



Australian Government  
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade



# AUSTRALIA'S SOLOMON ISLANDS JUSTICE AND GOVERNANCE PROGRAMS EVALUATION – MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

February 2021

## SUMMARY OF MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Australia's Solomon Islands Governance and Justice Programs (the Programs) commenced on 1 July 2017 and will conclude on 30 June 2021. The Programs were independently evaluated for the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) in late-2019 to inform evidence-based decision making on future engagement in the sectors, including future program designs and implementation. Since the evaluation was undertaken the global COVID-19 pandemic has changed the operating environment significantly, particularly in regard to the closure of international borders and the State of Public Emergency that has been in place in Solomon Islands since March 2020 to the time of writing (January 2021).

DFAT welcomes the evaluation of the Programs, which were designed to transition from support provided under the Regional Assistance Mission Solomon Islands (RAMSI) to a more sustainable model of assistance delivered under the bilateral program. We note the report's overall finding that, within this context of the time post-RAMSI, the two programs made decisions that were reasonable and did as much as could be expected in difficult circumstances.

DFAT broadly accepts the recommendations put forward in the evaluation report. Since the review was conducted many of the findings have been implemented where appropriate within the contemporary operating environment. In incorporating these findings into our future program designs we will need to clearly identify the strategic intent of the two programs and ensure that the theory of change is informed by the lessons learned from preceding programs for governance and justice. A key challenge will be identifying how to improve service delivery in areas where we do not or cannot operate the programs.

On one finding of the evaluation, that DFAT "ignored" findings of the reports into the Programs' forerunners that upstream system improvement would not improve downstream service delivery, we demure. Both reports recommended continuing to work with the central government; DFAT accepted those recommendations.

The Programs are driven by the explicit requests of the Solomon Islands Government in response to its needs and priorities. The action plan identified in this management response will be progressed where the Solomon Islands Government welcomes Australia's engagement. DFAT's Office of the Pacific and Honiara Post, in consultation with relevant multilateral and bilateral partners, will determine how best to implement agreed actions.

# INDIVIDUAL MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS

## GOVERNANCE

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 1</p> <p><i>In the next 18 months, reframe Component 4 of the governance program to investigate (and potentially support) formation of informal or formal networks to address specific service delivery bottlenecks (e.g. relating to remand times, filling vacancies etc), rather than more generic and abstract organisational, institutional or systemic change goals. Give priority to initiatives which increase all forms of accountability (political, social, executive).</i></p>	Agree	<p>The lack of formal civil society organisations in Solomon Islands has restricted progress against component 4. In Solomon Islands DFAT assesses coalitions emerge on issues and once there is resolution the coalitions disperse. Indigenous ownership of coalitions is critical to their success.</p>	<p>We will consider this recommendation in the design of our next phase supporting governance in Solomon Islands</p>	<p>By 30 June 2021 – before the start of the next governance program.</p>



Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
Recommendation 2 <i>In the next 18 months, phase out support to LCC and Ombudsman at end of the program</i>	Agree in part	Support to the LCC and Ombudsman is through a twinning agreement with the Commonwealth Ombudsman	The agreement with the Commonwealth Ombudsman concludes 30 June 2021. DFAT will consider further assistance to the LCC and Ombudsman as part of the next design	Ongoing
Recommendation 3 <i>In the next 18 months, examine the role and functioning of the Public Service Commission – can it reasonably be expected to change the ‘rules of the public service game’?</i>	Agree	The PSC is important to the functioning of a capable and responsive public service. The Solomon Islands Government has not requested our engagement in this area and the governance program does not provide any formal assistance to the PSC.	DFAT will consider the role and function of the PSC in the context of Australia’s investment in this body through the design process of the next investment into Solomon Islands governance.	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 4</p> <p><i>Engage with education and health sector teams to consider whether upstream governance activities are impacting service delivery.</i></p>	Agree	This consultation has occurred	This consultation will be ongoing, particularly during design work for the governance program	Ongoing
<p>Recommendation 5</p> <p><i>In the next 18 months, bring timeline forward for the governance redesign.</i></p>	Agree	Although we agreed with this response, the upheaval of the COVID-19 global pandemic on operations, including critical, urgent priority work with reduced resourcing, resulted in this recommendation not being implemented.	The next iteration of the governance program is currently being designed.	The current governance program expires 30 June 2021 and we aim to have a new program implemented from 1 July 2021.

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 6</p> <p><i>In the next 18 months, focus on amassing evidence, data and whole-of-AHC and government clarity / agreement on where the governance program should focus and why.</i></p>	Agree in part	DFAT will continue to work responsively with the SIG, with a focus on flexibility in approach.	Robust discussions have occurred within the AHC to contest the future of Australia's governance investment. We have initiated broad consultations across government and other sectors of SI.	Ongoing
<p>Recommendation 7</p> <p><i>In the next 18 months, establish steering committee with SIG to enable joint design process for the governance program.</i></p>	Agree in part		Ongoing deep consultation and partnership with SIG will be critical in any new program, and we will work with SIG to determine the best format in which to do this. To date, we have approached consultations in a less formal manner.	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 8</p> <p><i>Adopt a problem-driven approach to delivery – where a few critical cross-sectoral bottlenecks to service delivery are identified and drive all activities / TA workplans (e.g. on procurement, placement / retention of staff at the front line, program-based budgeting and planning) See Figure 1.</i></p>	Agree	<p>This approach provides a way to focus the resources on a specific problem and work it through the chain, rather than working across a broad horizon to improve all governance processes. However, processes are all interdependent.</p>	<p>We will consider this approach as part of the design process for the next governance investment.</p>	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 9</p> <p><i>Focus governance activities on these critical binding constraints to performance and functionality.</i></p>	Agree		<p>We will consider this approach as part of the design process for the next governance investment, particularly in relation to SIG interest in this recommendation.</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 10</p> <p><i>Consider ways to support CDFs and nudge them in a more accountable, transparent, and accountable direction.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>Constituency Development Funds are payments made to members of parliament to address constituency-based development.</p> <p>Outside of the governance program our Direct Aid Program is engaging with CDFs to improve accountability.</p>	We will consider this approach as part of the design process for the next governance investment, particularly in relation to SIG interest in this recommendation.	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 11</p> <p><i>Component 4 of the governance program designed to support issue-based and progressive reforms, however nascent, tackling specific service delivery bottlenecks.</i></p>	Agree in part	This recommendation will be developed in line with thinking under recommendation 8	We will consider this approach as part of the design process for the next governance investment.	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 12</p> <p><i>Consider if and how some element of a performance-based approach could work in the governance program.</i></p>	Agree	Australia's engagement in the Core Economic Working Group for economic and fiscal reform already uses performance-based aid as a mechanism to incentivise government reform.	We will consider this approach as part of the design process for the next governance investment.	30 June 2021



Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 13</p> <p><i>In the governance program, put in place a process for SIG line ministries, central and / or provincial agencies to come together and agree shared solutions, accountabilities, and performance measures for addressing binding constraints.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>We agree that shared solutions, accountabilities and processes and performance measures required to address binding constraints need whole of government agreement. We do not agree that we are the party who should put in place that coordination mechanism – any coordination would need to be SIG-led to be effective.</p>	<p>We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next governance investment and through that process will consider this recommendation.</p>	Ongoing
<p>Recommendation 14</p> <p><i>Use joint SIG / AHC committee to agree binding constraints relevant to the governance program and necessary responses.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>SIG engagement and agreement on constraints and required responses is key.</p> <p>We could establish a coordination mechanism. However, any coordination would need to be SIG-led to be effective.</p>	<p>We will address this recommendation through alternative forums.</p>	Ongoing
<p>Recommendation 15</p> <p><i>Establish AHC structure more closely to align successor governance program with sector programs.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>We agree that the governance program remain closely aligned to sector programs. The AHC structure considers many issues.</p>	<p>We will consider how to incorporate this approach as part of the design process for the next governance investment.</p>	30 June 2021

## JUSTICE

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 16</p> <p><i>In the next 18 months, task embedded TA to work with ‘their’ justice agencies to identify the underlying causes of the problems that the indictors speak to, ideally including convening a cross-agency forum (possibly using the Justice Sector Coordinating Committee (JSCC) as a platform) to develop a SIG cross-agency action plan</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>We agree that agency coordination is essential in the justice sector. We agree that TA can be a useful mechanism to identify causes.</p> <p>We could establish a coordination mechanism. However, any coordination would need to be SIG-led to be effective.</p> <p>We note incremental work toward better cross agency coordination is underway.</p>	<p>We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will consider strengthening a sector coordination mechanism.</p>	<p>By 30 June 2021 – before the start of the next justice program.</p>

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 17</p> <p><i>Consider facilitating and incentivising a remand prisoner reduction (or similar) initiative through a payment by results mechanism possibly implemented through the JSCC.</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>We agree that remand is a critical issue facing the justice sector. There are a number of agencies impacted, and a range of mechanisms may be required to assist the Solomon Islands Government with improving the situation. Many agency heads realise the weight of the remand issue. We have supported Correctional Services to convene a meeting with justice agencies on this issue. We have committed to supporting their reform efforts. We cannot commit to a payment by results mechanism being the right method to support remand reductions.</p>	<p>We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will consider how to reduce prisoner remand numbers.</p>	<p>By 30 June 2021</p>

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 18</p> <p><i>During the current justice program, start work on a more strategic approach to improving access to justice at the community level including: much stronger lesson-learning among initiatives currently being funded under Component 3 (especially WB and UNDP); review existing evidence and lessons learnt; identify SIG institutional home with responsibility for community level access to justice; engage other SIG agencies (Ministry of Provincial Government, the Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Peace and Ecclesiastical Affairs)</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>We agree access to justice at a community level is an important component of Australian assistance and a more strategic approach to this component is warranted.</p> <p>We cannot identify SIG institutional home as there is no single SIG institution with responsibility for community access to justice. A broader coalition approach is likely to be required.</p>	<p>We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will consider how to improve community access to justice</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 19</p> <p><i>For the formal justice system, choose a handful of key outcome-oriented indicators where there is existing data and use those to monitor the program. Or just focus initially on one indicator – the per cent of remand prisoners, internationally accepted as a key indicator of the functioning of the criminal justice system</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>We agree we need to identify key outcome-oriented indicators where data exists for the formal justice sector, and we think this will be a key area of focus in the design of a new justice program in early 2021.</p> <p>However, greater integration of SIGs own frameworks may require the adoption of a range of indicators that have been developed and endorsed by SIG, which are likely to have more success in collecting or monitoring data.</p>	<p>We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will consider key indicators for the formal justice sector.</p>	30 June 2021



Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 20</p> <p><i>During the current program, continue with the Justice Sector Strategic Framework refresh and push for the inclusion of RSIPF and CSSI</i></p>	Agree	DFAT has supported the JSSF review throughout the current program. The review is awaiting endorsement by SIG. The RSIPF and CSSI are referenced in the updated JSSF - with a view to increase future collaboration across the whole sector and greater engagement with these two agencies	Ongoing	Ongoing
<p>Recommendation 21</p> <p><i>During the current justice program, begin to put in place a baseline for M&amp;E purposes</i></p>	Agree in part	It will be most effective to develop a baseline for M&E purposes as part of the design, to be implemented during the next phase of the justice program.	We will consider M&E baselines as part of the design process for the next justice investment.	The Justice program expires 30 June 2021 and we aim to have a new program implemented from 1 July 2021.
<p>Recommendation 22</p> <p><i>For the next justice program, ensure clear strategic intent, goal and outcomes with a few measurable performance indicators</i></p>	Agree	We expect the new design to support the justice sector will consider greater alignment with SIG strategic frameworks and performance indicators, focusing on a handful of key measurable indicators.	We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will consider key indicators.	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 23</p> <p><i>Align justice program with SIG's vision for justice including the National Development Strategy and the (refreshed) Justice Sector Strategic Framework (JSSF) and its Performance Management Framework</i></p>	Agree	We expect the new design for support to the justice sector will consider greater alignment with the <i>National Development Strategy</i> and the updated Justice Sector Strategic Framework (JSSF) 2020-2030.	We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will consider SIG strategy harmonisation.	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 24</p> <p><i>Identify core justice agencies and issues (e.g. cybercrime) where there are mutual Australia/Solomon Island interests and promote partnerships between relevant Australian and Solomon Island agencies</i></p>	Agree	We expect the new design for support to the justice sector will seek to implement a greater issues-based approach.	We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will consider an issues based approach.	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 25</p> <p><i>Ensure community level access to justice lies at the heart of the program, with the ambition to take improved, affordable service delivery to scale. (The World Bank Community Governance and Grievance Management Project's approach to securing SIG funds at the Provincial and potentially national level is a model)</i></p>	Agree in part	Engaging with SIG and other partners on the development of the new design will guide areas of priority and focus for access to justice activities in the new program.	We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will seek SIG views on putting community justice at the core of the program.	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 26</p> <p><i>Work with the SIG and non-state actors to develop a realistic and affordable strategy to deliver community level justice using appropriate and context specific models (community officers / community paralegals / Crime Prevention Committees etc)</i></p>	Agree	Work with SIG and non-state actors to develop a strategy to deliver community level justice has begun under the existing program.	We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will seek SIG views on continuing this work.	Ongoing

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 27</p> <p><i>Pilot approaches through a series of 'small bets' backed up by a justice program design that encourages innovation, learning and then adapting</i></p>	Agree		<p>We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will seek SIG views on continuing this work to integrate pilot approaches.</p>	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 28</p> <p><i>Consider contracting out implementation of the justice program to a service provider skilled in working in these highly context specific and adaptive ways, with robust DFAT monitoring at outcome and impact level</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>A range of options and different delivery and contracting models will be considered during the design process.</p>	<p>We will consider this recommendation as part of the design process for the next justice investment.</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 29</p> <p><i>Include as core activity strengthening SIG justice data collection and impact / outcome level M&amp;E (operating across agencies), and the institutional arrangements (potentially the JSCC) responsible for such M&amp;E</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>We consider M&amp;E important to our programming decisions. However, we do not want to create a parallel system of data collection. Activities to support and encourage SIG data collection have been pursued where opportunities exist. The Justice Information Management System (JIMS) has been implemented across all agencies within the sector, although data from this system is patchy.</p>	<p>We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will seek SIG views on improving data collection.</p>	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 30</p> <p><i>Require design team for the justice program to consider payment by results mechanism</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>A range of options and different delivery and contracting models will be considered during the design period</p>	<p>We will consider this recommendation as part of the design process for the next justice investment.</p>	30 June 2021



Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 31</p> <p><i>Put in place baselines at the start of the justice program, with regular follow up</i></p>	Agree	As per recommendation 21, the new design will look to establish relevant baselines.	We will consider M&E baselines as part of the design process for the next justice investment	30 June 2021
<p>Recommendation 32</p> <p><i>Continue to provide embedded TA to core formal justice agencies, but with a stronger mandate to engage with SIG justice sector policy-making, planning, resource allocation and M&amp;E processes, as well as to facilitate collective action to address cross-agency problems in the justice system</i></p>	Agree in part	We agree there are opportunities for innovative approaches to the use of TA. We note the upheaval of the COVID-19 global pandemic on operations and the way in which programs utilise TA will need to be considered further. Current advisors have, when appropriate, engaged across the sector to address problems.	We will work in close partnership with SIG on the design process for the next justice investment and through that process will seek SIG views on the use of TA.	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
Recommendation 33 <i>Ensure justice-sector advisers have the necessary hard and soft skills</i>	Agree	We will seek improvement to the managing contractors recruitment processes to employ advisers with appropriate skill sets. We note that recruitment to Solomon Islands can be challenging, for a range of reasons, and that this has been exacerbated by the impact of COVID-19 on international travel.	Ongoing	30 June 2021

## MEL

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 34</p> <p><i>Given the lack of an agreed overarching-strategy for the two programs, the team suggests no major changes to the MEL approach and framework be made at this stage – and until the re-designs are complete. Instead focus on simplifying what exists and weighting MEL unit efforts towards bedding down core accountability functions (outlined below), and those learning processes where there is strong SIG and program buy-in</i></p>	Agree in part	<p>The MEL Unit approach did not work as originally intended. For the next programs in governance and justice we will rethink the approach for MEL. The current governance and justice programs were directed to follow this recommendation and it is being implemented.</p>	<p>DFAT recognises the importance of M&amp;E for enabling evidence-based decision making to improve value for money and effectiveness. M&amp;E will be considered as part of the design processes for the next justice and governance investments.</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 35</p> <p><i>Simplify and reduce the number of indicators in the PAF to focus on measuring what matters most. Where data does not exist, think seriously about need for indicator. Focus on retaining outcome level indicators, not inputs or activity indicators</i></p>	Agree	<p>The MEL Unit supporting the current governance and justice programs was requested to follow this recommendation. While DFAT has not seen the outcome of this recommendation from the MEL Unit we understand there has been some work undertaken including a draft theory of change for the justice program.</p>	<p>DFAT recognises the importance of M&amp;E for enabling evidence-based decision making to improve value for money and effectiveness. To offset the lack of progress of this recommendation we have sought evidence from other sources – one such being the programs’ Six Monthly Reports (with MEL Unit contributions). This recommendation will be considered as part of the design processes deliberations on M&amp;E for the next justice and governance investments</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 36</p> <p><i>Outcomes reporting and evidence of claims: continue to support the Team Leads to improve the quality of the six-monthly reports</i></p>	Agree	<p>Team Leaders for the current justice and governance programs and the MEL unit have worked together on Six Monthly Reports. Since the Evaluation there has been a renewed focus on the Six Monthly Reports by the programs and an effort has been made to improve and standardise formatting.</p>	<p>DFAT recognises the importance of M&amp;E for enabling evidence-based decision making to improve value for money and effectiveness. How M&amp;E reporting can continue to be improved will be considered in the design processes for the next justice and governance investments. See also the importance of the Six Monthly Reports in response to recommendation 35.</p>	30 June 2021



Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 37</p> <p><i>Confirm baselines are in place for major outcome areas (noting data was missing for many baseline measures in the PAF) and report on change against baseline in the snap-shot program reports.</i></p>	Agree	<p>The MEL Unit was requested to follow this recommendation. While DFAT has not seen the outcome of this recommendation from the MEL Unit we understand there has been some work undertaken.</p>	<p>DFAT recognises the importance of M&amp;E for enabling evidence-based decision making to improve value for money and effectiveness. To offset the lack of progress of this recommendation we have sought evidence from other sources – one such being the programs’ Six Monthly Reports (with MEL Unit contributions). This recommendation will be considered as part of the design processes deliberations on M&amp;E for the next justice and governance investments.</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 38</p> <p><i>Alignment of key MEL docs where needed, including the forthcoming and revised justice theory of change with a far more streamlined and simplified PAF.</i></p>	Agree	<p>The MEL Unit was requested to follow this recommendation. While DFAT has not seen the outcome of this recommendation from the MEL Unit we understand there has been some work undertaken.</p>	<p>DFAT recognises the importance of M&amp;E for enabling evidence-based decision making to improve value for money and effectiveness. This recommendation will be considered as part of the design processes deliberations on M&amp;E for the next justice and governance investments.</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 39</p> <p><i>Rapid case studies/analytics: consider establishing an analytic pipeline with each Team Lead for the next 18 months. This pipeline could identify a number of rapid, short, policy relevant pieces of research that LTU will produce. Ensure all analysis/case studies are attached to a user-uptake and communications strategy: is the analysis politically salient? What incentives are there for SIG or program stakeholders to use the analysis to inform policy or program decision making?</i></p>	Agree	<p>The MEL Unit was requested to follow this recommendation. DFAT has received only one paper from LTU, which they had begun prior to the Evaluation.</p>	<p>This recommendation remains relevant and part of our forward MEL workplan. Prioritisation of the pipeline will be determined by Heads of Program.</p> <p>This recommendation will also be considered as part of the design processes deliberations on M&amp;E for the next justice and governance investments.</p>	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 40</p> <p><i>Continue those existing learning processes where there is greatest buy in from the program and SIG agencies. Also seek feedback from agencies on the OCA process, including their advice on how to ensure the indicators and monitoring methods proposed align with corporate or agency plans (the team heard mixed messages about how useful different agencies found the OCA process – therefore the sustainability of this approach remains unclear)</i></p>	Agree	<p>Although we agreed with this response, the upheaval of the COVID-19 global pandemic on operations, including critical, urgent priority work with reduced resourcing, resulted in this recommendation not being implemented.</p>	<p>OCA's were not able to continue following the repatriation and resignations of MEL unit staff. DFAT did not seek to recruit replacement MEL Unit staff in country to undertake this work given the unavailability of SIG agencies due to COVID would have prohibited the OCA process.</p> <p>Lessons learned in relation to this recommendation will also be considered as part of the design processes deliberations on M&amp;E for the next justice and governance investments.</p>	<p>We consider this recommendation completed, given we are not able to resource the OCA process before the end of the programs.</p>

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 41</p> <p><i>Embed MEL team in the program and clarify reporting lines (consider whether it makes most sense for the MEL unit to report into the two Team Leads). In so doing, ensure the MEL unit is allowed to retain focus on the core actions outlined above – and does not become captured by input/ output reporting requirements or constantly responding to data demands from the AHC</i></p>	Agree		<p>Since receiving this recommendation following the Evaluation in November 2019, the MEL unit reports into the Justice and Governance Heads of Program.</p> <p>The balance of inclusion or independence of M&amp;E functions in the programs will be considered as part of the design processes deliberations on M&amp;E for the next justice and governance investments.</p>	Completed



Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 42</p> <p><i>La Trobe University support arrangement: suggest no fundamental changes to this arrangement be made until the strategic intent of both programs be clarified. However, the program could ensure the most value is achieved from this arrangement by setting a number of joint targets for the next 18 months and holding all parties to their achievement.</i></p>	Agree	<p>The MEL unit has established a clearer and reduced scope of services with LTU which shifts from capacity supplementation to capacity support and ‘on-call’ access for MEL advice on innovative methodologies or tools as well as strategic insight and learnings.</p>	<p>The balance of external and internal M&amp;E in the programs will be considered as part of the design processes deliberations on M&amp;E for the next justice and governance investments.</p>	Completed

## PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND THE SIRF

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<b>Recommendation 43</b> <i>Confirm separate management arrangements for the two programs</i>	Agree	It is our intent that the next iterations of the justice and governance programs will retain separate management.	This will be determined through the design processes for both new programs.	30 June 2021

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 44</p> <p><i>Ensure SIRQ re-design:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>o Clarifies accountability arrangements among SIRQ, the Team Leads and the AHC: specifically, who is responsible for the delivery of outcomes, and how much delegated authority (regarding budget management, activity design and relationship management with SIG)</i></li> <li><i>o Clarify SIRQ core functions: is it as a logistics service provider or a programming entity or both? Note that the team's major concern is that the operational and programming systems and skills required for an operational vs a programming facility are different. [...] It is usually better to separate sectors into several contracts and deal with the issues of coordination that necessarily need to be overcome</i></li> </ul>	Agree	<p>The Solomon Islands Resource Facility (SIRQ) design was paused in response to recommendation 45. SIRQ was tendered in late 2020 for a 12-month program (with possibility of 18 month extension). Roles and responsibilities were clarified and the levels of authority for budget management and activity design were clarified. The full redesign will be completed over this period, with the view to a new facility being tendered and in place in 2022/2023.</p>	These recommendations will be considered as part of the full redesign process for SIRQ.	Ongoing through to 2022

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
Recommendation 45 <i>Pause the SIRF re-design</i>	Agree	The full SIRF redesign was paused.	The SIRF redesign will happen before 2022.	Ongoing to 2022
Recommendation 46 <i>Bring forward the design of the governance program (at minimum) and ensure it is completed before the SIRF is re-designed. The team's view is that the strategy for the governance redesign (and ideally health and education) must be clear before the delivery modality (currently much of what SIRF does) is finalised. Sequencing is critical, otherwise the modality (how the program is to be delivered) will lock in and dictate the design (what DFAT and SIG want to achieve)</i>	Agree	The full SIRF redesign will be concluded after the governance and justice program designs have concluded.	The next iteration of the governance and justice programs are currently being designed with the implementation for both new designs set for 1 July 2021.	Completed

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 47</p> <p><i>Establish a 'light-touch' fortnightly (information sharing/coordination) mechanism for TLs and corresponding AHC staff</i></p>	Agree	<p>This recommendation has always been applied by AHC and the program teams.</p> <p>The governance and justice heads of program speak regularly with the responsible AHC staff. Regular, weekly or fortnightly, meetings have been a standard undertaking for the full life of the governance and justice programs.</p>	<p>AHC staff, including the Counsellor, First and Second Secretaries and Program Manager speak with the Heads of Program and other program staff at least on a fortnightly basis, but usually far more frequently.</p>	Completed.

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 48</p> <p><i>Keep justice and governance program management functionally separate – but:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>o Integrate the governance program more closely with health and education sector programs (see suggestions above regarding the governance re-design)</i></li> <li><i>o Focus the justice program on supporting SIG to facilitate better integration within the justice sector (prosecutors, police, magistrates, and the Ministries of Policy and Justice); and on better alignment between SIPDP and the Justice program by the Australian Government</i></li> </ul>	Agree in part	<p>We agree that the governance program should be closely aligned to our largest investments in Health and Education.</p> <p>We agree that the justice program should align with the SIPDP.</p> <p>While we agree that SIG needs to better integrate the justice sector we do not agree that we are the party who should put in place that coordination mechanism. We can address this through policy discussion.</p>	We will consider this recommendation during design work for the justice and governance programs.	The current governance and justice programs expire 30 June 2021 and we aim to have a new program implemented from 1 July 2021.



Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
Recommendation 49 <i>Put in place high level SIG-AHC oversight to review program progress and consider synergies</i>	Agree in part	We agree that there should be strategic oversight of the programs but wish to consider the mechanism or purpose of the oversight further.	We will consider this as part of the program design processes.	The current governance and justice programs expire 30 June 2021 and we aim to have a new program implemented from 1 July 2021.
Recommendation 50 <i>In regard to technical assistance, judge each case on its merits.</i>	Agree	This is our current process for placing technical assistance. For example, we consider alternative methodologies, SIG buy in, the engagement at the work unit level.		Completed

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 51</p> <p><i>Be clear about the objectives of the TA's role. This will determine whether an advisory position or an in-line position is appropriate. No prior assumptions should be made that advisory positions are better at developing competencies and skills or promoting organisational capacity. The extent to which any TA can 'build capacity' depends more on their individual skills and talents and the terms of reference than it does on formal organisational placement;</i></p>	Agree	<p>Terms of reference for technical advisers are developed with full engagement and endorsement of the counterparts and senior agency managers. The recruitment process for TA is thorough, merit based and involves at least one SIG member on the panel. As at recommendation 50, we consider a range of methodologies for achieving the desired outcomes and often choose (with SIG) to pursue other options (like twinning, mentoring or training)</p>		Completed

Recommendation	Response	Explanation	Action plan	Timeframe
<p>Recommendation 52</p> <p><i>Give priority to organisational rather than individual 'counterparting'. Most TA is expected to work alongside an individual who, it is assumed, will take over the position once the TA departs. Experience shows that it is more effective for the TA to provide support to the unit, department or agency in which he or she is working, rather than just one person; and</i></p>	Agree	TA all work to a unit and are responsible for building team performance. We have trialled broader spans of capacity building but find mixed results.	We will consider this recommendation further part of the program design processes.	The current governance and justice programs expire 30 June 2021 and we aim to have a new program implemented from 1 July 2021.
<p>Recommendation 53</p> <p><i>TA should be embedded in, and report to, national staff. Such a relationship creates an appropriate set of incentives.</i></p>	Agree	Typically, this is how our TA are placed. There are rare exceptions where TA operate from the SIRF (for example justice program gender adviser) but that is where a TA works across multiple agencies.		Completed