisy Maegoa – Finance Officer
- Andella Maria – Counselor
- ICP Manager
- Selina Tefui – ICP Program Officer
- Josiah Maesu – ICP Program Manager
- Live and Learn - IWDA

- Elmah Panisi – Finance Manager
- Johnson Fangalasuu – Country Manager

Oxfam

- Joe Weber – Country Director
- Alice Eric – Support Officer
- June Maru – Advocacy Program Officer
- Chris Roche – Director of Development Effectiveness (Skype discussion)
- [Meeting on Results Framework]
- Katie Greenwood – Deputy Country Representative (Programs)
- Apollonia Talo – Community Worker
- Kristina Sau – Community worker

Live and Learn SINPA-TTFT Program

- Elmah Panisi – Finance Manager
- Johnson Fangalasuu – Country Manager
- Ben Valepo – NRM Officer
- Doris Purahi – TTFT Program Manager
- Enif Petsakibo – TTFT Livelihood Officer
- Ileama Paul - TTFT M&E Officer
- Stephanie Polyn—TTFT Gender officer (attended the second meeting with Steve)
- Joanna Brislane—IWDA Program Manager for Solomon Islands (attended second meeting with Steve)

Save the Children

- Niamh Murnaghan – Country Director
- Thet Thet New, Operations Director
- Wilfried Zina – Area Manager, Honiara, Makira, Guadalcanal
- Joe Haga – Provincial Coordinator – Guadalcanal
- John Lolley, Finance Manager
- Stephen Milford, M&E Manager
- Willi Sau Kaituu, M&E Officer

Stephen Milford—(meeting with Steve)

AusAID

Australian High Commission

- HE Matt Anderson, Australian High Commissioner

AusAID

- Jane Lake, Development Coordinator, Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI)

- Peter O'Connor, Counsellor, Australian High Commission
- Tim Vistarini, Director, RAMSI Law and Justice Program
- Siddhartha Chakrabarti, Second Secretary, Australian High Commission
- Other Stakeholders
- Annette Leith, Deputy Country Director (Solomon Islands), World Bank

Other Stakeholders

- Ruth Alsop, World Bank Consultant, RDP
- Jennifer Wate, Solomon Islands Development Trust

ANNEX 4 – MISSION SCHEDULE

Date	Event
Wednesday 02/11	Afternoon: Arrival, meeting of evaluation team members followed by short briefing for observers at 6pm.
Thursday 03/11	8 -12: Briefing and interviews with AusAID (SINPA MGMT Team, Jane Lake (Development Coordinator), Law and Justice Program, Machinery of Government Program) – See A1. 1-4: Briefing and interviews with SINPA Steering Committee 4:30 – 5:30: Interview with SINPA Interim Coordinator.
Friday 04/11	9 – 12 Oxfam 12 – 1 Lunch Meeting, with other development partners - World Bank, UNDP 1 – 4 LLEE
Saturday 05/11	9 – 12 Inclusive Communities Program 1 – 4 APHEDA
Sunday 06/11	8 – 10 ADRA 1 – 4 SCA
Monday 07/11	Morning - Evaluators review Afternoon - Field Visits (Guadalcanal)
Tuesday 08/11 - Wednesday 09/11	Field Visits (Guadalcanal) – See below.
Thursday 10/11 - Saturday 12/11	Depart for Gizo (Flight: IE850 0830 HIR – GZO 0935) Field Visits (Western) – See below.
Sunday 13/11	Return to Honiara (Flight: IE851 1025 GZO - MUA – EGM – HIR 1205) Data Processing
Monday 14/11	Data Processing
Tuesday 15/11	Afternoon - presentation of preliminary findings to Partners
Wednesday 16/11	9-10 - Discussion with Australian High Commissioner 10 – 12 – Presentation to AusAID Afternoon – Departure of consultants

1. AusAID Meetings – Thursday 3 Nov 2011

Time	Activity	Location	Participants
08:30-9:00	Meet with Siddhartha Chakrabarti	Australian High Commission	Siddhartha Chakrabarti
10:30-11:00	Meet with Julien Barbara or Debbie Reschke	Small Conference Room, Lelei	Julien Barbara or Debbie Reschke
11:00-11:25	Meet with Tim Vistarini	Small Conference Room, Lelei	Tim Vistarini
11:30-12:30	Meet with Jane Lake	Small Conference Room, Lelei	Jane Lake

2. Field Visit Schedule

2.1 Guadalcanal Site Visits Schedule:

Date	Time	SINPA Partner NGO	Guadalcanal Communities	Group 1	Group 2
Mon. 7th Nov	2:30pm – 5:30pm	ADRA	Tau, North Guadalcanal	X	
	2.30pm - 5.30pm	ADRA	Kaio, North Guadalcanal		X
Overnight in Honiara					
Tue. 8th Nov	8.30am - 12.30pm	ICP	Horabau, Guadalcanal Plains	X	X
	2.30pm- 5.30pm	Oxfam- Family Supt. Center (FSC)	FSC Office	X	X
Overnight in Honiara					
Wed. 9th Nov	8.30pm- 12.30pm	APHEDA	Labukulila Community, N/West Guadalcanal	X	X
	2.30pm – 5.30pm	SCA	Kaibia, Central Honiara Guadalcanal	X	
	2.30pm – 5.30pm	ICP	Ndui Ndui Community, N/W		X

2.2 Western Site Visits Schedule:

Date	Time	SINPA Partner NGO	Western Communities	Group 1	Group 2
Thursday 10th Nov	11.00am – 3.00pm	APHEDA	Sausama, Kolobangara	X	
		Live & Learn	Sausama, Kolobangara		X
Overnight in Gizo Hotel					
Friday 11th Nov	8.30am – 11.30am	APHEDA	Urumage, S/Vella	X	
	12.30pm – 3.30pm		Field Visits to other sites in S/ Vella	X	
	8.30am - 11.30am	Live & Learn	Kalibae, Kolobangara		X
	1.30pm – 4.30pm	Live & Learn	Kena		X
Overnight in Gizo Hotel					
Saturday 12th Nov	9.00am – 12.00pm	SCA	Mile 6, Gizo	X	X
	1.00pm – 4.00pm	SCA	Sambora	X	X
13th Nov	Return to Honiara			X	X

ANNEX 5 CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF EACH NGO

For each NGO the following criteria were used against which the NGO was assessed. In cases where not sufficient information was available the criteria was not addressed.

1. Goal / Objectives of the project
2. Results to date? Focus on Results – what is the NGO presenting as results?
3. Strengths Based Approach – how is it applied? Strengths/Weaknesses.
4. Partnership – how is it applied? Who are the partners? Networks?
5. Potential to develop new approaches / learning?
6. Transparency and accountability to communities
7. Strategies on empowerment, gender and inclusion
8. Project management:
 - Monitoring and Evaluation
 - Quality of reporting
 - Capacity of Staff in-country
 - Oversight by the Australian based office
9. Sustainability
10. Overhead costs (brief – more detail in section on Value for Money)

ANNEX 6 – EXAMPLE RESULTS FRAMEWORK

DRAFT RESULTS FRAMEWORK OXFAM-FSC STAV PROGRAM

OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT RISKS
IMPACT (2018)		
Effective public action, at multiple levels, supports women and girls to live free from the threat and reality of violence.	Communities are effectively responding to violence against women and girls Effective services support survivors of violence against women. Laws are enforced and government policies implemented to provide effective protection to women and girls. <i>Endline compared to baseline</i>	Not required
OUTCOME (2014)		
Foundations laid for programme of action to tackle violence against women (VAW) sustainably in Solomon Islands.	Women report increased awareness and positive discussions around reducing violence against women in STAV pilot communities. Specialist services support women experiencing violence. New laws and ordinances, which protect women and uphold their rights, are passed, and existing ones implemented. <i>Endline compared to baseline</i>	Outcome to Impact Government, donors and other stakeholders committed to eliminating violence against women and girls and provide funding to scale up programmes. Political and economic stability. No major national disasters
OUTPUTS		
1. FSC developed as a 'good practice' provider of specialist support services to survivors of violence.	# Survivors of Violence supported with counselling and referral to other service providers by end Phases 3,4,5. Organisational capacity assessment tools indicated effective governance, financial management systems operational and counselling and referral systems Strategic plan published (2014-2019) with indicative commitments from SIG, donors.	FSC's good practice model is viable, can be scaled up and taken to other parts of Guadalcanal and other provinces. FSC's improved governance, management and service delivery practices are sustained, and FSC can manage the risks associated with scale-up.
2. Community-led approaches to combatting VAW	# men and women participating in each village at end Phases 4 and 5.	Pilot schemes result in approaches to combatting VAW that can be scaled-up in Solomon Islands

	developed and tested in 3 pilot villages.	Evidence from on-going evaluation of schemes used to redesign programme, as required.			
3.	Advocacy campaigns to change and/or implement laws and policies to combat VAW implemented.	# Advocacy campaigns implemented and results documented, by end Phase 4 and 5.	Policy makers willing and able to adopt and implement new laws and policies and implement existing ones.		
ACTIVITIES					
Output 1		Output 2		Output 3	
1.1	FSC capacity in providing specialist support strengthened (e.g., case management, counselling).	2.1	Capacity of existing women's groups in pilot villages to work with whole community strengthened.	3.1	Awareness and media campaigns, and policy forums undertaken to make policy makers aware of VAW and the need to combat it.
1.2	Organisational development of FSC (e.g., financial mgmt., governance, strategic planning).	2.2	Solidarity built among women and safe spaces found to share stories and experiences of violence.	3.2	Public awareness campaigns (e.g., media) undertaken on the need to combat VAW and the consequences of violence.
1.3	FSC engagement with the Referral Network strengthened	2.3	Women supported to take action to combat VAW in ways identified by themselves.	3.3	Participation in SIG working groups*, as requested, to ensure new laws and policies respond effectively to women's needs.
1.4	FSC engagement with 'first providers' (e.g., police, health professionals, judiciary) strengthened.	2.4	Awareness of men and youth of need to combat VAW and the consequences of violence raised.	3.4	Support provided to SafetyNet to monitor and report on performance of first providers.
		2.5	On-going participatory monitoring and lesson learning on the approaches used to improve programme and share with others.		* E.g., inter-ministerial working groups led by Ministry of Women's, Youth, Children and Family Affairs; Law Reform Commission review of the Penal Code.

DRAFT RESULTS FRAMEWORK
ADRA – Youth Engagement and Livelihoods Program (YELP)

OBJECTIVES	INDICATORS	ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT RISKS
IMPACT (2018)		
Communities in Solomon Islands better governed and meeting their needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % people living in ADRA and nearby communities (M/F) report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Communities more peaceful ➢ Less drug and alcohol abuse • All ADRA villages have adequate water supply and sanitation facilities. <p>Endline compared to baseline</p>	Not required
OUTCOME (2014)		
Young men and women sustainably engaged in income generating activities (IGAs) and playing a constructive role in community affairs.	<p>#/% young men and young women reporting sustainable incomes from IGAs</p> <p>#/% communities where men and women adults report youth are playing a more constructive role in community affairs,</p> <p>Endline compared to baseline</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Outcome to Impact</p> <p>Youth continue to play an active role in community affairs, in their own and nearby communities, beyond end of project.</p> <p>Youth willing to invest some of their skills and income from their enterprises in their communities and in mentoring younger people in their communities.</p>
OUTPUTS		
1. Cadre of 6 male/female volunteer Strength Motivators, selected by communities, trained in leadership, facilitation and public speaking.	<p># Strength motivators (M/F) in place by end Phases 3,4,5.</p> <p>#/% Strength motivators trained in key skills by end Phases 3,4,5.</p>	<p>Chiefs and elders willing to provide space for young people to participate in community affairs and decision-making.</p> <p>Strength Motivators are taking on leadership roles and motivating youth in the communities</p>
2. Skills of young men and women enhanced for IGAs.	<p>#/% youth (M/F) trained in IGA skills by end Phases 3,4,5.</p> <p># training courses run by subject by end Phases 3,4,5.</p> <p>Youth Action Plans in place for all IGA activities.</p>	<p>IGA activities are financially viable and technically sound.</p> <p>Necessary technical advice and support is available from Government and other service providers.</p>
3. Business skills training and microfinance provided to youth savings groups (6 people per group), if approved by youth	<p># youth savings groups and total amount saved (SBD) by end Phases 3,4,5.</p> <p>Size of revolving funds (SBD) by end Phases 3,4,5.</p> <p># businesses established by end Phases 3,4,5.and % still operating 12 months later</p>	<p>Small businesses are financially viable and technically sound.</p> <p>Necessary technical advice and support is available from Government and other service providers.</p>

committees.									
4.	Adult volunteer Youth Mentors encouraged to demonstrate interest in youth and transfer IGA and other skills to them	#/% youth (M/F) reporting greater interest of adults in youth affairs		Sufficient adults (M/F) willing to be mentors and able to provide useful coaching to youth.					
5.	Skills in Strength-based Approach enhanced and shared by young men and women	#/% of IGAs or community development projects without aid assistance by end Phases 3,4,5 #/% of youth (M/F) reporting sharing SBA with others		Young people are able to make desired changes in their lives and communities based with their own resources					
ACTIVITIES									
Output 1		Output 2		Output 3		Output 4		Output 5	
1.1	Community dialogues and awareness training by ADRA.	2.1	Community and activity-specific YAPs prepared by communities, facilitated by ADRA field staff.	3.1	Awareness building on savings, microfinance and business skills.	4.1	Assess needs for Youth Mentors and timing (now/later?)	5.1	ADRA staff conducts SBA training with communities
1.2	Youth motivators selected by community (3 M and 3 F per community) and trained in key skills.	2.2	Motivational sports activities organised by ADRA field staff, with communities (e.g., training by SI Football Federation).	3.2	Savings groups for microfinance and business skills training selected by communities, emphasising inclusion of female youth groups.	4.2	Adult Youth Mentors trained by ADRA Provincial Coordinator and Field Coordinators in mentoring and related skills.	5.2	Resources/skills that exist in the community are identified
1.3	Mentoring and support provided by ADRA field staff.	2.3	Training providers identified and commissioned to run training courses for YAP activities.	3.3	Training provided in savings and business skills and ANZ bank accounts opened.	4.3	On-going monitoring, support and further training, as required. Provided by ADRA.	5.3	Review of SBA at the beginning of each new project
1.4	Regular review and reflection and adjustment of programme, as necessary.	2.4	Procurement of materials by SMS supported, as necessary, by ADRA field staff.	3.4	Business plans developed.	4.4	Regular review, reflection, evaluation and adjustment of programme, as required		

		2.5	On-going technical support/training facilitated/provided by ADRA field staff.	3.5	Monitoring of group savings and provision on revolving funds by ADRA in proportion to savings.			5.4	ADRA facilitates process for key youth to share SBA with surrounding communities
		2.6	Regular review, reflection, evaluation and adjustment of programme, as required.	3.6	ADRA monitors and mentors groups, facilitating technical or other support, as required.			5.5	Collection of MSC stories—changes as a result of SBA
				3.7	Regular review, reflection, evaluation and adjustment of programme, as required				

ANNEX 7 – SELECTION OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- *This list is in addition to SINPA partners Project Design Documents, Annual Reports, Financial Reports and monitoring documentation.*
- Roche, Chris. An Oxfam contribution to SINPA's learning objective with a focus on different dimensions of partnership, Melbourne, September 2011.
- University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Exploring SINPA's Strengths-Based Practice: A Learning Paper, 2011.
- UTS, Exploring Processes for Participation and Accountability: A Learning Paper, 2011.
- Solomon Islands Family Health and Safety Study: A study on violence against women and children Secretariat of the Pacific Community for the Ministry of Women, Youth & Children's Affairs, 2009