THE HUMAN SECURITY INITIATIVE FOR TENSIONS REDUCTION, RECONCILIATION AND REHABILITATION

Evaluation of the United Nations Solomon Islands Joint Programme

Submitted by
Dr. Annette Ittig

30 December 2015

Acknowledgements

I am pleased to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the many people who facilitated the research and field work in the Solomon Islands for the review team during the evaluation of the UN Human Security Initiative – Tensions Reduction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation (HSI-T3R) Joint Programme.

I would like to thank Mr. Stanley Karuo'o, the national consultant for this review, for his inputs into the evaluation, including the production of the minutes of the 18th August stakeholder presentation (see Annex 6, below).

 I am grateful to Mr. Peter Mae, Under Secretary - Policy, Ministry of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace, for his time and insights, and for his efforts in arranging meetings with key stakeholders. I am also indebted to Mr. Donald Burgess, Mr. Eric Hale and Mr. Godwin Kamtukule at UNICEF, and to Mr. Bimlesh Raj, Mr. Ray Fugui and Ms. Jennie Funusui, at ILO, for all of their assistance in facilitating site visits and interviews with key informants and beneficiaries, as well as for sharing programme documentation and other information about HSI-T3R planning, procurement and implementation processes. I would also like to acknowledge with thanks the support received from Mr. Tristram Viulu at UNDP.

I would as well like to thank each of the national and municipal officials and NGO and CSO partners who took time to meet with us to provide programme details.

Above all, I am indebted to all of the Solomon Islanders who shared information about their communities and programme activities and expectations.

Dr. Annette Ittig
Team Leader, HSI-T3R evaluation

ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AWP	Annual Work Plan
C-BED	Community-Based Enterprise Development
CBO	Community-based Organization
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CFW	Cash for Work
CLTS	Community Led Total Sanitation
CPAD	Capacities for Peace and Development
CPR	Conflict Prevention and Recovery
DCC	Democratic Coalition for Change
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FP	Focal Point
HoA	Head of Agency
HSI-T3R	Human Security Initiative – Tensions Reduction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
ILO	International Labour Organization
J4P	Justice for the Poor
JP	Joint Programme
JPCM	Joint Programme Coordination Meeting
JPMT	Joint Programme Management Team
JPSC	Joint Programme Steering Committee
LLEE	Live and Learn Environmental Education
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDPAC	Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination
MEHRD	Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development
MHMS	Ministry for Health and Medical Services
MNUPR	Ministry for National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace
MoCILI	Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Labour and Immigration
MTDP	Medium Term Development Plan
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NDS	National Development Strategy
NPP	National Peacebuilding Policy
PACA	Participatory Appraisal of Competitive Advantage
PMU	Programme Management Unit
PC	Programme Coordinator
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
RAMSI	Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SICCI	Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce and Industry
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SIG	Solomon Islands Government
SIWBA	Solomon Islands Women Business Association

SPC	Secretariat of Pacific Community
SYOB	Start Your Own Business
TOC	Theory of Change
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPA	Townsville Peace Agreement
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNTFHS	United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security
UNV	United Nations Volunteer
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rationale for the Human Security Initiative.
From 1998-2003, a period known locally as the "tensions", the Solomon Islands experienced large scale social unrest and violence.   As the level of violence escalated, hundreds were killed; and some 30,000, or 15% of the population, were internally displaced.

Since the arrival of the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI), the international peacekeeping force, in 2003, the country has experienced relative peace. However, the complex root causes of the "tensions", including poverty, social and political exclusion and the weakening of traditional systems of authority, have still not been fully resolved; and they could undermine efforts for peace and security in the Solomon Islands.

With the aim of addressing human security needs in some of the country's most conflict-affected areas, the Solomon Islands Government (SIG) and the United Nations Solomon Islands initiated the joint programme *Human Security Initiative – Tensions Reduction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation* (HSI-T3R) in 2012.

The HSI-T3R is a three year collaboration between the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the SIG through its Ministry of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace (MNURP) and Ministry of Health and Medical Service (MoHMS). The Programme targets approximately 12,000 people, including 3,000 ex-combatants and some 3,000 Government, NGO and civil society stakeholders, in Honiara City and in the two provinces of Malaita and Guadalcanal. The Programme has been funded by the Japanese Government through the UN Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS) with contributions from UNDP ($500,000) and UNICEF ($180,000) for an initial total budget of US $2,886,434.

The Programme's stated goal is *to "enhance human security for the selected communities and former combatants in the Solomon Islands through reducing "tensions" and promoting peaceful and sustainable measures for their survival and dignity.* Through its *Freedom from Fear* and *Freedom from Want* approaches, the HSI-T3R aims to deliver policy, institutional and sector outputs and outcomes through three components which focus on various aspects of peacebuilding and conflict resolution; sustainable livelihoods; human rights; and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). The Programme's implied theory of change (ToC) is based on the transformation and diffusion of conflict through individual and communal socio-economic empowerment and behavioral change.

The HSI T3R Evaluation Scope, Methodology and Limitations.
The HSI T3R evaluation was commissioned by UNDP Solomon Islands in order to assess the Programme's continued relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, including emerging outcomes, and its post-project sustainability (see **Annex 1, "Terms of Reference"**). The evaluation also presents forward-looking recommendations for future programming, and it considers the functionality of the HSI-T3R as a UN Joint Programme (JP). Its intended audience includes UN HSI partner agencies; national, NGO and CBO partners and donor representatives.

The evaluation has employed a participatory approach. It has been informed by a document review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as well as visits to selected project sites, and a local stakeholder presentation and validation in Honiara. The mission's short 20 day timeframe curtailed

some of the evaluation's proposed interviews and fieldwork. The turnover of staff at partner agencies and in SIG offices also hindered the collection of background information on the design and early implementation phases of the Programme.

Key Evaluation Findings - Relevance.
As the underlying root causes of the 1998-2003 "tensions" have yet to be fully addressed, and as the country's development needs remain great, the Programme's overarching human security theme remains relevant to the Solomon Islands. However, since the Programme's formulation in 2006, both the veterans and conflict-affected communities have come to share common vulnerability features, making the HSI's specific focus on ex-combatants less relevant than it was than a decade ago. A differently focused, broader vulnerability targeting would therefore now be more appropriate for human security-related programming.

Overall Programme Design.
The Programme's design is very ambitious, and fewer strategic results would have been more achievable.   Moreover, the Programme's ToC, including how the three HSI T3R components would align in support of behavioral change and conflict reduction, has not been explicitly stated. Therefore, while conflict resolution and peacebuilding sensitizations feature in each component, the full synergies anticipated between these activities have not been realized.

Management and Coordination.
The HSI T3R governance structure does not include a Programme Manager; programme management was originally to be the responsibility of a Programme Management Team (PMT) of UN partner agency technical focal points and deputy Heads of Agencies. Perhaps due to staffing gaps, the PMT became a Programme Coordination Committee. In the extended absence of a Programme Coordinator, the partner agencies carried on their activities separately. A JP governance structure in which there are separate programme management and technical implementation groups, both supported by a programme management unit, might have been more effective.

Programme Risks and Assumptions.
Some of the macro level assumptions upon which the HSI-T3R was based, such as the national and local government aims and actors remaining constant during its duration, were beyond the control of the UN partner agencies. Other assumptions, including that UNDP as the Lead Agency would have the capacity to coordinate the Programme and that there would be no staffing gaps, have been optimistic. Finally, the Programme does not have a clearly articulated risk management strategy or context specific strategies for guidance if things go off plan.

Efficiency and Effectiveness.
The delivery of HSI T3R planned outputs and preliminary outcomes has been uneven in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, as has its functionality as a Joint Programme, due in part to the design, operational and management issues noted above.

Emerging Programme Achievements.
The strongest programme results were achieved in the WASH and Cash for Work (CfW) activities, as well as in the approval of the National Peacebuilding Policy (NPP), towards which the HSI-T3R contributed support. (This activity was not anticipated in the Programme's 2012 ProDoc, HSI-T3R support began in November 2013.)

Sustainability.
Results achieve thus far through the HSI could be sustained after its completion, where those results align with national priorities and are integrated into national policies and frameworks, e.g. the integration of CfW modalities into Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Labour and Immigration MoCILI) programmes; the possible adaptation of UNICEF WASH standards by MHRED; and the approval of the NPP. However, as national and local stakeholders' financial resources are limited, they may require ongoing support from donors over the short to medium term.

Best Practices:
The HSI-T3R has followed JP best practice in identifying an appropriate national counterpart, the MNURP, to carry on its activities once the programme is completed. Moreover, through the peace rehabilitation activities proposed in its 2016 draft budget, for example, the MNRUP has shown its commitment to champion the human security agenda for post-project sustainability.

Lessoned Learned:
The Programme provides several lessons learned which should inform future human security-related programming, e.g.

Effective coordination requires investments of time, funding and commitment:
Transactions costs such as staff time can be high, particularly in the inception of joint programmes.

Sustainable behavioral transformation requires ongoing sensitivity, awareness raising and tracking. Although the HIS has supported initial peacebuilding, trauma counseling, conflict-sensitive business practice and other workshops, to date no tracking of the effects of these trainings has been undertaken.

During the course of project implementation, beneficiary target groups may need to be redefined to better align with emerging post-design issues. In the HSI T3R inception phase, there were challenges in identifying the ex-combatants originally targeted as beneficiaries; the beneficiary group was therefore expanded to include other vulnerable groups in the selected communities.

Recommendations.
As the Programme is now winding down, select recommendations for documenting its achievements and for its handover, as well as for future programming, are presented below:

Wind Up of Current Programme:
Identify local partners to whom activities not completed by project end can be transferred. Initiate tracer studies and collect data from implementing partners to demonstrate behavior modification and other HSI achievements.

Future Programming -Project Design:
Ensure project design aligns to the contemporary Solomon Islands context; reference the SDGs in the project outcome levels to ensure relevance to the post-2015 international development agenda. Conduct a conflict assessment to inform the project design, including reference to site specific conflict dimensions, as well as a mapping of other conflict prevention and peacebuilding interventions with which the project could be synergistic. Articulate a clear ToC to guide the project strategy. Involve national stakeholders in the project formulation to ensure its relevance and value-added to national

development plans, as well as its sustainability. For multiple agency projects, consider the comparative transaction costs and institutional efficiencies of joint programming as opposed to those of a Joint Programme

Governance, Staffing and Coordination Mechanisms.
For future Joint Programmes (JPs), consider a stronger interagency PMU which would both manage and coordinate administrative, financial, communication, M&E and liaison functions.   PMU staffing should include a JP Manager and an M&E specialist at a minimum. Ensure JP budgets cover staff costs for all participating UN agencies,

Funding Modalities:
Consider pooled or pass-through funding, or a combination of modalities, in future JPs, as these may support a better aligned Programme implementation than the parallel funding modality, which can encourage agencies to act independently rather than jointly.

Priority Themes:
Consider human security-related themes which are synergistic with current and pipeline projects, e.g. UNDP's social inclusion initiative, as well as other themes which have become more prominent since the HSI formulation, e.g. climate change adaptation (CCA)   Finally, consider how future human security-related programming can support SIG and MNURP priorities such as peace rehabilitation and strengthening national consciousness and unity.

INTRODUCTION

*Human Security and the Solomon Islands Context: the Rationale for the Humans Security[1] Initiative –
Tensions Reduction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation (HSI-T3R) Programme.* The concept of human
security was originally articulated by UNDP in its 1994 Human Development Report. Human security is
based upon individuals' rights to "freedom from fear," "freedom from want," and "freedom to live in
dignity". It has been closely linked to the Millennium Development Goals ("MDGs"); and it is as well as a
pre-condition to the achievement of the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).   Human
security is distinguished from national security by its people-centre focus. In its advocacy for the
protection and empowerment of the most vulnerable in times of crisis, human security is also relevant
to the objectives of conflict prevention and conflict transformation.

Like many other Small Island Developing States (SIDS), the Solomon Islands faces particular development
challenges due to its remoteness, small size and narrow resource and export base. For example, it is
more vulnerable to external shocks, including fluctuations in food and energy prices, than other kinds of
developing countries.   Its distance from international markets has also hindered the development of a
more broadly-based economy; and much of the country's rural population depends on subsistence
agriculture and/or fishing for their livelihood.

The Solomon Islands has one of the world's most pluralistic societies: its population of 572,900 includes
70 language groups and is dispersed over 90 of its approximately 1000 islands and atolls. Less than 20%
of the population is urbanized. The Solomon Islands' social organization has traditionally been based on
the wantok[2], or "lineage" group; and the remoteness of the islands have reinforced the distinctions
between these groups.

The country has experienced economic progress since 2010, with growth primarily in the export of
timber, palm oil, cocoa and minerals. Nonetheless, the Solomon Islands, with Papua New Guinea, holds
the lowest ranking of the Pacific Islands in the United Nations Development Index for 2014[3] Moreover,
any economic gains could be drastically reversed by the natural disasters to which the country is
particularly prone, including floods, landslides, earthquakes and cyclones.

---

[1] The concept of human security, as originally articulated by UNDP in its 1994 Human Development Report, is
based upon individuals' rights to "freedom from fear," and "freedom from want". It is closely linked to the
Millennium Development Goals (MDGs.) Human security is distinguished from national security by its "people-
centered" focus. In its advocacy for the protection and empowerment of the most vulnerable in times of crisis,
human security is also relevant to the objectives of peacebuilding, conflict prevention and conflict transformation.
[2] Wantok, 'pidgin', "one who speaks the same language", "one talk" "Wantokism is used to describe the
relationships or mutual obligation and support between near and distant kin, and those sharing other kinds of
social and geographical associations , e.g. from the same village, area or province": Sinclair Dinnen and Nicole
Hally, Evaluation of the Community Officer Project in Solomon Islands, World Bank Research Report (J4P
programme), May 2012, p. iv
[3] Both countries are ranked at 157 out of 187 countries: *United Nations Human Development Index 2014*, Table 1:
http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/table-1-human-development-index-and-its-components

From 1998-2003 – a period known locally as the "tensions" - the country experienced large scale social unrest and violence. The conflict began with attacks by gangs of armed youth from Guadalcanal on settlements there which were populated mainly by people from the neighbouring island of Malaita. The level of violence escalated and left hundreds dead and some 30,000 internally displaced[4]. Social and economic infrastructure was severely damaged as the militants took control of Honiara; and the entire country was destabilized.

In 2002, in response to requests from the Solomon Islands Government (SIG), the Pacific Islands Forum mobilized the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI) as an Australian-led multi-national stabilization force. The Solomon Islands has experienced relative peace since the arrival of RAMSI[5]. However, the root causes of the "tensions" have still not been fully addressed.

The factors underlying the conflict are complex. They include poverty, social and political exclusion, outstanding grievances which often manifest along ethnic lines, and the weakening of traditional systems of authority by the introduction of new, non-traditional structures. Moreover, a national identity which would unite the country's diverse and dispersed population above the wantok level has not yet been developed. If not addressed, this combination of factors, particularly in a small, remote, under-developed country context, will undermine efforts for peace and security in the Solomon Islands.

PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES, LINKAGES AND COMPONENTS

With the aim of addressing human security needs in some of the country's most conflict-affected areas, the Solomon Islands Government (SIG) and the United Nations Solomon Islands initiated the joint programme *Human Security Initiative – Tensions Reduction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation* (HSI-T3R), in 2012. The HSI-T3R is a three year collaboration between the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the Solomon Islands Government through its Ministry of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace (MNURP) and Ministry of Health and Medical Service (MoHMS). This UN Joint Programme (JP) anticipates strong inter-agency partnerships and national ownership. It is under implementation in Honiara City and the two provinces of Malaita and Guadalcanal.

The Programme is funded by the Japanese Government through the UN Trust Fund for Human Security (UNTFHS), with contributions from UNDP ($500,000) and UNICEF ($180,000), for a total budget of US $2,886,434. The Programme utilizes a direct implementation, parallel funding modality. The Programme's original end date was 2014. It has received two no-cost extensions, and its current date of completion is October 2015.

Programme Objectives and Components. The Programme's stated goal is *to "enhance human security for the selected communities and former combatants in the Solomon Islands through reducing "tensions" and promoting peaceful and sustainable measures for their survival and dignity.[6]* Through its *Freedom*

---

[4] The 30,000 internally displaced would have been the equivalent of 15% of the country's population at that time.
[5] Although there were violent incidents in both the 2006 and 2014 election periods.
[6] HSI-T3R project document (prodoc), 2012, p. 5

from Fear and *Freedom from Want* approaches, the HSI-T3R aims to deliver policy, institutional and sector outputs and outcomes.

The Programme includes three components which focus on various aspects of peacebuilding and conflict resolution; sustainable livelihoods; human rights; and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH). The Programme's implied theory of change is based on the transformation and diffusion of conflict through individual and communal socio-economic empowerment and behavioral change.

The HSI-T3R aims to reach approximately 12,000 beneficiaries, of whom an estimated 8,000 would be former combatants and some 3,000 would be other conflict-affected persons.[7] Up to 3000 additional beneficiaries would include Government officials, NGOs, vulnerable groups including women and youth, as well as those employed in project activities. Indirect beneficiaries would include the communities of the project implementation sites. [8]

The HSI-T3R builds upon and expands the activities and outputs of two human security projects previously funded by the UNTFHS in the Solomon Islands in 2002-2003 and in 2003-4[9]. Both of these projects also targeted conflict-affected communities and ex-combatants and included infrastructure components.

Programme Linkages. The HSI-T3R is aligned with SIG development priorities on national unity and peacebuilding as presented in the *National Development Strategy 2011-2020,* the National Peacebuilding Policy and the *Medium Term Development Plan 2014-2018,* for example, in the MNURP's 2014-2018 development programme for "National Peace and State Building Institutional Development", particularly

> **"**Output 1.5 Youth and peace building Activities
> Activity 1.5.1. Capacity training in peace building and youth development issues….
> Activity 1.5.2. Integration of peace building & livelihood programs or business trainings for youths…"[10]

Moreover, the Programme is also closely linked to the mandate of the MNURP, particularly to its peace and reconciliation as well as post-conflict rehabilitation functions[11].

---

[7] 2012 prodoc, p. 5

[8] 2012 prodoc, p. 5

[9] *Employment generation and economic recovery through the rehabilitation and maintenance of infrastructure using labour based equipment supported technology (in the Solomon Islands), 2003-2004:* http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/Solomon%20Islands%2061%20FINAL%20TEMPLATE.pdf; see also http://www.internal-displacement.org/assets/library/Asia/Solomon-Islands/pdf/Solomon+Islands+-18March+2004.pdf p. 68; and *Rehabilitation of schools in provinces affected by the ethnic conflict in Solomon Islands 2002-2003:* http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/Solomon%20Islands%2058%20FINAL%20TEMPLATE.pdf

[10] MTDP 2014-2018, pp. 131-132

[11] "MNURP has the government-wide mandate t coordinate all "tensions" related reconciliation and peacebuilding activities in the Solomon Islands": Prodoc, 2012, p. 32

Its links to UN policy and programming frameworks include

- the Regional UNDAF, particularly Outcome 1, *Pacific Island countries develop and implement evidence-based, regional and pro-poor National Sustainable Development Strategies (NSDS) to address population, poverty and economic exclusion issues, stimulate equitable growth, create economic opportunities and quality employment and promote sustainable livelihoods.* and Outcome 5, *Regional, national, local and traditional governance systems are strengthened and exercise the principles of good governance, respecting and upholding human rights, especially women's rights, in line with international standards.*
- The Millennium Development Goals ("MDGs"), particularly MDG 1, "eradicating extreme poverty and hunger"; and MDG 3, "promoting gender equality and empowering women"

Programme Partners. The Programme's primary national partners are the MNURP and the MHMS. Its other main partners include:

- Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development (MEHRD)
- Department of Commerce, Industry, Labour and Immigration
- Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce
- Honiara City Council
- Other local partners include Youth@Work[12], Vois Blong Mere Solomons, local Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs); local school authorities; the National Youth Council; Solomon Islands Council of Trade Unions; Solomon Islands Women's Business Association, the Christian Care Centre
- The International NGO Live and Learn Solomon Islands

Other HSI-T3R partners and allies are referenced below, in the three "Implementation" sections of this report.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGIES

Evaluation objectives and scope. The evaluation of the HSI-T3R was commissioned by UNDP Solomon Islands. The objective of HSI-T3R evaluation consultancy was to conduct an assessment of the Programme based on the detailed terms of reference (TORs) presented in **Annex 1**. The evaluation takes into consideration the Programme's continued relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact; and, as required by the evaluation TORs, the performance of those aspects of the HSI have been given numerical ratings which are presented below in **Annex 4, "Table of Ratings for Programme Performance".**

The evaluation also considers the functionality of the HSI-T3R as a UN Joint Programme. More specifically, the evaluation aims:

---

[12] A local social enterprise funded by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC). For more information on SPC and the Youth@Work initiative, see http://www.spc.int/en/spc-and-the-pacific-plan/1233-solomon-islands-youth-work-programme-leads-to-paid-work.html

- to determine the extent to which the programme objectives defined in the 2012 project document and Results and Resources Framework have been met, and to assess the likelihood of achieving them upon completion of the programme.
- to assess current programme activities, challenges and opportunities
- To determine the extent to which the Joint Programme modality has reduced duplication among participating UN Agencies, reduced transaction costs and maximized synergies with national partners.

The evaluation's intended audience includes UN HSI partner agencies; national, NGO and CBO partners and donor representatives.

Evaluation work plan

The evaluation schedule is attached herewith as **Annex 2.**

Evaluation Methodologies – Literature Review, Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group discussions, Field Visit Observations. The evaluation has employed a participatory approach. It has been informed by a document review (see below, **Select References**), key informant interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), field visits to select project sites in Honiara and Guadalcanal, and a local stakeholder presentation and validation session in Honiara. This mixed methodological approach has allowed the triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data.

In both Honiara and in the field, the evaluation consultants held interviews and FGDs with key informants and stakeholders, including members of the Joint Programme Steering Committee (JPSC), the Joint Programme Coordinating Committee; the SIG Ministry partners and other relevant ministries, departments and agencies, as well as with other UN agencies.   Additional interviews with CSOs, NGOs and project beneficiaries were also conducted (see Annex 3, "Schedule"). Fifty-seven respondents, among them UN agencies' representatives, SIG officials and NGO and CSO partners, as well as male and female beneficiaries were interviewed.

The consultants also presented their findings and recommendations to stakeholders in Honiara upon completion of their fieldwork. The text of the PowerPoint from the stakeholder presentation and summary minutes from this session are presented below in **Annex 5, "Stakeholder PowerPoint Presentation – Text"**, and **Annex 6. "Summary Minutes from the Stakeholder Presentation".** The feedback from the stakeholder presentation has also been incorporated into this report.

Risks and Constraints. The mission's restricted timeframe of 20 days curtailed some of the evaluation's planned interviews in Honiara as well as fieldwork outside of the city.[13] Moreover, the turnover of staff at UNDP and ILO, as well as in SIG offices, hindered the collection of background information on the design and early implementation phases of the programme. Furthermore, there is an absence of

---

[13] For example, interviews with Justine Barrett, RAMSI; Ms. Susan Sulu Dhan, Director, Aid Coordination, Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination; and Ms. Atenasi, UN-WOMEN JP Focal Point, as well as project site visits in Guadalcanal.

counterfactual evidence that would indicate what peacebuilding and development results might have been achieved in the absence of the HSI-T3R Programme. Finally, the submission of the draft and final evaluation reports were delayed due to ambiguities in the National Consultant's TOR.[14]

PROGRAMME DESIGN, MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

Programme Design - Relevance. As the underlying root causes of the 1998-2003 "tensions" have yet to be fully addressed, the relevance of the Programme's overarching human security theme to the Solomon Islands should not be under-estimated. Moreover, as noted above, the country's development needs still remain great. Therefore support to interventions which aim to address behavioral and systemic constraints to physical and economic security, well-being and social cohesion remains relevant for donors, government and communities towards achieving human security objectives and development goals there.

Nonetheless, the extent to which the actual components and activities of the Programme, which was designed in 2006 but only initiated in 2012, remain relevant in the current context must be considered.   There have been changes in the Solomon Islands context since the HSI-T3R was formulated which would need to be referenced in any future programming, including:

- the installment of a new government, the Democratic Coalition for Change (DCC), following the 2014 national elections
- the DCC's new policy directions, including the geographical and thematic expansion of the mandate of the MNURP and its interventions with line ministries
- changes in national partners' staffing since the 2014 elections
- approval of the National Peacebuilding Policy in 2015

There have also been modifications to the international development agenda since the Programme was designed, e.g. the completion of the MDG cycle and the formulation of the post-2015 development agenda, including new development models and the launch of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs[15]).   Any future programming would also need to reference these topics.

These changes make the Programme's specific focus on ex-combatants less relevant now than a decade ago. Moreover, there is a stigma attached to the term "ex-combatants"[16], and the Programme has had challenges in identifying its stated target beneficiaries, that is, ex-combatants and victims of the conflict, from the start of its implementation.[17]   Indeed, MNURP requested that this term not be used to target Programme beneficiaries, due to its sensitivity, and that women, youth and other vulnerable groups be

---

[14] The revision to that TOR was collectively agreed upon during the 4-19 August field mission, which was also the data collection phase. However, the revision was not signed off by the Programme for more than one month afterwards as a result of, among other matters, staff leave periods. The draft evaluation document was submitted to UNDP on 31 October; feedback from all UN partner agencies was received on 7th December.

[15] Integration of the SDGs into programming may require a development package that cuts across key business areas for various UN partner agencies; e.g. for the HSI—T3R WASH, environment, livelihoods and education.

[16] "MNURP suggested for the project not to target ex-combatants directly as it was a matter of great sensitivity and had potential to instigate turmoil. It was suggested that the initiatives should instead be targeting the women, youths and other vulnerable groups in the rural and urban communities", HSI T3R *Third Annual Progress Report, 2013, p. 22;* see also JPSC meeting minutes 19 June 2013, p. 3

[17] JPSC meeting minutes, 19 June 2013, p. 3

targeted instead.   Finally, as time has passed, both the veterans and the conflict-affected communities have come to share common vulnerability features, and a differently focused vulnerability targeting would now be more appropriate for human security-related programming

Overall Programme Design. The programme design of the HSI T3R is very ambitious, with three separate activity streams and multiple anticipated outputs and outcomes. UNICEF, ILO and UNDP act, respectively, as the lead agents for the three activity streams or components on WASH, resilient livelihoods and peacebuilding/conflict resolution. Each component includes a broad range of activities relevant to the reduction of human security threats which were intended to build upon each other. However, the Programme's Theory of Change, including how the three HSI-T3R components would align in support of behavioral change and conflict reduction, has not been explicitly stated.

Moreover, the Programme did not undertake a detailed conflict analysis to inform its strategy for reducing human security threats, either during its inception phase or subsequently. Therefore, while conflict resolution and peacebuilding sensitizations feature in each component – although not in each activity - the full synergies anticipated between these activities have not been realized. Additional details are given below in section III, "Programme Implementation".

Programme Risks and Assumptions. The Programme does not have a clearly articulated overall risk management strategy or context specific strategies for guidance when things go off plan, for example, if national counterparts are replaced or if government strategies change. A risk mitigation matrix, including strategies for mitigating and responding to operational and policy risks, for example, was not included in the 2012 project document, nor was one developed subsequently[18]. Moreover, some of the assumptions upon which the HSI has been based, including that UNDP as the Lead Agency would have the capacity to coordinate the Programme; that there would be no staffing gaps and that the parallel funding modality would be efficient, have been optimistic.   It has therefore not been possible for the Programme to achieve all of its anticipated targets.

Cross-cutting issues such as gender and youth[19] have been well integrated into the programme design and mainstreamed into each of its components. Particularly noteworthy are ILO's initiatives with Youth@Work and the SIWBA, UNICEF's collaboration with local Parent-Teacher Associations and school administrators; and UNDP's work with the local women's advocacy group Vois Blong Mere Solomons.

Efficiency and Effectiveness. The delivery of HSI T3R planned outputs and preliminary outcomes has been uneven in terms of efficiency and effectiveness, as has its functionality as a Joint Programme, due in part to the design, operational and management issues noted above.

Sustainability. Results achieve thus far through the HSI could be sustained after its completion, where those results align with national priorities and are integrated into national policies and frameworks, e.g. the integration of CfW modalities into Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Labour and Immigration MoCILI) programmes; the possible adaptation of UNICEF WASH standards by MHRED; and the approval of the

---

[18] Any agency strategies for managing operational or policy risks were not shared with the evaluators. Moreover, it appears from the JPSC meeting minute that JPSC guidance and recommendations on risk management focuses more on responding to challenges as they arise, for example, impact of the April 2014 floods on Programme implementation (JPSC minutes for 26 August 2013, p. 3) , the rather than on strategic risk mitigation measures.
[19] There is no national definition for "youth" in the Solomon Islands.

NPP. However, as national and local stakeholders' financial resources are limited, they may require ongoing support from donors over the short to medium term

Emerging Programme Achievements. Some significant and positive emerging outcomes have already been achieved by, or in part through, the HSI T3R, including

- in the UNDP component, awareness raising, technical and financial support from the Programme have contributed in part to the approval of the National Peacebuilding Policy (NPP); MNURP are starting to mainstream human security into planning and activities; relevant national, provincial and municipal stakeholders have been introduced to the Human Security approach, with conflict sensitivity, conflict prevention, and peace-building trainings.

- In the ILO component, at least 30 businesses have been formed and are operating as a result of trainings on self-employment and SYOB; the MoCILI, the Guadalcanal Provincial Council and the Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce and Industry are planning to integrate the ILO CFW model into their work plans, and the Solomon Islands Correctional Service is also considering continuing C-BED for inmates. MNURP has indicated its interest in incorporating the C-BED model into its planned peace rehabilitation activities. The ILO C-BED and SYB trainings have been institutionalized with Youth@Work.

- 10 school WASH facilities are on track for completion by October 2015, with supporting hygiene training; maintenance for WASH facilities is under discussion for the MEHRD 2016 budget; and UNICEF WASH standards are under consideration for adaption as the national standard

Post-Design Critical Issues. Since the formulation of the HSI T3R, certain issues have been identified as particularly relevant to the Programme's objectives, and they will be important to reference in any future programming with peacebuilding, conflict resolution and social cohesion themes. These issues include the recognition of the site-specific dimensions of conflict. In addition, new, non-traditional opinion leaders, in addition to the more traditional influencers such as chiefs and church authorities, have emerged who could also potentially advocate for human security principles and/or from whom individuals may seek advice on post-traumatic stress –related concerns such as substance and alcohol abuse.

Programme Management and Coordination

Programme Governance Structure.
As detailed in the HSI-T3R 2012 prodoc, the Programme's governance structure would consist of a Joint Programme Steering Committee (JPSC)[20] which would provide overall strategic guidance to the Programme; a Joint Programme Management Team (JPMT)[21], a Project Management Unit (PMU) and a Programme Coordinator.   The HSI-T3R was not designed to include a Joint Programme Manager.

Perhaps due to staffing gaps, the planned JPMT became a JP Coordination Committee (JPCC). The current JPCC includes primarily UN and implementing partner technical focal points as well as the Programme Coordinator, and its focus has become narrower, and primarily concerned with operational matters. The team has become a committee; and the "management" function has also been altered. From a review of JPCC minutes, interviews with UN agency respondents and the international consultant's attendance at the 11 August 2015 JPCC meeting, the JPCC meetings seem to consist more of recitations of individual agencies' activities than of coordination and collaboration in joint activities.

Inter-agency communication and collaboration are also challenged by the fact that the ILO Project Officer for the HSI is not resident in Honiara. Finally, there is currently no common information-sharing platform, such as Teamworks, which is used by all the UN partners and which would provide real time implementation data.

Financial and Operational Procedures
The synchronization of financial and operational procedures between the UN HSI partners has been problematic due to differences in the agencies' administrative and financial systems.   This has affected some of the Programme's sequencing of activities, particularly UNICEF's WASH construction work[22]. Indeed, during the first year of Programme implementation (2012), there were no expenditures by either ILO or UNICEF, due to implementation delays caused in part by agencies' business practices[23]. For ILO, the delay was also due to the lack of representation in Honiara: additional details are presented below in "Staffing".

Some UN respondents perceived that the Programme's parallel funding modality has further exacerbated activity sequencing and encouraged agencies to act independently rather than jointly; and other funding modalities could be considered for future programming.[24] Unlike larger Joint Programmes

---

[20] JPSC members include the UNDP-DRR and the MNURP Permanent Secretary as co-chairs, plus the Heads of Agencies (HoAs) of each UN agency signatory to the prodoc; the Programme Coordinator and the MHMS Permanent Secretary

[21] Membership of the JPMT includes UN partner agency technical focal points; plus UN partner agency deputy HoAs or their delegates; a representative from MNURP and from other national implementing agencies; and the Programme Coordinator.

[22] However, the harmonization of business practices is a challenge frequently seen in Joint Programmes elsewhere, in spite of the various guidance notes which have been produced, e.g. the 2014 UNDG *Guidance Note on Joint Programmes*, New York.

[23] HSI-T3R 2012 *Annual Progress Report,* p 15

[24] The 2014 UNDG *Guidance Note on Joint Programmes* includes a table summarizing the obligations and advantages of pooled, parallel and pass-through mechanisms for various types of Joint Programmes: pp. 10-11. Also, "There is some evidence that pooled and pass-through funding arrangements reduce transactions costs for

elsewhere, the PMU of the HSI-T3R does not have a dedicated finance office tasked with keeping disbursements on track.

At the time of the evaluation, approximately 80% of HSI funds had been disbursed[25]. The Programme would be obliged to return any funds which are not disbursed by the end of this phase in October 2015 to the UNTFHS.

Transaction costs
The initial transaction costs of staff time required for planning and establishing the HSI have been high for the UN partners. As a result, some UN respondents mentioned that time required for Programme coordination and reporting actually increased their workload, rather than reducing duplication of activities.

Staffing
The efficiency and effectiveness of the Programme has been negatively affected by significant staffing gaps throughout its implementation. Both the isolation of the post and the paucity of quality medical care are among the reasons it has been difficult to retain staff. The first Programme Coordinator was engaged on a temporary basis from April-July 2013, the second year of programme implementation. When she left in July 2013, the post was vacant for nearly one year, until the current Programme Coordinator was engaged in mid-2014[26]. In 2013, four of the six national professionals resigned. Although an ILO project officer was in place in early 2013, there were subsequently a series of unfortunate staffing gaps until mid-2014[27].

It must be noted that only UNDP and ILO have staff who are dedicated full-time to the Programme; the Programme design for the UNICEF component did not include any staffing. Instead, UNICEF provided financial support to the Programme with one UN volunteer for two years in 2012-214 and a technical consultant for 2014-2015.

Monitoring and Evaluation
The HSI does not have a joint M&E Plan or joint reporting templates. Rather, M&E is undertaken more as an independent activity: each agency monitors and reports on its activities to its own office, and this information should subsequently be forwarded to the HSI Coordinator.[28] Moreover, reporting is

government and donors. However, when UNCTs chose to use parallel funding mechanisms, there has been little reduction in transaction costs to government, as Ministries are still required to interact with UN agencies separately: United Nations Development Group, *Delivering as One,* December 2006, p. xiii

[25] Programme Coordinator in response to query at stakeholder presentation, 16 August 2015.

[26] During that time, the UNDP CPR Project Officer acted as interim Programme Coordinator.

[27] A UN Volunteer, Miss Natalie Ahanda from France, was engaged in early 2013 as the ILO Project Coordinator, but she resigned after less than a year in June 2013. A new Project Coordinator, Mr. Denton Bennie, with two Program Assistants, Mrs. Jenny Funusui and Mr. Avis Mamau, were then hired. Unfortunately, Mr. Avis Mamau resigned not long after being recruited. Mr. Roy Fugui was hired in March 2014. Mr. Iresh Lal, the Fiji-based ILO Programme Officer responsible for Solomon Islands, resigned in May 2014, and the Project Coordinator- Mr. Denton Bennie passed away suddenly on the 11th July 2014. Mr. Bimlesh Raj, the Fiji-based Programme Assistant, has looked after ILO project activities in Solomon Islands since then. For additional information, see HSI T3R *Third Annual Report* 2014, p. 25

[28] For example, UNICEF and LLEE participate in M&E missions on a quarterly basis. Observations, discussions and recommendations from these missions are communicated through trip reports which are often shared with

activity and output focused; and additional information that would qualify these figures, such as tracer studies, has not yet been collected.[29]

Finally, although the consultancy TORs suggested that the evaluation would "… fill the gaps of the regular monitoring exercises undertaken under the project"[30], a rapid evaluation cannot fill the evidence gaps that have developed over the three years of project implementation. This evaluation can only complement, rather than substitute for, the planned and ongoing collection of data by the Programme itself.

PROGRAMME COLLABORATIONS AND PARTNERSHIPS

The HSI T3R has two national partners, MNURP and MHMS, and it has developed collaborations with many of the key stakeholders in the targeted project sites. Each of the Programme's different components have developed networks of local partners, which is important both for implementation as well as the post-project sustainability of its activities.

A significant achievement is the relationship that the Programme has developed with MNURP to champion the human security agenda for post-project sustainability.

However, alliances with other potential partners, such as with the private sector for livelihood interventions, or with related programmes funded by other donors such the World Bank, have as yet not been well-explored.

---

partners and the HIS coordinator. The same information is also channeled to the HIS coordinator and othe partners during the fortnightly coordination meetings: UNICEF, written response to evaluation questionnaire.
[29] Since the data collection period, ILO has advised that they have undertaken a tracer study of trainees; this study should provide an indication of the extent to which businesses established by trainees are viable and sustainable.
[30] See below, Annex I, "TORs" for the international and national consultants, p. 2

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

The HSI aims for policy, institutional and sector outputs and outcomes. The delivery of planned HSI outputs and preliminary outcomes has been uneven in terms of efficiency and effectiveness; this is due in part to the operational and management-related issues noted above. Overall, the WASH, CfW, C-BED and support to the NPP approval activities have scored better than other activities: additional details are given below.

Component 1 – Freedom from Fear Approach

Outcome 1.1: To improve local governance and provide capacity building measures to local stakeholders such as local government officials, community leaders, CBOs and women's groups for successful recovery from violent conflict

UNDP is the agency responsible for the implementation of these activities.

Table 1

Expected Outputs	Remarks on intended versus actual results to date	Sources of Information
Output I-1.1: Up to 90% of selected stakeholders (local governmental officials, community leaders, representatives of CBOs and Women's Groups) participate in the process of establishing local registration systems to improve local participation *(lead support: UNDP)*	12 provincial workshops on implementation and exit strategy Results: 11 conducted	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
	36 registration workshops Results: 24 conducted	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
	Number of stickers and posters *(revised from radio & TV spots)[31]* Results: 8000 printed	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
	12 newspaper articles on project events Results: 3	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
	90% of the selected stakeholders attend project arrangements such as coordination meetings on and/or proposing modalities to improving local participation Results: 80%	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
Output I-1.2: All three target sites of Honiara City and the two provinces of Guadalcanal and Malaita possess 'green' community peace centres as	Four (4) renewable energy systems delivered Results: 0	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
	Five (5) peace centres constructed or retrofitted	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014

---

[31] The only TV station in the country suspended activity at the beginning of 2014.

foundation for "tension" reduction *(lead support: UNDP)*	Results: 3	
	15 "Peace and Development" billboards delivered Results: 15	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
	Annual strategies for social rehabilitation Results: 1	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014

Objective I-2: To establish a pilot initiative for promoting reintegration and make it fully functional to meet the needs of the community members and former combatants, for human security and peaceful co-existence

Table 2

I-2.1: Local reintegration counselling mechanism with focus on negotiation, conflict resolution, mediation developed and fully functional.	6 Needs assessment conducted, reintegration, mechanisms established, 78 people trained on conflict-related topics	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014
I-2.2: Minimum of 70% target beneficiaries obtained knowledge on human security &peaceful co-existence &translated into action through locally organized events. (12,000 total beneficiaries x 70% = 8,400 beneficiaries)	Annual strategy to advocate human security and peaceful co-existence 28 workshops participated by selected local stakeholders; Results: 15 12 locally organized events; Results 3	

Observations on the UNDP Component. This component includes a wide variety of consultations, awareness raising (including on the NPP) and trainings on peacebuilding, conflict resolution and trauma counseling. Although UNDP has documented the numbers of trainings and trainees and other outputs of this component, additional information that would qualify these figures, such as follow-ups to conflict sensitivity trainings – whether reports of violent incidents have decreased, for example -, and that would allow an evidence-based assessment of this Programme component's contributions to local peace building and conflict resolution, have not yet been collected. Trainee tracer studies, which might be carried out before the wind up of the Programme, would provide some supporting evidence for this.

Several of the UNDP component's intended results relate to vulnerability reduction and behavioral change, and are medium to longer term outcomes that may not be realized within the HSI's remaining timeframe. However, data on related Programme outputs which is both qualified as well as quantified would have indicated whether these activities are on track or should be modified in future programming.

One of the Programme's few joint agency activities is the UNDP-ILO C-BED training given to inmates at the Auki Correctional Centre[32]; and it is understood that at least some of the inmates participating in this activity are now earning income through the sales of their produce.

Perhaps the most notable outcome that the UNDP component has, in part, supported, is the approval of the NPP in 2015; this was not envisaged in the original 2012 prodoc. The Programme began support to the NPP process in November 2013[33].

Component II: "Freedom from Want" Approach – Economic Security, Water and Sanitation, Human Rights and Women's Empowerment

Objective II-1. To empower economic security and promote sustainable livelihoods for the target communities and returned ex-combatants through income generation measures

ILO is the agency responsible for this outcome.

Table 3

Expected Outputs	Remarks on intended versus actual results to date	Sources of information
*Output II-1.1:*Economic needs of target ex-combatants and their families are fully identified through field-based survey, using ILO PACA and CEA methodologies	Number of assessment of local economic development opportunities and skills needs using PACA methodology with additional focus on potential value chain upgrading Progress – 0; process towards engagement of consultant for this task started	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014; Key informant interviews with ILO
Output II-1.2: Up to 65% of trained beneficiaries obtain enough skills and knowledge to engage in small but sustainable self-start businesses within the context of improved social relations with partners and the communities	Number of ex-combatants provided with pre-vocational skills (life skills) and vocational training [34] Progress – Partially achieved; training to inmates (many of whom are excombatants) through Solomon Islands Correctional Service provided	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014; Key informant interviews with ILO
	Number of ILO (gender-sensitive) enterprise development, micro-finance, and crisis response training materials adapted to local context	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014; Key informant interviews with ILO

[32] For a similar prison initiatives, see: Uruguay (UNDP, ILO, EU, Pan American Health Association : http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/ourstories/developing-new-chances-beyond-bars.html

[33] HSI—T3R 2013 Progress Report, p. 10. The NPP framework draft had already been developed in 2011.
[34] Many inmates are ex-combatants.

	Progress – 1 set of materials adapted	
	Number of TOT and refresher workshops delivered

Progress – 1 ToT conducted[35] | Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014;

Key informant interviews with ILO |
| | Number of local partners to implement Training of Entrepreneurs using the ILO's gender-sensitive materials

Progress – Partially achieved | Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014;

Key informant interviews with ILO |
| | 15 monitoring and evaluation sessions of training implementation

Progress – 15 Achieved | Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014;

Key informant interviews with ILO |
| *Output II-1.3:* At least 60% of training beneficiaries in rural areas have access to business development services to improve their sustainability and business success
(lead support: ILO) | Number of needs assessment concerning business development services and micro-finance services, identification of existing service providers and their services, cost, and service uptake

Progress – 1 assessment undertaken; discussions with UNCDF on activity synergies | |
| | Workshops on business group formation

Progress – 15 C-BED workshops achieved with over 800 trainees; SYOB trainings through Youth@Work initiated | Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014;

Key informant interviews with ILO; Youth@Work; trainers |
| | Number of project beneficiaries' supported for participation in the government and private sector organized monthly market trade fairs and related promotional events ...

Progress – Women vendors' market in Honiara through SIWBA and with Youth@work, including provision of tables and chairs to enable vendors to participate in monthly markets | Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014;

Key informant interviews with ILO; site visits; FGDs with beneficiaries |
| *Output II-1.4:* Awareness raising | Number of training and awareness | Third Annual Progress Report, November |

---

35 Since the data collection period, ILO advises that additional TOTs have been undertaken.

among beneficiaries on human rights, labour rights and gender equality	raising activities ... to promote ... International Labour Standards, Gender Equality and Human Rights principles Progress – 1 training on human rights delivered with SPC; Target to be redefined	2014; Key informant interviews with ILO
Output II-3.1: 300 urban ex-combatants and their communities have improved income-generating capacity through access to (pre-)vocational skills training, business skills training and support, and job placement services	Number of urban ex-combatants benefiting from training on basic business skills &group formation	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014; Key informant interviews with ILO
	Number of urban ex-combatants benefiting from pre-vocational (life skills) training	
	Number of meetings to ensure market-driven vocational training and subsequent placement in decent jobs	
	Number of urban ex-combatants benefiting from group's access to sustainable diversified and affordable financial services Partially achieved	

Partnerships.
A key outcome of these activities has been ILO's establishment of strong partnerships with the local NGO Youth@Work, the Solomon Islands Business Women's Association; the Honiara City Council and the Department of Labour for the training of youth and women in skills development and business development through ILO's trademark SYOB and C-BED packages. Additionally, the floods of April 2014 provided an opportunity for ILO to initiate CFW activities in 10 disaster-affected communities; and this has been documented in the ILO video about the CFW project.[36] The CFW activities contributed to the easing of household income gaps caused by the flood.

Challenges.
Implementation of this component has been delayed due to staffing gaps, including the death of ILO's Honiara-based IUNV Project Activities Coordinator and subsequent remote programme management of activities from Suva, as well as bottlenecks caused by the parallel funding modality. These delays may also impact upon the achievement of all of ILO's expected outcomes during the remaining programme implementation period.

---

[36] http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/multimedia/video/video-news-releases/WCMS_380415/lang--en/index.htm

Benefit Sharing.
The modalities for distributions of gains and the sharing of benefits from the ILO CFW activities have been developed. However, discussions with beneficiaries and other local stakeholders revealed some uncertainties about benefit sharing modalities[37]; and there is a possibility that some discontent and conflict among community members could ensue, if these are not properly moderated.

Observations on the ILO Component.
The training outputs of this programme component are mostly on track, and respondents indicated that the SYOB and C-BED trainings are very much appreciated. However, while the ILO partners have documented the numbers of trainings, trainees and job placements, additional information that would qualify these figures, such as on job placement types, e.g. full-time, part-time, temporary, long-term, etc., or from follow-ups to conflict sensitivity trainings, and that would allow an evidence-based assessment of programme contributions to local sustainable employment and poverty reduction, has not yet been collected.

As of August 2015, a consultant to carry out the PACA assessment had not been identified, and it is unlikely that this activity will be completed before the end of this programme phase in October 2015.

Furthermore, several of the ILO component's intended results relate to vulnerability reduction and behavioral change, and are medium to longer term outcomes that may not be realized within its remaining timeframe. Data on related Programme outputs which is both qualified as well as quantified would indicate whether these activities are on track or should be modified in future programming.[38]

Finally, as a result of the successful implementation of its CfW activities, ILO has received expressions of interest to replicate the CfW model from the Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce and the MoCILI. The ILO CfW model has already been institutionalized locally through incorporation into the Youth@Work Youth Employment Programme; and integration of the CFW model into government programmes will guarantee its post-programme sustainability.

Objective II-2: To enhance by up to   80% the   functional capacity of target communities to deal with conflict-affected water and sanitation management problems:

UNICEF is the agency responsible for the implementation of these activities.

---

[37] International consultant's site visit to Papagnu, 12 August.
[38] Since the data collection phase, ILO has advised that a tracer study of trainees has been conducted; see above, footnote 29.

Table 4

Expected Outcomes/Outputs	Remarks on intended versus actual results to date	Sources of information
II-2.1: Water & sanitation needs in selected communities identified in consultation with relevant stakeholders	Progressed well with 10 communities selected. Activity completed.	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014; August 2015 evaluation site visits; key informant interviews with UNICEF, LLEE; local school authorities; students; community contractors
II-2.2: 10 selected communities establish and self-managed fully functioning water and sanitation committees	10 functional water and sanitation management committees targeted; the activity is ongoing with 90% now complete Activity expected October 2015 date of completion	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014 August 2015 evaluation site visits; key informant interviews with UNICEF, LLEE; local school authorities; students; community contractors
II-2.3: Local water and sanitation technicians trained in basic skills in WASH facility installation, hygiene and sanitation	20 technicians trained 20 hygiene technicians trained Activity completed	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014 August 2015 evaluation site visits; key informant interviews with UNICEF, LLEE; local school authorities; students; community contractors
II-2.4: Water supply facilities in 10 affected communities installed and become fully functional	10 water supply facilities in place. The activity is on-going. Reported number for rainwater supply systems only. Activity expected October 2015 date of completion	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014 August 2015 evaluation site visits; key informant interviews with UNICEF, LLEE; local school authorities; students; community contractors
II-2.5: Guidelines and manuals on operation and maintenance of community water supply developed	Production of guidelines is ongoing, contribution to production of Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) in Solomon Islands. Information sharing with MEHRD and MHMS Activity expected October 2015 date of completion	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014 August 2015 evaluation site visits; key informant interviews with UNICEF, LLEE; local school authorities; students; community contractors
II-2.6: Local monitoring mechanism installed at Central and Provincial levels.	10 monitoring mechanisms installed at central & provincial levels. Inclusion of mechanisms in MEHRD and MHMS Information Systems to advocate for WASH monitoring purposes. Activity expected October 2015 date of completion	Third Annual Progress Report, November 2014 August 2015 evaluation site visits; key informant interviews with UNICEF, LLEE; local school authorities; students; community contractors

Observations on the UNICEF component. The rationale for the inclusion of this component in the HSI T3R is that the targeted communities will have more time to focus on livelihood activities, and children will have a more conducive learning environment in the targeted schools, if their WASH needs are addressed.   The sequence of activities for this component involved community mobilization, consultation and awareness raising; the formation of school working committees; training on maintenance and WASH promotion; the construction of WASH infrastructure facilities, and the sharing of WASH policies and international standards with MHMS, MEHRD and NGOs. These activities included the development of a WASH communication strategy for school aged children, a youth radio talk show and Jingles, and Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials including school board games. UNICEF implemented these activities in partnership with MHMS, MEHRD, school administrators and teachers, and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs); its implementing partner was the NGO Live & Learn.

Outputs and Results. WASH infrastructure at 10 schools in Honiara, Guadalcanal and Malaita will be completed by project wind up. Over 5,000 school children and their teachers will have gained access to adequate and safe drinking water supply and improved toilet facilities; and they will now practice improved hygiene behaviors such as hand washing.

As a result of this initiative, additional WASH stakeholders are now interested in implementing such projects; and several other communities and schools have approached UNICEF for replication. Community contribution has been high - sometimes was more than 60% - indicating community demand is high, which bodes well for ownership and thus sustainability.   Moreover, there have been initial discussions with national stakeholders to link WASH infrastructure to school infrastructure policy and, if it is institutionalized, the post-project sustainability of the WASH component of the HSI will be assured. Finally, the Programme has provided an opportunity for UNICEF to demonstrate best and contextual practices and sustainable services that link national to global goals.

BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

The HSI is an ambitious and complex programme. The Programme's design is broad, with many subcomponents and numerous intended results.   As noted above, at least some of its initially expected outcomes will not be realized within the time remaining in the programme. There are some key lessons learned from the current Programme which can inform its remaining implementation and the formulation of the future JPs. These include:

The inception period for a JP can be lengthy. As the initial transaction costs for UN agency partners – including the investments of staff time and funding needed to establish joint implementation, monitoring, and administration mechanisms – are high, programme periods of up to five years may be required to realize reductions in these costs[39].   This should be a consideration in determining whether or not to create a JP, as well as the length of its lifespan.

---

[39] This has been well-documented elsewhere: see for example, the UNDG *Guidance Note for Joint Programmes,* 2006, p. xvi

Communication

A common information-sharing platform for real time mapping of activities and sharing of documentation is essential for a Joint Programme, particularly when its managers are located off-site, and poor intra-programme communication is a challenge. An example of such a platform is Teamworks, which is already widely used for this purpose in the UN system.

Funding Modality.

Procurement and the sequencing of HSI T3R activities have been hindered by the parallel funding modality; and it seems to have also increased transaction costs. Moreover, parallel funding has also encouraged agencies to work separately, rather than jointly[40]. However, as the Programme is winding down, it is not now possible to change the HSI T3R's funding mechanisms before the end of its current phase. Other options, such a pooled or pass-through funding, or a combination of modalities, might have supported a better aligned implementation; and they should be considered in the design of future JPs [41]

Monitoring and Evaluation.

A strong, jointly owned and managed M&E system is essential to measure a Joint Programme's progress against plan. The HSI does not have a Joint M&E plan, and monitoring and reporting of the programme by UN partners has been more as individual agency undertakings rather than a "One Team" activity.

Sustainability.

In best practice, to ensure local ownership as well as sustainability, a JP is well- integrated into the host country's national budget, and an appropriate national counterpart is dedicated to its coordination, monitoring and evaluation as, for example, in the UN JP for Local Governance and Community Development in Nepal[42] . Such strategies should be built into programmes from their design stage to ensure the sustainability of their results after interventions are wound down.

Given these caveats, results achieved thus far through the HSI-T3R be might be sustained after its completion, where those results closely align with national priorities and are integrated into national policies and frameworks, e.g. the integration of CfW modalities into Solomon Island Chamber of Commerce and MoCILI programmes; the adaptation of UNICEF WASH standards by MEHRD; the enactment of the NPP and the mainstreaming of human security principles by MNURP. However, as national and local stakeholders' financial resources are limited, they may require ongoing support from donors over the short to medium term.

Redefining Beneficiary Target Groups.

During the course of project implementation, beneficiary target groups may need to be redefined to better align with demographic changes and with emerging post-design issues. In the case of the HSI T3R, there were challenges in identifying the beneficiary groups originally targeted in the 2012 prodoc.

---

[40] This is an issue in some other UN JPs, e.g. the UN JP for Local Governance and Decentralized Service Delivery in Somalia: www.jplg.org

[41] See, for example, the table of fund management and disbursement mechanisms presented in the UNDG 2014 *Guidance Note.*

[42] http://www.lgcdp.gov.np/

Consequently, these groups were expanded to include others from conflict affected communities, and these changes are reflected in the adjustments made to the HSI Annual Work Plans.

Best Practices:
The HSI has followed JP best practice in identifying an appropriate national counterpart, the MNURP, to carry on its activities once the programme is completed. And through the peace rehabilitation activities proposed in its 2016 draft budget, for example, the MNRUP has shown its commitment to champion the human security agenda for post-project sustainability.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAY FORWARD

Some significant and positive emerging outcomes have already been achieved by, or in part through, the HSI-T3R. However, its actual versus intended outputs have been uneven. Design, operational and management-related bottlenecks which have hindered the Programme's progress have been noted above. Some of the challenges that the HSI T3R have faced are common to JPs elsewhere.

 As the Programme is now winding down, recommendations for documenting its achievements and for its handover, as well as recommendations for future programming, are presented below:

Wind Up of Current Project Phase:
Identify local partners to whom activities not completed by project end can be transferred; initiate tracer studies and collect data from implementing partners which will demonstrate behavior modification and other Programme achievements

Future programming - Project Design:
Align project design to the contemporary Solomon Islands context to ensure greater relevance. Reference the SDGs in the project document to ensure relevance to current international development agenda. Conduct a conflict assessment to inform the project design and include in it a mapping of other conflict prevention, peace building and livelihoods activities by other DPs with whom the project's activities would be synergistic, and reference site specific conflict dimensions. Develop and include a risk and risk mitigation matrix in the project document. Articulate a clear theory of change (TOC) to guide the project strategy and present the TOC in the prodoc. Involve relevant national stakeholders in the project formulation from its earliest stages to ensure not only its relevance and value-added to national development plans and to minimize duplication, but also its sustainability. For multiple agency projects, consider the comparative transaction costs and institutional efficiencies of joint programming as opposed to those of a Joint Programme

Governance and Coordination Mechanisms:
It is recommended that future Joint Programmes include a small interagency PMU to provide overall programme management as well as to coordinate administrative, financial, communication, M&E and liaison functions. PMU staffing should include the JP Manager and an M&E specialist at a minimum. The Programme Coordinator role would become redundant. It is further recommended that a national counterpart also be considered for inclusion.   Ensure JP budgets cover staff costs for all participating UN agencies. Joint programming, rather than a JP, might offer a less cumbersome governance structure.

Funding Modalities:
Consider pooled or pass-through funding, or a combination of modalities, in the formulation of future JPs, as these may support a better aligned Programme implementation than the parallel funding modality.

Communications and Knowledge Management:
Introduce a common information-sharing platform through which agency partners can access real- time implementation details and share key documents, for example, Teamworks, which is already widely used for this purpose in the UN system

Monitoring and Evaluation:
For Joint Programmes as well as for joint programming, develop a joint M&E plan with   commonly agreed indicators and timelines

Priority Themes:
Consider human security-related themes that are synergistic with current and pipeline projects, e.g. UNDP's social inclusion initiative, as well as other themes that have become more prominent since the HSI formulation, e.g. Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction and environment.   Consider additional UN partners whose demonstrated advantages are synergistic with human security-related themes, e.g. UNCDF for activities related to economic security. Consider how future human security-related programming can support SIG and MNURP priorities such as peace rehabilitation and strengthening national consciousness and unity

SELECT REFERENCES

Unpublished Sources

United Nations Human Security Initiative (Solomon Islands), Minutes *of Joint Programme Steering Committee Meetings,* 2013 – 2015

_____, *Minutes of Joint Programme Coordination Meetings,* 2014-2015

Published Sources

Akmeemana, S. et al., Justice*, Security and Development in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States Bank-Netherlands Partnership Program (BNPP), Draft Engagement Note1 for Solomon Islands,* World Bank, November 2012

Asian Development Bank, *Building Resilience to Fragility in Solomon Islands Context: Forum on Building Resilience to Fragility in Asia and the Pacific,* June 2013

Commission on Human Security, *Human Security Now*, New York, 2003

Kabutaulaka, Tarcisius Tara, "Failed State" and the War on Terror: Intervention in Solomon Islands, "Asia *Pacific   Issues*   (72),   the   East-West   Center,   May   2004: http://www.eastwestcenter.org/fileadmin/stored/pdfs/api072.pdf

Maebuta, Jack**, "**Peace Education and Peace-building in the Solomon Islands: Disconnected Layers", *Regional Security,* vol. 8, no. 4 2012

Norwegian Refugee Council, *Profile of Internal Displacement: Solomon Islands,* Geneva, March 2004: http://www.internal-displacement.org/assets/library/Asia/Solomon-Islands/pdf/Solomon+Islands+-18March+2004.pdf

Smith, Melinda et al., *Solomon Islands Case Study in Education, Conflict and Social Cohesion* (prepared for the UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Regional Office), Bangkok, 2014.

United Nations Country Team in Solomon Islands, UNDP/UNICEF/ILO*, Human Security Initiative for Tensions Reduction, Reconciliation and Rehabilitation - Project Proposal for the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security*, 2011

United Nations Development Group, *Guidance Note on Joint Programming*, New York, August 2014: https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Guidance-Note-on-Joint-Programmes.pdf

_____, *Consolidated Report of Joint Programme Experience in 14 Countries,* 17 March 2006: http://www.undg.org/archive_docs/7613-Consolidated_Report_of_Joint_Programme_Experience_in_14_Countries.pdf

United Nations Development Programme Regional Office for Asia Pacific, *Sub-regional Programme Document for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (2013-2017)*, November 2012

United Nations Human Development Index 2014, Table 1: http://hdr.undp.org/en/content/table-1-human-development-index-and-its-components

United Nations Trust Fund For Human Security, *Guidelines For The United Nations Trust Fund For Human Security,* 5th Revision, 12 May 2009

_____, *Rehabilitation of schools in provinces affected by the ethnic conflict in Solomon Islands 2002-2003,* *http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/Solomon%20Islands%2058%20FINAL%20TEMPLATE.pdf*

_____, *Employment generation and economic recovery through the rehabilitation and maintenance of infrastructure using labourbased equipment supported technology (in the Solomon Islands), 2003-2004.* *http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/Solomon%20Islands%2061%20FINAL%20TEMPLATE.pdf*

Annex 1

Terms of Reference

Attached as separate PDF file

Annex 2

Evaluation Schedule

Thursday, 6th August - Thursday, 20th August 2014

Date	Time	Name/Group/Institution	Location	Persons Met
Wednesday August 5	International consultant travel from home base to duty station			
Thursday August 6				
	International consultant arrives in Honiara			
Friday, August 7				
	9:00	Initial meeting	UNDP	Annette, Ms. Stella Delaiverata, Programme Analyst, UNDP
	9:30	Security briefing	UNDSS	Mr. Morris, UNDSS Local Security Officer; Annette
	10:30	Project briefing	MNURP	Ms. Gina Ilie, HSI Project Coordinator; Annette
	12.30	Programming overview	Lime Lounge	Ms .Akiko Suzaki, UNDP DRR; Annette
	1.30	Evaluation activity planning	UNDP	Stanley ,Annette
Saturday, August 8	9.00	Finalization draft inception	Iron Bottom Sound Hotel	Annette
Sunday, August 9	Finalization and submission of draft inception report–Annette			
Monday August 10	9:00	Courtesy call MNURP	MNURP	Ms. Margaret Etua; Acting PS, MNURP; Annette
	9:30	Courtesy call	MNURP	Mr. Peter Mae, Under Secretary, Policy, MNURP ;Annette
	10:30	ILO	Solomon Mendana hotel	Mr. Bimlesh Raj, Programme Officer, ILO Suva; Annette
	3:00 – 5:00	FGD-JPSC presentation of inception report	UNDP conference room	Akiko, Peter Mae; Tom Nanau, MHMS; Donald Burgess, UNICEF; Raj; Gina; Margaret Etua, ,Acting PS, MNURP; Stella; Satoshi, ILO (by phone); Annette

Day	Time	Activity	Location	Participants
Tuesday, August 11	9:30	UNDP CPR	UNDP	Stella, Christina, Annette
	10:00 – 11:30	FGD-JPCM	HS Project Office	Reuben Laiti Lilo, Director, Peace and Reconciliation, MNURP; Godwin Kamtukule, UNICEF; Eric Hale, UNICEF, Roy Fugui, ILO
	2:15	ILO SYOB partner	Youth at Work	Sandra Bartlett, Youth@Work; two Youth@Work trainees; Annette
	4.30	WASH	UNICEF	Donald Burgess, WatSan Specialist, UNICEF;Annette
Wednesday,August 12	10:00	ILO SYOB (teacher careercounseilingworkshop)	Heritage Hotel	Mr. Geria Lepping; SYOB trainer;Annette
	10:30	ILO CFW field trip discussion	Heritage Hotel	Mr. Jeff Alexander, ILO community focal point; Annette
	11.00	ILO CFW in Honiara		Mr David Kaumae. ,Deputy Director, Annette
	1:00	Group discussion – SYOB follow up	Heritage Hotel	Raj, Geria, Ron ,Annette
	2.00	Oberservation ILO teacher career counseling workshop (HS funded)	Heritage Hotel	ILO workshop participants; Raj, Geria, Annette
	4.30	WASH- UNICEF and IP	UNICEF	Mr. Kieren Davis Liveand Learn; Donald ;Annette
Thursday August 13	7.00	ILO site visit-CFW school project	Papagou	Jeff; Annette
	9:00	ILO phone interview	En route from Papagou	Satoshi, ILO; Annette
	10:30	ILO project sites	Heritage Hotel	Raj; Jeff; Annette; Geria
	11:00	ILO SYOB graduate	Heritage Hotel	Karen ;Annette
	11:30	ILO SYOB SIBW women's market	Park next to Heritage Hotel	Raj;6 female vendors; Annette
	2.00	UNICEF WASH site visit	Ilie School, Honiara	Eric, UNICEF; Sophia, Live and Learn; Paul Maet'e Olisimae, Lead Construction Work Supervisor Annette
	4.00	Recap UNICEF site visit	UNICEF	Donald, Annette, Godwin
	5:00	Evaluation update	UNDP	Akiko; Stanley; Annette; Tristram; Crystal; Gina
Friday, August 14	9:30	MNURP – contextual issues	MNURP	Peter Mae, Annette
	11:00	UNWOMEN JP	By phone	Ms. Atenasi, UNWOMEN; Annette (no response)
	11:30	ILO CFW site visit	St. John's School	Peter, Principal, St. Johns School; three students; Annette
	1:00	Evaluation procurement meeting	UNDP	Tristram, Crystal; Stanley;Annette

	2:15	UNICEF WASH	School visit	Ms. Mervalyn,, Head Mistress; four students; Godwin; Annette
	4:30	UNICEF WASH visit recap	UNICEF	Donald, Annette
Saturday, August 15	4:00	Draft operational components prepared	IBSHotel	Stanley, Annette
Sunday, August 16	Preliminary sections of report finalized Preparation of PPT–Consultants			
Monday August17	9.30	In-house debrief on preliminary findings	UNDP	Stella, Christina ,Annette, Stanley
	10.30	ILO, UNDP Implementing partners	Project Office	Harry James Olikwailafa, Honiara Youth Council; Prema Malato, SSEC; Annette
	1.30	SIG initiatives related to HSI	MDPAC	Mr.Aaron Pitaqae, ,Annette
	3.30	Additional HSI activities	Project Office	Gina, Annette
	5.30	UNICEF activity update	UNICEF	Donald, Annette
Tuesday August 18	10.00	Focus group discussion with representatives from Voice Blong Mere; Honiara City Council; Christian Care Centre; Youth@Work	Project Office	Ms. Josephine Teakeni. Voice Blong Mere; Ms. Mary Tuhaika, Honiara City Council; Sr. Ruth Hope, Christian CareCentre; Ms. Vanessa Teutao, Youth@Work; Stanley
	11.30	MNUPR 2016 planning	MNUPR	Fr. Philip Valusa, Deputy Director, MNURP Guadalcanal; Francis Kairi, Deputy Director, MNURP Malaita; Mr. Wilson Liligeto, Deputy Director, MNURP Western Province; Mr. Kemuel Laeta, Director, Policy, MNURP; Stanley
	3.00	Other donor programmes	World Bank	Ms. Anne Tully, World Bank ,Annette
Wednesday August 19				
	2.30 – 5.00	Stakeholders workshop: PPT presentation of preliminary findings to stakeholders; validation; ways forward	Project Office	Consultants (for complete list of participants, see Annex 6, "Minutes from Stakeholder Presentation"
Thursday August 20	Morning	Revision of draft	UNDP	Consultants

	Afternoon	International consultant travels from duty station		

Annex 3

Frameworks for Interview Questionnaires

Questions will be selected and customized according to the respondent, e.g. UN agency respondent, SIG representative, CBO/NGO representative.

A.   FOR UN respondents

Were you involved in the programme design phase?

What were/are your overall expectations of the programme?

How do you handle the expectations of national partners and of beneficiaries?

What do you feel has gone well with the programme and specifically with your component?

How well do you feel the programme is doing in terms of:

Joint Programme management/governance structures, e.g. Programme Steering Committee, Programme Coordination, etc. Transaction costs?

The JP funding modality – parallel funding

Planning – coordination with other UN partners, SIG partners, other actors

Staffing

Implementation - coordination, e.g. within your component(s) – sectoral outputs, delivering on schedule – how far are you towards meeting your targets?

M&E – joint monitoring? How does M&E information flow to the Programme Coordinator – how is it disseminated to other JP partnersSome of the expected results involve behavior modification - how are you measuring that?

How do you see this programme fitting in with the overall UN programme for Solomon Islands for development outcomes? With the Multi-country UNDAF? Aligning with the SIG strategies and plans?

What would you say are the key programmes from other donors/government in the Solomon Islands which are relevant to this programme? What are your linkages with those programmes?

Implementation Efficiency and Effectiveness:

What have been the particular challenges with regards to, e.g. procurement, financial arrangements, stakeholder expectations?

Would you expect targets to be met if the programme progresses as it is? If not, what kinds of revisions do you think should be made?

National and Local Stakeholders:

In your sector, who have been the key CBOs, NGOs?

Out of your relationship with national/local stakeholders what has gone well and what could be improved?

How often do you visit project communities / stakeholders?

Please describe the role that UNVs play/have played in your component (for technical/sector focal points).

How will benefit sharing be handled to minimize potential conflict within beneficiary communities?

Risk Management
What are the main external risk factors outside of the UN's sphere of influence?   What are the main internal risk factors?   What are the risk strategies for the Programme?

Sustainability

How will programme activities be maintained and sustained after the programme funding stops? By local government funds; community funds; another donor?

What is your exit strategy?

B.   **FOR NATIONAL/LOCAL STAKEHOLDERS**

Was your Ministry involved with the programme design?

As you know human security is a complex concept. How well do you think local stakeholders understand these concepts and their relevance to their situation?

How often do you visit project communities / district level stakeholders?

Who have been the key CBOs, NGOs in your sector?

In your view how is the involvement of local community groups in the project activities?

Which HSI strategies are likely to be adopted / adapted by your Ministry in its future programming?

C   **FOR PROJECT BENEFICIARIES/END CLIENTS**

In your view how are community members consulted on the programme?

How are community members participating? (traditional authorities, community leaders, women, men, youth and children, different community level groups).

What are your expectations of the programmes activities?

In your opinion how successful are the strategies and targets being used in addressing conflict issues in the community? How is this different from traditional conflict dispute mechanisms?

Who are the biggest influencers now in your community – traditional leaders? Others?

Are the strategies employed by the programme useful in addressing the critical economic, social and security needs and issues of the community?

What will happen when the project support comes to an end?

Annex 4

Table of Ratings for Programme Performance

According to the Terms of Reference for both the international and national consultants, a "Numerical rating of the performance of Human Security Initiative is expected to be conducted by using a standard scale of rating items consisting in *excellent, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, not applicable, insufficient information*. Numerical rating must be complemented by comments and justifying elements with explicative value…"[43]. Moreover, the ratings are to be focused upon relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and overall performance, and to answer the questions listed in the table below.

The numerical rating and questions in the TORs are copied from the UNTFHS Project Final Assessment Form which is to be completed by the implementing organization or, in the case of multi-organization projects, the lead organization[44]; for the HSI T3R, this is UNDP. The lead organization's final report to the UNTFHS should include inputs from all implementing partners.

 The numerical ratings presented below reflect the findings of the evaluation from the data collection period.

The relevance and performance of the Programme have been rated according to the following scale:

 1 – Excellent
2 – Good
3 – Satisfactory
4 – Unsatisfactory
5 – Not applicable
6 – Insufficient information

Rating Criteria	Questions	Comments and relevant sections of HSI T3R evaluation text	Rating
RELEVANCE	1. Has the project proven to be as relevant as originally envisaged?	No. See text on "Relevance", p.14	4

---

[43] See Annex 1, "Terms of Reference"; the numerical rating is given on p. 2 of both the national and international consultants' TORs.

[44] Final Assessment Form, *Guidelines for the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security*, New York, 30 October 2014, pp. 32-34, including Part II: Numerical Rating:
http://www.un.org/humansecurity/sites/www.un.org.humansecurity/files/untfhs_guidelines_8th_edition_-_final_3.pdf

EFFECTIVENESS	2. Were the project's main objectives achieved in keeping with the original activities, outputs and performance indicators?	As noted in Relevance (pp. 14-15), the Programme was less relevant to the Solomon Islands context than originally envisaged. As a result, there were several changes to activities in the Annual Work Plans, as well as a broadening of beneficiary targeting. However, the objectives of the overall human security concept, fear from fear and freedom from want, remained focal to the Programme.	3
	3. How would you assess the effectiveness of the management	On effectiveness of actual management arrangements see p.16	3
	and administrative arrangements employed to implement the project?	On effectiveness of parallel funding modality, see p 16	4
	4. How effectively did the project partners collaborate? (Elaborate what, if any, were the major challenges)	Synergies between programme components were less than envisaged, and collaborative activities were limited: pp. 14. Collaboration and synergies were hindered by the design of the programme; lack of harmonization of business practices and the lack of a Programme Coordinator for extended periods of time: pp.	3.5

		14-16	
EFFICIENCY	5. Were the anticipated outputs generated on time and	No; outputs were not generated on time, and two no-cost extensions were ranged	4
	within the budget, as specified in the work plan and implementation schedule? (if certain outputs were not achieved, elaborate briefly the reasons)	Yes, overall outputs were generated within budget	3
		For constraints and other factors which affected efficiency see p. 15	
IMPACT	6. How would you rate the overall performance and impact of the project?	As noted in the evaluation text, p 15 and in Executive Summary, performance of the Programme varied between components; there have been emerging achievements in each	3
		Impact: while there are emerging achievements, such as the Programme's support to the enactment of the NPP; the construction of WASH facilities and accompanying health education messages; and the business trainings for youth and women, it is premature to assess their actual impacts in	6

		terms of recorded reduction in incidents of violence; reduction in rates of water borne diseases and the numbers of sustainable jobs and businesses created, respectively. See evaluation pp 15, "Emerging Achievements" and p. 17, "Monitoring and Evaluation.. .	
	7. If appropriate, were the communications and public/media outreach components of the project effectively implemented? To what extent were the project's achievements disseminated to benefit wider audiences (even beyond the project's direct beneficiaries)?	Communications: radio, billboards and newspapers were used to disseminate information, but there is no firm information on numbers reached beyond the immediate beneficiaries	6
Sustainability	8. What is the prospect that the project's activities and achievements will be sustained following UNTFHS support? (Elaborate on major factors and potential follow-up needs that are likely to influence whether the project's activities will be sustained)	See "Sustainability", pp. 15-16	3
Overall Performance Assessment	9. How would you rate the overall performance of the project, considering the Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability of the project?	On overall performance of HSI T3R as a Joint Programme; see pp.14-16	4
		Programme Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability are rated above, with text references for each provided. The average of these ratings is 3	3

Annex 5

Stakeholder PowerPoint Presentation Text

Attached as separate PowerPoint file

Annex 6

Preliminary Findings and Validation Session with Project Partners and Stakeholders

Wednesday 18th August 2015.
2.30 – 5.30 pm, HSI-T3R Office, Point Cruz

Minutes

ATTENDANCE: Akiko Suzaki (Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP), Dr. Annette Ittig (International Evaluation consultant), Stanley Karuo'o (National Evaluation Consultant), Margaret Qoloni (Undersecretary - Admin, MNURP), Reuben Lilo (Director – Peace & Reconciliation, MNURP), Kemuel Laeta (Director – Policy, MNURP), Mary Tuhaika (Youth Development Officer, Honiara City Council), Harry Olikwailafa (President, National Youth Council), Sandra Bartlett (Youth @ Work), Prema Maeato (C-BED Facilitator), Cecilia Kopana (SIWIBA), Benardette Usua (Vois Blong Mere), Elma Panisi (Live & Learn), William Chipu (Live & Learn), Donald Burgess (WASH Specialist, UNICEF), Godwin Kamtukule (WASH consultant), Roy Fugui (Project Assistant, ILO), Jenny Fugui (Project Assistant, ILO), Stella Delaiverata (CPR Programme Analyst, UNDP), Christina Mitini (CPR Programme Assistant), Gina Ilie (HSI-T3R Project Coordinator), Mevalyn Atu (HSI-T3R Project Assistant, UNDP), Gladys Boka (HSI-T3R Project Assistant, UNDP), Clifton Mahuta, Tony Kagovai (Solomon Islands Council of Trade Unions), David Tuhanuku.

APOLOGIES: Peter Mae (Undersecretary – Policy, MNURP)

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING: This meeting was called to allow the HSI-T3R project partners and stakeholder who were invited to be informed of the findings by the two evaluation consultant regarding the performance of the three component of the project. It also provided an opportunity for partners and stakeholders to express their views and to make validation, and written submission on components of the project in which they are involved.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
- **Welcome and opening remarks**

The Director for Peace & Reconciliation, Mr. Reuben Lilo, who was also the facilitator, on behalf of MNURP made welcoming remarks on behalf of the Ministry with which the HSI-T3R project was attached. He pointed out the importance of the evaluation of the project to the government in peace building.

The Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP, Ms Akiko Suzaki also made introductory remarks, highlighting the history of the project, the importance of an independent evaluation and the value

of the participation of stakeholders who attended. UNDP and partner UN agencies appreciated that participation which helped in assessing the performance of the project and in finding ways to move forward with lessons learnt through the project.

- **Presentation by International Evaluation consultant.**

The PowerPoint presentation (attached) summarises key findings of the evaluation assignment and is briefly outlined as follows.

i) Principles of Human Security Initiative (HSI) as a wide area but can be clearly understood:

- As People – centred

- In terms of the Principle of 'Freedom from Fear'

- In terms of the principle of 'Freedom from Want'

ii) The Methodologies applied in the Evaluation exercise

iii) In understanding the context of the Solomon Islands the factors outlined hold influence on HSI.

- The country as a Small Island Developing State,

- Its relative isolation

- Its diversity,

- Having a fragile social, political, economic and environmental context,

- Low per capita income of US$641 and a very low rating according to Human Development Index equal with PNG,

- Only 20% of the population is urban,

- The tensions that occurred between 1998 and 2003,

- Understanding the root causes of the tensions,

- The intervention under RAMSI is the stabilising force.

iv) Rationale for the project evaluation

v) Aims and Objectives of the project:

- Enhancing Human Security as stated in the project document,

- Defusing of "tensions" at individual and community level

vi) Budget and Timeframe

- The project budget was US$3.5 million of which 80% was expended on project activities.

- Roughly US$0.6 million is unspent to date; if this is not utilised before closure of the project in mid October 2015 it must be returned to UNTFHS

- Project resources were used to support selected communities in Honiara, Guadalcanal and Malaita.

vii) Emerging Programme achievements by component include

- UNICEF – WASH developed standard practice, wide networking and elaborate information systems and sharing.

- ILO - Training programmes for entrepreneurs, youths, counsellors and other beneficiaries.

- UNDP - Financial and technical support to MNURP, including support for NPP approval

viii) Assumptions and Risks

- The project was designed in 2006 based on the environment in the years immediately after the tensions which was different from present years.

- There are cross-cutting issues in the project.

- Three component led by UNDP, UNICEF and ILO.

- UN partners and stakeholders made assumptions that

  - All un agencies understand operational and financial modalities, parallel funding, fund disbursement in a joint project,

  - Monitoring and evaluation systems are understood.

- It is an ambitious project.

- The project is Honiara-centred, with most activities implemented areas in the proximity of Honiara.

- Synergies are not spread nationally and targets only Honiara and parts of Guadalcanal and Malaita.

- Other stakeholders could have been involved to enhance effectiveness, co-funding and wider spread of benefits to a larger group of beneficiaries. Some of these potential partners are the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination (MDPAC), World Bank and schools.

ix) Programme Design Findings

- Conflict analysis needs to be done first.

- There is a need for explicit site specified.

- There was an absence of a 'Risk Management Strategy'. The design did not well consider the dynamics of changes in the political climate, human resourcing, counterpart staffing and shifts in society priorities.

- The results are uneven; some components deliver outputs than expected. In measuring outputs, there are no baseline standards, Monitoring and Evaluation mechanisms were not in place and performance indicators are missing.

- Coordination and monitoring was affected by high staff turnover, leading to the absence of continuity.

- Funding modalities among UN partners are different leading to delays in implementation of activities. UNICEF for instance has its headquarter in Fiji, therefore takes longer to process payments.

- In any future joint projects, careful consideration has to be afforded to the areas of Project management separately from project coordination, see examples of other types of governance structures suggested like UNDP Somalia JPLG

x) Networking and Collaboration

- The Ministry of National Unity Reconciliation and Peace (MNURP) is the lead centre for coordination of HSI activities.

- National partners involved in HSI ncluded MHMS, MEHRD, Ministry of Commerce, Industries, Labour and Immigration; NGOs

- Collaborations with other potential partners, such as the private sector in relation to livelihoods, or other donor programmes, have not been well-explored yet

- Coordination and collaboration should apply to the national level as well sub-national level.

xi) Lessons Learned

- The project is Honiara – centred,

- Its design is ambitious and too large,

- There is a high transition cost of staff time for coordination between agencies

- Funding modality – pooled funding might have supported better alignment

xii) Recommendations and Way Forward.

- The programme is winding down with the unlikelihood of an extension with costs or a new project approval.

- Positive results and gains under the three components needs to be consolidated, sensitised and remaining activities completed.

- Undertake tracer studies to collect data to inform partners for future planning and good project design. Collect data from implementing partners which will demonstrate behaviour modification and other achievements.

- Exit strategies – sustainability Ministry partners already involved, but funding over the short/medium term may be an issue

- Clarity in guidelines, benefit sharing of programme output should be specified in future design and implementation.

- The needs and challenges at present differ from those ten years ago and designs must address these, the clearer ones are social inclusion, Climate Change Agenda, Disaster Risk Reduction

- **Stakeholder Group work Validation**

Following group discussion, participants made the following recommendations around the focus questions. Individual groups held discussions and made wider group presentations. Group finding are presented.

Group 1. Relevance – How relevant is the HSI-T3R programme to the current context?
How responsive has the programme been to issues which emerged since its launch?

- The adapting of a community-wide approach is highly relevant. This approach however is not beneficial to some initial target groups identified in the project document.

- The timing of the programme is appropriate to issues in the years immediately after tensions.

Group 2. Constraints – What have been the main constraints in implementing the HSI in Solomon Islands?
What are the key lessons learned?
The Key constraints in implementing HSI in Solomon Islands include;

- Lack of proper awareness about the project to inform communities of its outputs and activities.

- The absence of linkages of communication information and decision making between the upper level and lower levels.

- There are no baseline mechanisms in place, data and indicators to inform about quality of achievements. Monitoring & Evaluation mechanisms are non-existent in the structure of the programme.

There are key lessons learned to inform future project;

- Before implementation of projects, root causes of problems must be identified.

- There needs to be more awareness using about project activities using appropriate channels such as FBOs, CBOs, SIG, national and local NGOs.

- Funds should be prioritised to the right organisations or target groups.

Group 3. Efficiency – How has the HSI-T3R contributed towards improving efficiency in the rationalisation of national priorities, e.g. in reducing duplications?
- In the ILO component, development of attitudes such as 'appreciation for each other' added value to training participants' current skills in a comprehensive manner, especially for Youth@Work

- ILO component training component also introduced new skills in marketing using marketing strategies applied in more competitive market such as in Asia. This improved competitiveness and thus efficiency.

- UNDP/ILO synergy

- Training relevant to developing skills for youth has help build skills for employment

Group 4. Effectiveness: Results and Sustainability. How has HSI-T3R contributed to the realisation of national priorities? To what extent can the programme's outputs be sustainable? How?
- Results can need to be embedded in the line Ministries' Strategic Plans and Annual Work Programmes. All implementation of activities are to be aligned and absorbed with line ministries.

- Information sharing through reporting and collaborative dialogue will enhance the alignment process.

- Ensuring the allocation of adequate resources will contribute to achievement of outputs and distribution of benefit at a larger scale.

Group 5. Recommendations: How can we build on the many lessons learned from the HSI-T3R for new initiatives? For additional partners? For increased support to national development priorities?
- New Initiatives – Establish clear guidelines on benefits identified.

- Clear stakeholder identification and engagement in SIG sector, civil society organisations, academic institutions/persons, private sector.

- Overall objectives must be well articulated and shared with all partners.

- Additional Partners:

  - Share a bigger picture of the programme

- Detailed orientation mechanisms

- Experience sharing and accessibility to information at community level.

- Sharing of experiences with partners in their areas of activities to gain their support and extend knowledge with others.

Information sharing, resource allocation and capacity of human resources must be developed to handle the demands of alignment and sustainability (for future programmes).

The question of collaboration with ex-combatants was raised in the discussion pertinent to the extent to which they were consulted in the evaluation process. The response was that registration of this group was difficult and did not take off because of unwillingness on their part to register. It is hence difficult to identify them. Also related to that the conflict is now a thing of the past and most have moved on in their lives.

There are situational changes which pushed other areas of need to prioritise. The ex-combatant demands may have to be addressed in other ways appropriate to present time using the right level of resources and MNURP is the lead ministry to purpose those strategies.

The meeting closed with remarks of appreciation for undertaking the evaluation and stakeholder involvement in the sessions.