

Let's Make our Families Safe - Mekom Famili Blong Iumi Sef Solomon Islands: prevention of family violence program

Annexes

31 January 2014

Annex 1.	List of people consulted.....	3
Annex 2.	Existing prevention of family violence activities, categorised	6
Annex 3.	Lessons learned for community based programs	8
Annex 4.	Implementation options considered.....	11
Annex 5.	Rationale for proposed selected provinces	13
Annex 6.	Cooperation with sector programs	16
Annex 7.	Proposed approach to implement component 1 on community activities.....	19
Annex 8.	Draft competitive grants program guidelines for component 1.....	27
Annex 9.	Proposed approach to implement component 2 on coalitions	30
Annex 10.	Proposed approach to implement component 3 on monitoring and evaluation.....	41
Annex 11.	Draft terms of reference for monitoring and evaluation contractor	48
Annex 12.	Risk Register.....	51

Contents

Annex 1.	List of people consulted.....	3
Annex 2.	Existing prevention of family violence activities, categorised	6
Annex 3.	Lessons learned for community based programs	8
Annex 4.	Implementation options considered.....	11
Annex 5.	Rationale for proposed selected provinces	13
Annex 6.	Cooperation with sector programs	16
Annex 7.	Proposed approach to implement component 1 on community activities.....	19
Annex 8.	Draft competitive grants program guidelines for component 1.....	27
Annex 9.	Proposed approach to implement component 2 on coalitions	30
Annex 10.	Proposed approach to implement component 3 on monitoring and evaluation.....	41

Annex 11. Draft terms of reference for monitoring and evaluation contractor	48
Annex 12. Risk Register.....	51

Annex 1. List of people consulted

Particular thanks must go to the DFAT Honiara gender team—Rochelle White, Louisa Gibbs, Brenda Wakela and Susan Cash, especially Louisa and Susan who wrote parts of this design; Gillian Brown, Lesley Hoatson and Daniel Evans who provided valuable external reviewer comments; Dr Alice Pollard who has provided sage advice throughout, and the Pacific Leadership Program—Georgina Cope and Lionel Gibson.

The following list includes only those consulted since the family violence prevention design began in June 2013. Many others provided valuable contributions to the broader gender program design process and those people are credited in previous mission documents. Their contributions have been drawn upon for this design.

Vital input was garnered through several village level community consultations in Isabel and Choiseul provinces.

i. Australian Government

DFAT

Minister Counsellor, Sue Connell

DFAT Honiara community programs – Kennedy Folasi , Daniel Nugent

DFAT Honiara sector teams – Kirsten Hawke, Sarah Kernot, Clair Cochrane, Shalom Akao-Waita, Angellah Kingmele, Jacob Zikuli, Edward Suinao, Skyneck Opepiko, Atenasi Ata-Wasuka, Cheryl Seeto

DFAT Honiara procurement – Philippa Armstrong

DFAT Canberra – Tracey Newbury, Arthi Patel, Susan Ferguson, Corinne Tarnawsky, Amie Milligan

DFAT Suva – Sheona McKenna, Sandra Kraushaar,

DFAT Philippines - Joji Abot-Camelon

RAMSI Office of the Special Coordinator - Justine Braithwaite, Toby Sharpe

AFP/PPF – Valyn Barrett, Mike Smith, Lance Tebbutt, Scott Langtree

Australian Sports Commission – Amy Berson

Emele Duituturaga, Consultant

ii. Solomon Islands Government

Ministry of Women, Children, Youth and Family Affairs - Permanent Secretary Ethel Sigimanu, Pionie Boso and Vaela Devesi

Royal Solomon Islands Police Force – Gabriel Manelusi, Solomon (Honiara); Josiah Laumana (Isabel); Roland Lapo, Margaret Bisa, Daisy Rooney (Choiseul); John (Western Province)

Ministry of Health and Medical Services – Nashley Vozoto (Social Welfare), Amy Watts, Matias Simata and Dr Patrick (Buala Hospital, Isabel)

Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development – Patrick Daudau (Curriculum), James Bosamata (Teacher Training), Elison Mane (Buala Education Authority, Isabel)

Frank Wickham, former PS of Ministry of Agriculture and Solomon Islands Rugby Federation

Isabel Provincial Government – Premier James Habu, Loretta Soaki, Mark Toni, Lindon, Dudley Vunagi, Edward Tadarea,

Choiseul Provincial Government – Premier Jackson Kiloe, PS John Tabepuda, Joanne (women), John (youth), William Timba (Ag Hospital Director), Joe (agriculture)

iii. Churches

SICA Federation of Women, Ethel Suri, and SICA President James Funa

Seventh Day Adventists – President George Fafale, Pastor Fraser Reuben

Church of Melanesia – Archbishop David Vunagi, General Secretary Dr Abraham Hauriasi, Mission Secretary Fr George Elo, Robert Fakafu, Judith Siota, Peter Beta, George Bogese, George Kiriau

Mothers' Union – President Mary Edith Koete, Mary Vunagi, Moira Dasipio (Isabel President)

Bishop Patteson Theological College, Kohimarama – Rev Milton Talasasa, Fr Ben Wate

South Sea Evangelical Church – Reverend Peter Maesulitala, Elison Sau

Catholic Church – Sister Cora, Jacqueline

United Church – Reverend Ronny Bo and Judy Bo (Nukiki, Choiseul)

iv. Civil society (including church based NGOs)

West Are Are Rokotanikeni Association – Dr Alice Pollard

National Council of Women – Lorio Waitara

Vois Blong Mere – Josephine Teakeni

Christian Care Centre – Sister Doreen Awaisi, Ani Kideo

Live and Learn - Doris Puiahi, Haiku Baiabe

Solomon Islands Development Trust – Dr John Roughan, Longden Manedika

I Lukim Sustainability – Watson Puiahi, Jacob Zikuli

Secretariat of the Pacific Community – Mia Rimon, Val Stanley

IWDA – Joanne Brislane

World Vision – Koisau Sade, Abigail Will, Ali Zareqe Kiko

Oxfam – Katie Greenwood, Belinda Barnard, Meghan McBain

Save the Children – Dr Rudaba Khondker, Elise Bryce-Johnson, Joe Haga, Heather Clarke, Ronny Lekafia (Isabel), Nelson Katovai (Choiseul)

Caritas – Adam Elliott and Mary Magdalen

Anglican Overseas Aid - Kate Higgins, Tagolyn Kabekabe

The Nature Conservancy – John Pita

Clair Varley – former volunteer Isabel Province

YWCA – Julianne Wickham

Martha Horiwapu

Sam Alasia

SOLMAS – Jeremy Miller

v. Private Sector

One TV - Dorothy Wickham

Solomon Islands Women In Business Association – Rose Isukana, Marilyn Ronia, Ning Gabrino

Pasifiki – Bob Pollard, Sharon Naesol

vi. Donors

UNWomen – Elsie Wickham, Alvina Soaki Ereka

UNFPA – Polini Boseto

World Bank – Alison Ofotalau, Daniel Evans

UNICEF – Annalisa Caparello, Anika Kingmele

American Bar Association – Joanna Mansfield

New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Anna Reid and Debbie Sade

Annex 2. Existing prevention of family violence activities, categorised

The following matrix maps the current formalised activities taking place in Solomon Islands in relation to primary, secondary and tertiary prevention interventions directly aimed at family violence.¹ Notably, for a country with one of the worst rates of family in the world, the number and scale of activities is very small.

Primary Prevention Activities – stopping violence before it occurs			
Activity	Implementer	Location	Description
Community Channels of Hope for Gender	World Vision	Honiara, Weathercoast and Temotu, + targeted program for Police Officers	Using faith-based approaches to change attitudes towards gender equality and particularly family violence.
Men Against Violence Against Women	Live and Learn Environmental	Honiara	Empowering male advocates to speak out against violence in their communities.
Positive Parenting	Anglican Church of Melanesia	To be rolled out progressively nation-wide	Community based program adapted from Church of England international materials.
Positive Parenting	Unicef	4 provinces	Discussions and demonstrations of positive child rearing practices preventing abuse, violence and exploitation of children.
Standing Together Against Violence	Oxfam	Honiara	Gender equality awareness community training.
Violence Against Women Drama Piece	SEI Theatre Group	Honiara. (Previous one off tours to Malaita and Western Province.)	Confronting theatre piece to inform and encourage the audience to take action.
Violence Against Women Drama Piece	Stages for Change Theatre Group	Honiara 2013. Planned tour of main islands 2014.	Using theatre as a vehicle for reducing violence against women and increasing women's participation in civil society and peace making.
Advocacy and education about Family Violence	Family Support Organisation	Gizo (Western Province)	Endogenous community action to raise awareness of the issue of violence against women and campaign for support services in Gizo.
Family Violence workshops	Isabel United to Stop Family Violence	Across all Isabel province	A week-long workshop developed and presented collaboratively by police, Mother's Union, nurses, and other local actors, that educates communities about family violence and builds their ability to respond to and reduce family violence at a village level.

¹ Definitions of the types of prevention are in Part 3. It is important to note that sometimes programs or activities can have impact in more than one category of prevention. In the table below, the most significant category of prevention has been noted. In Solomon Islands, primary interventions (that aim to stop violence before it occurs) in most cases also act as secondary prevention measures (targeting a reduction in the rate of repeating violence), given the high proportion of people who have been involved in family violence, including from an early age as children.

Secondary Prevention Activities – reducing the rate of repeat violence			
Activity	Implementer	Location	Description
Thinking, Feeling, Doing	Short Workshops in Mission	Honiara prisons	Anger management program delivered to prisoners, which has also been expanded to be available to prison officers and their families.
Dry Out Program	Anglican Church of Melanesia	Honiara	Parish based program for alcoholics based on a successful model from Kiribati.

Tertiary Prevention Activities – mitigating the negative impacts of violence			
Activity	Implementer	Location	Description
Refuge	Christian Care Centre	Honiara	Only formal accommodation service for survivors of violence in the country.
Counselling	Family Support Centre	Honiara	Only secular counselling service in the country.
Investigation and prosecution	Royal Solomon Islands Police	Nation-wide	Investigation and prosecution of criminal matters.
Legal advice	Public Solicitor's Office	Honiara, with single staff outposts in Gizo (Western Province) and Auki (Malaita)	Free legal advice on family law and criminal law matters.
Medical care	Ministry of Health and Medical Services	Nation-wide	Medical assistance provided through hospitals and local clinics. Nurses and doctors are being trained in protocols for dealing with patients presenting with signs of family violence.
Homes for Hope and Healing	Seventh Day Adventist Church	Nation-wide in Seventh Day Adventist communities	Congregation members offer space in their homes for women who are not safe in their own houses. Based on international Seventh Day Adventist model.
SAFENET "Hotline"	Ministry of Health and Medical Services	Nation-wide	24 hour, toll free number to call for referrals. (No calls received in first year of operation).
24 Hour telephone counselling	Family Support Centre	Nation-wide	Available to clients of the Family Support Centre.
Proposed safe house	Noro safe house project	Noro, Western Province	Fundraising and community awareness to establish a safehouse in Noro (Western Province).
Development and advocacy in relation to the <i>Family Protection Bill</i>	<i>Family Protection Bill</i> Taskforce	Honiara	SIG, NGO and donor representatives working together to progress the development, passage and civic education of the <i>Family Protection Bill</i> .

Annex 3. Lessons learned for community based programs

i. International experience

International research² points to consistent lessons for community based programs seeking to address and prevent family violence. These include:

- Include local leaders
- Foster local acceptance and instil a sense of ownership among community members
- Anticipate the risk of backlash against women
- Be realistic about the lack of services available in rural contexts
- Sustain partnerships and change beyond a single program cycle
- Support network-building and coordination between groups to increase the power, reach and scale of interventions
- Interventions to change attitudes and behaviours need solid backing over a long period of time. Support organisations that are rooted in communities, have history there, and will maintain a long connection with that community.

ii. Solomon Islands experience

Over the past 10 years, Australia has supported a wide variety of initiatives to challenge gender inequalities in Solomon Islands.³ These include support for legislative and policy change,⁴ dedicated programs to empower and advance women in the public service,⁵ influence on spending patterns in relation to women's and girls' health and education, provision of specialist gender equality technical assistance,⁶ programs to encourage women to stand for election and for men and women to consider men and women candidates equally, support to coalitions of women in many forms;⁷ and encouraging community level engagement and education on economic empowerment, combatting violence against women and local level leadership.⁸

² DFID *Guidance Note 2: A Practical Guide on Community Programming on Violence Against Women and Girls*, 2012

³ In addition to support to SIG ministries and agencies, a 2012 mapping exercise of civil society actors working on gender equality issues found that 50 per cent of Honiara-based civil society organisations working to improve gender equality received funding from Australia (Emele Duituturaga, *Civil Society Organisations Gender Mapping Exercise*, p4).

⁴ Including in relation to health, education, equal opportunity and legal protections for survivors of family violence.

⁵ RAMSI's Women in Government Program implemented a variety of skills building, mentoring and institutional reforms to support women in the public service.

⁶ RAMSI and Australian bilateral development programs have engaged technical gender equality advisers in short and long term forms over the years.

⁷ Examples include support to civil society groups such as the Solomon Islands Women in Business Association and alliances formed in the public services, such as the women's staff network at Correctional Services of Solomon Islands.

⁸ Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Agreement (SINPA) and its predecessor the Civil Society Program (CSP)

Key lessons from these programs include the following:

1. **The need to “walk”, with Solomon Islands women in rural areas, at their own pace.** Programs which have taken time to forge relationships and build knowledge slowly have been accepted warmly and progressed well in Solomon Islands.⁹
2. **Strengths based approaches at the community level can positively change the culture around aid delivery and support communities in taking greater control of their own development.** The experience of the Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Agreement has been that using a strengths based approaches has been a positive one; but note that is an environmental factor only and must still be accompanied by good development practices and solid project management and project implementation.¹⁰
3. **Use of inclusive language in relation to gender equality and family violence is crucial.** “Gender” is considered an introduced term and can be associated in a negative way with aggressive assertion of women’s rights. Wording that stresses working together will avoid the problems of excluding men that using the term “gender” sometimes creates.¹¹
4. **Civil society action is often acutely localised.** With the exception of the five main churches which collectively have a broad reach across the county, the vast majority of Solomon Islands civil society organises itself along small sized community or interest group lines.¹² Previous Solomon Island experience identifies that relationships to family, extended family, friends, community province and *wantok* strongly affect what program delivery mechanisms are appropriate when working with communities. The relationship culture within Solomon Islands means that an emphasis on building relationships is of primary importance. **Particular caution needs to be taken when using local NGOs as it is often assumed that they have good relationships within the community and thus relationship building time gets cut.**
5. **Sufficient time needs to be given to allow genuine consultation and participation.** Any new activities need to devote significant time to engaging with local leaders and community groups to build trust and cooperation. Timelines imposed by international partners can act as a major barrier to how successful relationship building activities will be.
6. **Without the support of leaders it is impossible to make constructive progress.** However, working with and through leaders is a complex process and can affect the level of inclusiveness achieved, particularly with regard to gender equity and involvement of women. Therefore this work must be a feature of the program from the beginning. In Solomon Islands the church is a powerful influence and Christianity is central to local cultures. Garnering genuine support and commitment from the churches takes time, but has the potential to be a powerful vehicle for influencing behaviour change.
7. Evidence shows that **organisations underestimate the impact of the additional requirements related to forming a network** and this underestimation of the required time and energy meant it had been a burden for many. It took 4 years of NGO partners working

⁹ For example, the leaders of Rokotikeni West Are-Are Association spent 7 years socialising the idea of saving money before a savings club was formed. Many of the women in the group had rarely held bank notes in their hands.

¹⁰ SINPA Mid-Term Evaluation, p 16.

¹¹ Live and Learn Environmental and IWDA, *Exploring the opportunities and challenges of local cultures in working towards gender equality in Solomon Islands – Learning Paper*

¹² Emele Duituturaga, “Civil Society Organisations Gender Mapping Exercise”.

together to build a level of trust where information is shared and for power-sharing to occur in one community development program.¹³ Prior to this point, partners found that it was hard to realise the benefit of coalitions and overcome the disincentives for groups to overcome their traditional competitive grant seeking approach to work together.¹⁴

8. The long term process of change within communities means that donors must accept that **tangible results will often be slow to appear**. NGO partner staff felt under pressure from AusAID to demonstrate tangible outcomes from their work.¹⁵ In lessons learned reports produced by NGO members it was noted that it was particularly hard to report on the benefits of the coordination element of the program.
9. **Monitoring and evaluation processes need to be specially designed to meet multiple accountability and learning needs**. Community-led development takes significant time which may require increased capture and recognition of 'process' outcomes and reduced expectations on tangible 'final' outcomes. A program evaluation highlighted that there needed to be sufficient baseline data and strong M&E systems in place.¹⁶ That program did not consistently incorporate lessons learned from its own activities as implementation progressed.¹⁷ Poor M&E at the program level has served to undermine trust between AusAID and partners and resulted in AusAID requests for stronger reporting.¹⁸
10. Finally experience from previous community level programs in Solomon Islands also clearly shows the need for **a staged approach and to be careful not to be too over-ambitious in terms of the number of provinces and range of activities supported**.

¹³ SINPA

¹⁴ CSP. Respondents in the design consultations also reported that the incentives within their organisation to deliver short-term outputs do not always support dedicating time to coalition activities where the benefits may be seen to be more remote.

¹⁵ SINPA

¹⁶ CSP

¹⁷ CSP

¹⁸ SINPA

Annex 4. Implementation options considered

A number of delivery mechanisms for this design were considered and assessed:

1. *Country-wide competitive grants mechanism.* This has the benefit of supporting what is already there without risking a donor dictating the agenda. But Australia is already funding UNWomen's Elimination of Violence Against Women grants. Local organisations have struggled to comply with the application process and results have been limited. Australia's limited investment would be better spent on targeting efforts in a more concentrated area to work towards delivering a critical mass of activities in those areas, allowing additional support to help those activities work together and join up to other local actors and initiatives.
2. *Competitive grants in two locations only.* This clearly satisfies the requirement to concentrate efforts. However, in addition to the problems for organisations to apply for grants outlined above, the competitive nature of the grants process could work against the objective to bring individuals and organisations working to prevent family violence together to work cooperatively. Support for action at the community level must be implemented in a way which promotes those organisations to work with others. This can be done through incentivising those organisations to work with others at the community level in implementing their activities. But care will also need to be taken that the way organisations are selected for support does not foster competition between organisations which may work against the objective for organisations to work together at the enabling environment level. Competitive grants, for example, could encourage organisations to work together through a selection criteria but they are not a useful tool to encourage any un-funded organisations to work together at the enabling environment level.
3. *Funding existing activities and improving their monitoring and evaluation.* Instead of a competitive grants mechanism, it was considered whether Australia could select organisations to fund directly and improve their effectiveness and documentation of lessons learned through conducting quality M&E on the individual activities. This would have been a simpler model to implement and may have been appropriate for a three year program. But it would preclude funding of activities conducted by communities rather than organisations. It was considered that over 10 years we can expect more effective results by facilitating communities to decide themselves what activities should be funded (whether conducted by organisations or community groups) and encouraging them to join up with other stakeholders.
4. *NGO Partnerships.* Australia currently funds the Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Agreement (SINPA) which supports five Solomon Islands NGOs and their Australian counterparts to improve health and livelihood opportunities in rural communities. SINPA is nearing completion and may be redesigned in 2015. A specific objective of preventing violence against women in any new NGO partnership program was considered. One of the benefits of SINPA is the community of practice which SINPA has created, through bringing all the partners together to learn from each other's experience in community development and jointly monitor progress. This could be the formation for a coalition to work on family violence. However, the efficiencies in combining management were considered to be outweighed by the uncertainty in the future of SINPA, the risk of family violence prevention being sidelined in favour of other objectives, the risk of weakening the SINPA community of practice by extending it too quickly to other stakeholders at a provincial level and the difficulty in focussing activities in two provinces only.
5. *Church partnerships.* Given the influence and networks of the five main churches in Solomon Islands, partnerships with churches were considered. Research indicates that while churches are

very important in any change process, churches alone are not effective in changing behaviour of individuals and communities. For example, Australia's work with churches in PNG has shown that good outcomes can be achieved for example in service delivery, but progress towards reducing family violence has not been made. Respondents to the consultations also said that many church leaders emphasise forgiveness and reconciliation and reinforce the man as the head of the family rather than work to prevent family violence. Accordingly, it was decided that Australia should work with churches and others. Collaborating with church leaders is likely to be a necessary component of effective activities at the individual, community and enabling environment levels and this will be encouraged as part of the community level support, alongside support to other activities.

6. *Government partnerships.* Australia's primary partner is the Government of Solomon Islands and Australian sector programs work in partnership with the Ministries of Health, Education and Justice, and the Police amongst others, all of whom have some responsibilities to act to prevent family violence. But given limited evidence of the national government being able to impact on changes in behaviour at the community level, working solely through sector programs is too blunt an instrument to approach family violence. However, sector Ministries are important in influencing the enabling environment and working with Australian sector programs to influence relevant Government Ministries is a key part of the proposed model.

Given that these more straightforward implementation options are considered unsuitable to achieve results in this program, the implementation model proposed is complex. Several implementers will be needed to achieve the program's objectives. This complexity means that management of implementation needs to be taken seriously and properly resourced.

Annex 5. Rationale for proposed selected provinces

Given the need to work for a critical mass to achieve change in social issues in Solomon Islands this program will initially be concentrated in two locations.

On the basis of current information and recommendations from people consulted, components 1 and 2 could commence in Choiseul and Malaita provinces, with some supporting work in Isabel, although this choice can be revisited in the first phase of implementation if the context changes.

i. Choiseul

Choiseul is one of the smallest provinces in population, has strong community structures and has a significant amount of community development activity.

The provincial government is well organised and coordinated on some issues and is committed to supporting activity at the community level. For example, the Ministry of Agriculture's Extension Officers support activities of various established women's groups across the province. The Police provide family violence awareness training to communities, with some talks facilitated by Save the Children. There is a Choiseul multi-stakeholder group on climate change¹⁹ chaired by the Provincial Secretary which coordinates and supports climate change adaptation activities at the community level. The Premier has just been re-elected so there is some stability at the political leadership level. While the Premier is not actively supporting family violence prevention action, he was receptive to the design team's visit and facilitated access to stakeholders.

There is significant coordination between provincial level stakeholders, although sharing of boats for travel to communities is not routine. Police in Choiseul have started to talk to Police in Isabel about their Alliance against Family Violence and whether Choiseul police could also access the RAMSI boat to travel to do community awareness on family violence.

Several well-organised NGOs are active in the province, including Save the Children, Live and Learn, The Nature Conservancy, Apheda and Kastom Garden Association. Most activities are centred on livelihoods, conservation and youth activities. This influences the number of active and mobilised communities, many with trained community facilitators.

The strongest local organisation is the Luru Land Conference of Tribal Community, formed in 1981, which works mainly on land and cultural issues. It brings together church and traditional leadership. It has an active women's program and operates rural training centres. It trains chiefs in *kastom* issues.

Like Isabel, it is said that Choiseul people continue to have respect for traditional leaders and women are more active in decision-making. There is also an association of Choiseul elders in Honiara called Turituri Kaji which works to promote Choiseul's welfare and development.²⁰

Most people live on the coastal fringe making access possible by boat, although travel is very expensive. Most of the population belong to the United Church, with a smaller number belonging to the Catholic and Seventh Day Adventist Churches. Most women's groups are church groups and the churches remain a focus of community activities.

¹⁹ Climate Change Adaptation Program (CHICAP)

²⁰ AusAID, *Solomon Islands Smallholder Agriculture Study*, 2006

ii. Malaita

Malaita contains the highest incidence of family violence (because it is the most populated province with around 27 per cent of the population). It also has some solid governance structures²¹ and some strong leaders.

Kwaso (distilled alcohol made of yeast, sugar and water) is frequently consumed in Malaita, especially north Malaita (ironically partly because there are no licenses to sell beer there). Marijuana is also common especially in east Kwaio and east and west 'Are'are. Substance abuse is often a trigger for violence.

Malaita has strict *kastom* rules surrounding relations between men and women. Violation of these rules can result in immediate demand for compensation. A married woman who leaves her house to avoid family violence or who even just speaks about it is seen to bring shame on her husband and the woman may be required to pay compensation for inflicting this shame. (But for an unmarried woman involved in a premarital liaison, the 'affronted' woman's brothers may claim compensation.)²²

Maasina Rule, a local movement that formed to protest colonial rule in Malaita from 1940s, strove to set up an island-wide hierarchical system of chiefs, customary courts and councils.²³ As a result, traditional structures are stronger in some parts of Malaita than in many other provinces (although structures do vary across the province).²⁴ These structures can exclude women, but this is not always the case. For example west Kwaio, in central Malaita, is known as one of the most socially conservative areas of Solomon Islands, but it has two women chiefs.²⁵ This reflects a broader acceptance by communities in west Kwaio of the leadership role of women – men support the women chiefs' leadership role and acknowledge they are better at handling women's issues. Youth have also reported that they find it easier to approach the women chiefs to resolve issues than the male chiefs (who assume they are troublemakers). One of the wards in west Kwaio has also elected a woman as their provincial member (one of two wards in Malaita to have done so).²⁶

Importantly for this program, this commitment to local structures does not translate into a current rejection of government – in fact there is a call for a more proactive state presence at the community level in Malaita.²⁷ There is dissatisfaction with current levels and standards of state

²¹ The strength of governance structures vary across the province.

²² Allen, Dinnen, Evans and Monson, *Justice Delivered Locally: Systems, Challenges and Innovations in Solomon Islands*, World Bank Justice for the Poor Research Report, August 2013

²³ It also tried to codify *kastom* law (which was actually a mix of *kastom* principles, state law and Christian doctrine)

²⁴ There is often a distinction in Malaita between tribal chiefs (who handle land and *kastom* issues) and village chiefs (who handle community governance, eg for development projects), Allen, Dinnen, Evans and Monson, *Justice Delivered Locally: Systems, Challenges and Innovations in Solomon Islands*, World Bank Justice for the Poor Research Report, August 2013.

²⁵ In addition to being involved in land disputes and being holders of *kastom* knowledge, they deal with serious offenses involving women, including sexual assault, Allen, Dinnen, Evans and Monson, *Justice Delivered Locally: Systems, Challenges and Innovations in Solomon Islands*, World Bank Justice for the Poor Research Report, August 2013.

²⁶ Allen, Dinnen, Evans and Monson, *Justice Delivered Locally: Systems, Challenges and Innovations in Solomon Islands*, World Bank Justice for the Poor Research Report, August 2013

²⁷ Allen, Dinnen, Evans and Monson, *Justice Delivered Locally: Systems, Challenges and Innovations in Solomon Islands*, World Bank Justice for the Poor Research Report, August 2013

service delivery, particularly policing. Less than 6 per cent of RSIPF staff are located in Malaita even though it has over a quarter of the population.²⁸ There are significant performance issues in relation to policing but a new provincial police commander is likely to be appointed in 2014 which may open opportunities for reform.

Further, there is a drive to decentralise government from the provincial capital, Auki, to five regional governing zones. This would include devolution of government service delivery and the establishment of councils to advise the provincial government on regional issues and make bylaws for civil and 'cultural' cases.²⁹ This flux and energy provides potential entry points for engagement with local community structures.

The population is dispersed throughout the island including in the hinterland, but the roads and boat networks although poor are better than other provinces. Many Malaitan men have traditionally migrated to other islands, especially Guadalcanal, leaving women to bring up the children and produce the food. Today, Malaitans make up the majority of the Honiara population and travel between Honiara and Malaita is frequent. Although this program is focusing on provincial areas, progress towards change in Malaita may have the added benefit of promoting change in Honiara. And it follows that Honiara-based programs may have indirect benefits for Malaita.

Church leaders tend to exercise less authority than chiefs at the community level in Malaita, particularly in relation to handling disputes. Most Malaitans belong to the South Sea Evangelical Church, followed by Church of Melanesia and the Catholic Church. There is a much smaller number of Seventh Day Adventists. There is a link between the number of denominations present in a community and conflict levels – for example, west Are'are which has members of five denominations showed the greatest level of community conflict and discord in recent World Bank research.³⁰

There are a number of NGOs operating in Malaita including the Adventist Development Relief Agency, Family Planning Australia, *Kastom* Garden Association, Oxfam, Red Cross, Save the Children and World Vision International. There are also several rural training centres in Malaita.

²⁸ Allen, Dinnen, Evans and Monson, *Justice Delivered Locally: Systems, Challenges and Innovations in Solomon Islands*, World Bank Justice for the Poor Research Report, August 2013

²⁹ The proposed decentralisation policy is outlined in 'Summary of the Alliance for Reform, Change and Regional Development Government Policy Statement' of May 2011 prepared by the Policy, Planning and Management Unit of Malaita province.

³⁰ Allen, Dinnen, Evans and Monson, *Justice Delivered Locally: Systems, Challenges and Innovations in Solomon Islands*, World Bank Justice for the Poor Research Report, August 2013

Annex 6. Cooperation with sector programs

The Safe Families program will work closely with the Australian government sector programs in Solomon Islands to reinforce the work being undertaken in those programs to support gender equality. As an example of this work, Australia has recruited a Senior Social Development Adviser in Solomon Islands to assist the sector programs to improve their gender outcomes. Cooperation will focus on the following areas:

i. Health

Australia is the lead donor to the health sector and its health program provides about 40 per cent of the Ministry of Health and Medical Services' annual budget. Part of Australia's budget support is earmarked to support the Ministry's SAFENET and EAW coordinator. The program engages in regular high level policy dialogue on health issues and supports the Ministry's Health Management Information System. An assessment on gender equality and social inclusion in the health sector is planned for 2014 which will include analysing why women and girl survivors of violence are not accessing quality health services and recommendations for Australia and Solomon Islands government to strengthen the health response to gender based violence. The Ministry has protocols for how health workers should respond to cases of family violence but has not yet rolled out training or other management processes to improve health workers' response to family violence.

The Senior Social Development Adviser will help the health program to ensure that policy dialogue messages and the Ministry's and program's M&E and other analysis and the family violence program are mutually reinforcing. The Adviser will help the program to track progress of the Ministry in implementing its SAFENET and own GBV health policy and protocols and make policy dialogue recommendations accordingly. The Adviser will ensure that lessons and information from the family violence program, for example on how the health system is serving or failing to serve survivors, is provided to the health program to include in policy discussions with the Ministry.

ii. Law and Justice

Australia's law and justice program works primarily with state institutions³¹ to assist courts and justice agencies to better deliver services and better manage their financial and human resources. It also works to strengthen laws and policies and funds a policy officer in MWYCFA who is working on family violence laws and policies, including the *Family Protection Bill*. It also aims to extend the delivery of justice services to rural communities. One activity is funding the World Bank's Justice for the Poor's proposed Community Governance and Grievance Management Project which will support the Ministry of Provincial Government and Institutional Strengthening's pilot program to place community officers at the village level to assist local authorities to address conflicts and disputes and to facilitate links with the state. This will likely start in mid-2014 in two provinces – Isabel and Makira - with extension to two more provinces anticipated.

The Australian Federal Police, under the Participating Police Force in RAMSI, provides training and other support to develop the Royal Solomon Islands Police Force into a highly effective, modern and professional police force. One aim is that by 2017 the RSIPF will be able to respond to existing and

³¹ Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs; Ministry of Police, National Security and Correctional Services; National Judiciary; Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (O/DPP); Public Solicitor's Office (PSO); Attorney-General's Chambers; Correctional Services of Solomon Islands (CSSI); and the Police Prosecutions Directorate (PPD)

emerging community based crime threats effectively and efficiently. RAMSI's PPF continues to support provincial police posts through a mentoring program, communications and logistical support, police housing and station refurbishments. The PPF is also assisting the RSIPF to develop community crime prevention programs and strengthen community policing in rural and isolated communities.

Both the RSIPF and the Public Solicitor's office are members of SAFENET and have obligations to coordinate services to survivors of family violence.

The Senior Social Development Adviser will help the law and justice program to ensure that policy dialogue messages and the Ministry's and program's M&E and other analysis and the family violence program are mutually reinforcing. They will also ensure that lessons and information from the family violence program, for example on how the justice system is serving or failing to serve survivors, is provided to the law and justice program to include in policy discussions with the Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs other justice institutions. They will also engage with the PPF, particularly its support to the Family Violence Unit and Community Policing to ensure Australia's efforts are mutually reinforcing.

iii. Education

Australia provides budget support to the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development to improve learning outcomes especially literacy and numeracy. The Ministry is rolling out a new curriculum for primary and secondary schools. The social science subject includes a family violence module which includes case studies and scenarios to give children tools to make decisions and take action to cope with the problem. The curriculum should be fully operational in 2015 in both state and church schools. Education Authorities will be trained in how to implement the new curriculum but it is up to them to resource the training of in-service teachers.

The Senior Social Development Adviser will help the education program to ensure that policy dialogue messages and the Ministry's and program's M&E and other analysis and the family violence program are mutually reinforcing. They will help the program to track progress in the Ministry's implementation of its new curriculum module on family violence and make policy dialogue recommendations accordingly. They will ensure that lessons and information from the family violence program, for example on how schools are handling or could handle cases of family violence, is provided to the education program to include in policy discussions with the Ministry.

iv. Economic development

Australia's support to sustainable economic development in rural areas includes support for communities to make more productive and sustainable use of resources and enable more people to access financial services.

The Senior Social Development Adviser will help the economic development program to ensure that policy dialogue messages and the program's M&E and other analysis supports and the family violence program are mutually reinforcing. They will help the economic development program and the family violence to make relevant connections in the target provinces.

v. Community programs

Australia's Solomon Islands NGO Partnership Program (SINPA) supports five local NGOs together with their Australian counterparts to improve health and livelihood opportunities. This program will be redesigned in 2015.

The Senior Social Development Adviser will help to make sure that the new SINPA program is set up to enable lessons on effective community level work to be shared between the community and family violence programs.

Annex 7. Proposed approach to implement component 1 on community activities

Australia proposes to contract the implementation of component 1 to an organisation through a competitive grants process. The Implementer will work closely with PLP and the Hub. The Implementer will need to demonstrate how they will ensure Solomon Island leadership of the program and activities and provide support to this leadership as appropriate. Based on the research conducted for the design, a detailed proposal for how component 1 could be implemented follows. Applications under the competitive grants process can use this as a guide but are invited to propose changes to make implementation more effective through the competitive grants process.

i. Local conversations

The Implementer would run the local conversations process and provide support to activities based on the results.

The Implementer would conduct a series of local conversations in the target provinces. A 'local conversations' approach aims to promote productive working relationships between organisations and between levels (provincial down to community level). Individuals and organisations working on family violence or related issues at the community level would be invited to come together to discuss the cause of family violence in their communities, what needs to be done to prevent family violence and who is best placed to do it and hence receive support. This way all actors would have a stake in the decisions made collectively and the approach would start to develop recognition of a community of interest such that consensus is built across groups on priorities and the benefits of working together.³² The advantage of this approach includes fostering joint ownership and action from the start of the program rather than forming the relationship with the program around applying for scarce funding. This would also further the aims of coalition component 2.

It is expected that these conversations would happen at the ward level. There are 14 wards in Choiseul and 33 wards in Malaita. The selection of locations would be made by the Implementer in consultation with PLP and the DFAT Gender Program Manager. The selection should balance the need to test approaches in locations with different characteristics and a preference for working in places where communities are actively engaged in community activities. In a large province such as Malaita, the selection may be based in one geographic area due to the need to encourage a critical mass of activity. It is expected that each conversation would take place over two or three days.

It is important that the conversations are inclusive to mitigate the risk of backlash and fostering competition between actors instead of encouraging actors to work together. Local networks should be utilised to ensure interest from a broad range of organisations working or intending to work in the target provinces. The aim is not to reach all citizens in a province, but to reach a range of beneficiaries (including women, men, children, youth and the disabled) and foster a broad range of approaches to preventing family violence so that a variety of approaches can be tested and lessons learned applied more broadly. The Implementer should have in-depth discussions with People With Disability Solomon Islands (PWDSI) - the only disability focused NGO operating in the country – early in implementation to ensure the program is sufficiently supporting women with disability. PLP would also assist in ensuring the inclusiveness of the local conversations run by the Implementer by using their networks.

³² Harris, *PNG: A Nation in Waiting, The dance of traditional and introduced structures in a putative state*, 2007

The local conversations would need to be conducted cognisant of lessons learned both internationally and in Solomon Islands with respect to successful community development approaches, as outlined in Annex 3. These lessons include: including local leaders, fostering ownership among community members such as by using a strength based approach, anticipating backlash against women and moving at communities' own pace. The Implementer would need to support local actors involved in the local conversations to develop and articulate their ideas in writing and develop and use networks without detracting from community ownership.

ii. Community activities

It is expected that the local conversations would generate a wide range of ideas that are likely to cover the spectrum of primary and secondary and tertiary preventative approaches. It is expected therefore that proposed activities would focus not only on efforts to make family violence less acceptable, but also to protect and serve women and children survivors. Activities may be new or extensions of existing activities. Activities involving children should be encouraged given the intergenerational nature of the transmission of violence in Solomon Islands. Australia's *Child Protection Policy* will apply to any activities involving or impacting upon children.

The Implementer would need to help communities not only to articulate and develop their ideas for activities, but may also need to provide ongoing support to help them implement their activities. The Implementer would seek to encourage:

1. Organisations or groups to join with other local actors in the implementation of their activities at the community level
2. Organisations or groups to link with other activities and partners at the provincial level
3. Organisations or groups wanting to participate in and contribute to learning and to being subjected to rigorous monitoring and evaluation conducted by the program.

Following the local conversations, the Implementer could decide to (1) support activities directly and/or (2) provide grants to groups with sufficient capacity to manage the funds. If there are insufficient funds available to support all activities which are proposed through the local conversations, the Implementer would make the final decision on priorities taking into account the following principles as appropriate:

- At least one supported activity in each 'local conversation' location
- Encouraging communities to prioritise activities themselves
- Ensuring transparency and accountability in all decisions
- Consultation with PLP and Honiara Post.

For (1), it is expected that direct support for activities could include logistical costs such as transport, communications and venue hire, and training.

For (2), grants could be made to NGOs, churches or other civil society or private sector groups with sufficient capacity to manage the funds. In addition to financial capacity, any organisations receiving direct financial support would need to demonstrate a number of attributes including:

1. Demonstrated understanding of family violence and other family issues
2. Focus on working to prevent family violence or an activity which will clearly contribute to family violence prevention at the community level in one or more target locations. Grantees

may be involved in broader activities, such as pastor training or livelihoods activities but they would need to be able to show a clear link between their activities and prevention of family violence

3. Effective relationships at the local level or demonstrated ability to create and use those relationships
4. Willingness and capacity to be part of rigorous monitoring and evaluation conducted by the program and to use this information to improve performance and enhance learning
5. A minimum level of organisational identity and structure which identifies the people (including women) responsible for the activity
6. Community support for the proposed activities.

iii. Coalition activities

As discussed in Annex 8 on component 2, it is expected that the coalitions would agree on activities to support their objectives. Where such activities require funding it may be more efficient and effective for the Implementer to manage the provision and oversight of these funds.

The following table details the above proposed approach.

Table 1: Indicative process for local conversations and community activities to prevent family violence

Step	Action	Implementer Role	Resources / Support	Timing
1	<p>In conjunction with PLP, undertake Baseline Analysis in each Program location (at provincial and sub-provincial levels) to establish knowledge and understanding of context in relation to prevalence, attitudes towards, services available for and stakeholders currently engaged in family violence issues.</p> <p>This would help confirm selection of local conversations locations and inform initial engagement under components 1 and 2; and provide a starting point for ongoing M&E and learning under component 3.</p>	<p>Develop Terms of Reference for Baseline Analysis, to ensure Analysis adequately addresses issues of cultural, political and structural factors impacting on family violence in each location, as well as analysis of stakeholder behaviours and incentives.</p> <p>Implement the baseline analysis according to the TOR</p> <p>Provide concise and accessible reports of the findings of the analysis</p>	<p>Locally engaged Facilitators in each province working closely with component 2 PLP Brokers</p>	<p>Month 1-3</p>
2	<p>Recruit locally engaged Facilitator in each province to provide dedicated support to local conversations and activity development and implementation and Financial Officer in each province to provide and oversee activity funding.</p> <p>The Facilitator would work closely with the component 2 Broker in each province.</p>	<p>Undertake identification and contracting of staff in consultation with Australian aid program (Honiara Post) and PLP Country Representative.</p> <p>Manage and support the staff</p>	<p>Recruitment costs and salaries</p>	<p>Month 1-4</p>
3	<p>Conduct local conversations in Choiseul and Malaita to discuss problems and solutions and come to consensus on funding priorities</p> <p>This would be informed by the Baseline Analysis in each location (above).</p>	<p>Facilitator in each province leads and manages the local conversations in that province. Facilitators would work closely with the PLP Brokers to identify influential champions and ensure that conversations are inclusive.</p>	<p>Locally engaged Facilitators in each province working closely with component 2 PLP Brokers</p>	<p>Month 3-8</p>

Step	Action	Implementer Role	Resources / Support	Timing
4	Provide and oversee funding to activities and/or organisations	Financial Officer in each province in conjunction with Facilitator and with oversight from the Implementer	Locally engaged Financial Officers in each province	Month 8-36
5	Maintain support to communities implementing agreed activities during implementation and assist in documenting and analysing progress and learnings in each Program location in conjunction with components 1 and 2.	Facilitator and Financial Officer in each province would maintain regular contact and offer advice and amend financial support if necessary.	Locally engaged Facilitators and Financial Officers in each province	Month 8-36
6	Application of the iterative approach: learning by doing, and taking time out to reflect on what has happened, (what worked? what didn't? what have we learned? where to from here?) and contribute to planning next phase of action at community and province level.	Participation in reflection and redevelopment workshops at agreed intervals (every 6-12 months, depending on pace of implementation). Assessment of progress against Baseline Analysis (Step 1), with support from specialist expertise under component 3.	Locally engaged Facilitators and Specialist M&E/ Action Research expertise sourced through Pacific Women Hub under component 3.	Month 3-36
7	Provide and oversee funding to coalition activities agreed to under component 2	Financial Officer in each province in conjunction with PLP component 2 Facilitator/Broker and with oversight from the Implementer.	Locally engaged Financial Officers with component 2 PLP Brokers	Month 8-36

iv. Management and Coordination

The grant agreement with the Implementer would be managed by the DFAT Gender Team. The Implementer will be required to coordinate with PLP and the M&E Implementer.

- **Links to components 2 and 3**

Implementation across all three components must be well coordinated and integrated from the outset. This will minimise stakeholder confusion when interacting with different components, maximise opportunities for collaboration and information sharing, and ensure a streamlined and unified approach.

However, given the areas of overlap between all three components – such as sourcing of M&E and coordinating local conversations and coalition activities – it will also be important to establish clear protocols and processes to determine the respective responsibilities and accountabilities for implementers under each component. The DFAT Honiara gender team will facilitate the implementers to agree to these protocols and processes early in implementation.

It is anticipated that component 1 and 2 would mobilise simultaneously, or very close together, so that early lessons and trends emerging from the ‘local conversations’ under component 1 can be tracked and developed, where appropriate through the coalition building activities under component 2. It is proposed that personnel engaged to work directly with communities and coalitions under each component (i.e. the Facilitator, Financial Officer and PLP Broker) would be co-located in an office at the provincial level to ensure they work very closely together from the early stages of implementation. The costs of the office and its equipment would be shared by the components. Depending on the availability of suitably qualified people to undertake the Facilitator, Financial Officer and Broker roles, arrangements for resource and personnel sharing may need to be agreed. Implementers must be mindful to avoid competition between components 1 and 2 for suitably qualified people and to present a united front to stakeholders at the community and provincial levels.

- **Links to Australian aid program**

Because of the different management arrangements in place for each component, it is important to establish clear and consistent messaging and representation of the Safe Families program as a unified Australian aid initiative.

While practical delivery arrangements would be confirmed at component level in consultation with the respective support implementers for PLP and components 1 and 3, Honiara Post will play an important oversight and coordination role on the Program. This will ensure lessons are being effectively captured and shared across components, as well as being fed into Australia’s other investments (e.g. Health and Education sectors). Honiara Post will also be responsible for scheduling and commissioning independent Program reviews and other program evaluations under component 3.

The frequency of formal and informal communication between the Implementer and Post would be determined by the pace of implementation at different program locations, and is likely to be adjusted from time to time.

v. Personnel

▪ Facilitators

Working with communities is a resource intensive approach requiring sustained engagement and support. A critical factor in the successful implementation of component 1 will be the identification and engagement of a suitably qualified local Facilitator in each province.

The Facilitator would be the primary point of contact for communities and activity implementers on all aspects of component 1 implementation, including facilitating local conversations; supporting prioritisation processes; identifying and fulfilling resource requirements (with support from the Financial Officer); and maintaining links with component 2 and 3 activities.

The Facilitators would need the following expertise and characteristics:

- Well connected with existing networks and ability to tap into others' networks in the province and nationally
- Demonstrated understanding of gender, children's and family violence issues
- Experience facilitating community workshops and ability to explain complex concepts in plain language
- Demonstrated commitment to integrity, accountability and transparency
- Proactive, respected leader with authority in their community
- Ability to navigate big man and local politics
- Ability to assess the strength of activity ideas, people's ability to manage them and the likelihood of achieving measurable results
- Ability to help local actors develop their ideas, articulate them in writing and implement them without detracting from local ownership.
- Pidgin language skills (native speaker level) and high level written and spoken English (this might be facilitated through management support from the implementing agency). Working knowledge of local dialects would be very desirable.

Recruitment of a Facilitator in each province should commence at the start of program implementation (months 1- 3). This would ensure close engagement with key stakeholders including component 2 personnel from the start.

There is a significant risk that the unique technical and person specifications of the Facilitators will be difficult to find in each province. The Implementer should be mindful of the risks involved in 'poaching' key stakeholders working in the area of family violence (who might otherwise be active activity implementers or coalition members) and competing with PLP for personnel. The Implementer and PLP may need to assess the market in each location and, if necessary, devise alternative approaches to recruitment and management of staff. This could include joint recruitment with PLP or a mentoring arrangement.

More than one Facilitator may be required in Malaita. Given its size, both geographically and in terms of population, and depending upon the number of sub-provincial locations in which the program seeks to work, it may be appropriate to recruit a small team of two or three Facilitators, who can focus on specific constituencies or areas in that province.

▪ **Financial Officers**

The Financial Officers would be required to ensure money reaches its intended recipients and purpose in an efficient way which still meets Australian Government financial requirements.

The Financial Officers in each province would need the following expertise and characteristics:

- Experience in managing grants to organisations and funding community activities in areas without banking facilities
- Experience in assessing financial capacity of organisations
- Experience in assessing and managing fiduciary risk
- Demonstrated commitment to integrity, accountability and transparency
- Ability to work as part of a small team
- Ability to implement in accordance with the Australian Government's financial requirements.

Recruitment of a Financial Officer in each province should commence at the start of program implementation (months 1-3). This would ensure close engagement with key stakeholders including the Facilitator from the start.

▪ **Implementer's Country Representative**

The Implementer's Country Representative would be responsible for overseeing and providing day-to-day support to all activities and personnel under component 1. The Representative would have primary responsibility for communications with the Honiara Post and for financial accountability.

vi. Financial management and controls

The Implementer would be financially accountable for spending of Commonwealth funds. Funding arrangements would need to comply with Australian Government policies and guidelines on funding for external organisations. These policies include requirements for due diligence, transparency, accountability and child protection.

Annex 8. Draft competitive grants program guidelines for component 1

It is recommended that the following information be used as a basis for inclusion in the program specific guidelines to implement the competitive grants process to select the Implementer for component 1. This information follows DFAT Guideline and Template for Establishment and Administration of a Competitive Grants Program but has not been cleared by Canberra. The Design Document (including Annexes) should be attached.

i. Operational objectives

The Let's Make our Families Safe program (the Safe Families program) aims to prevent family violence in Solomon Islands. This is the first three year phase of a 10 year program with action at community and provincial levels, starting in two provinces, and expanding over time across Solomon Islands. The goal for this program is that family violence is no longer considered acceptable behaviour in Solomon Islands. The main indicator of success will be a reduction in the incidence of family violence.

The program will contribute to this goal through focus on the following objectives:

By the end of the first three years of the program:

- In targeted provinces women report that they have options for dealing with family violence when it occurs and that their communities have strategies to prevent family violence.
- Service providers in targeted provinces are now identifying and responding to victims of family and sexual violence.

By the end of six years of program implementation:

- In targeted provinces men and women no longer consider violence to be acceptable in family relationships.
- Action to prevent family and sexual violence is being taken beyond the initial two provinces targeted in this program.

The program consists of three components:

1. Support to existing and new community activities to prevent family violence
2. Facilitation of coalition activity at the provincial level
3. Rigorous monitoring and evaluation.

The Grantee will implement Component (1) above but will be expected to contribute to the activities of (2) and (3). Component (2) will be implemented by the Pacific Leadership Program (PLP).

ii. Organisation eligibility criteria

Applications are open to all Australian accredited NGOs. Consortiums, for example with companies or Solomon Islands NGOs, are eligible.

iii. Activity eligibility criteria

Proposals must detail how the Grantee would implement Component 1, as detailed in the Design Document. Under this component the Grantee would provide direct financial and other support to communities in two provinces in Solomon Islands to conduct activities to prevent family violence.

Decisions on what should be supported should be made locally and collectively such as through a 'local conversations' approach, described in the Design Document (including Annexes).

At a minimum, the Grantee will describe how they would bring together individuals and organisations working on family violence or related issues at the community level and other leaders to discuss causes of family violence in their communities, what needs to be done to prevent family violence and who is best placed to do it and hence receive support. The Grantee will demonstrate how they would facilitate these individuals and organisations to reach a consensus and develop an appreciation of the benefits of working together. Based on this consensus, the Grantee will demonstrate how they would provide support to groups to conduct activities to prevent family violence, including funding. Where funding is provided to an organisation, the Grantee will show how they would ensure compliance with Australian requirements, including requirements for due diligence, transparency, accountability and child protection.

The Grantee will show how they would seek to encourage:

1. Organisations or groups to join with other local actors in the implementation of their activities at the community level
2. Organisations or groups to link with other activities and partners at the provincial level
3. Organisations or groups wanting to participate in and contribute to learning and who agree to being subjected to rigorous monitoring and evaluation conducted by the Safe Families program.

The Grantee must demonstrate strong community development skills applicable to the Solomon Islands context and explain who or how suitable staff at the provincial level would be recruited. The Grantee must propose how they would work with PLP implementing component 2 on coalitions and the contractor implementing component 3 on M&E.

Proposals may include salaries and costs for staff in Honiara and in the two target provinces, office costs, equipment related to community assistance activities, workshop costs and travel costs and allowances for staff and communities. Proposals must not exceed AUD 1,000,000 per year for three years.

iv. Safeguard and cross-cutting issues

Proposals must include the Grantee's approach to 'do no harm' and protect women, to including people with disabilities, to child protection and to minimising fiduciary risk.

v. Reporting and acquittal requirements

Six monthly reports and acquittals on activities and expenditure including of community activities funded submitted electronically in Microsoft Word. The Grantee would also contribute to reporting led by the contractor implementing component 3 on M&E.

vi. Activity proposal format

DFAT's standard template for a one-step selection process could be used as a basis for information supporting the proposal. Significant detail should be encouraged in the proposal.

vii. Assessment criteria

Proposals will be assessed based on:

1. Strength of community development approach – 25%
2. Strength of approach to financial management of component and community activities – 20%
3. Experience in operating in Melanesian or similar context – 10%
4. Demonstration of how local leadership will be promoted – 10%
5. Approach to safeguards and cooperation with other components – 20%
6. Value for money – 15%

viii. Proposal assessment process

Assessment will be a one-step process, so a full proposal must be submitted for assessment. The assessment panel will include representatives from DFAT, Solomon Islands Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs and a Solomon Islands representative with gender and community development experience.

DFAT's *Complaints Handling Procedures Relating to Procurement and Grant Funding Administration* will apply.

ix. Operational procedures

Roles and responsibilities of the Grantee vis-a-vis the implementers of components 2 and 3 and DFAT are detailed in the Design Document.

x. Dates of funding round

The funding round will aim to open in February 2014 and close 45 days later. Applicants will be advised within six weeks of the closing date.

Annex 9. Proposed approach to implement component 2 on coalitions

Australia proposes that component 2 (*Facilitation of coalition action*) be implemented by the Pacific Leadership Program (PLP). Based in Suva, PLP is a regional initiative of the Australian aid program that supports Pacific leaders to shape and lead development change. The Program works at a regional level, and nationally and sub-nationally through country programs in Solomon Islands, Samoa, Tonga and Vanuatu.

PLP identifies influential individuals, organisations and coalitions in the Pacific and supports them in their exercise of ‘developmental leadership’ – that is, leadership involving collective efforts to bring about inclusive and durable changes (in behaviours, policies and institutions) for the public good. PLP also invests in sharing lessons and building knowledge of Pacific developmental leadership.

This Annex provides the proposed approach to implement component 2 and can be used by the DFAT Honiara Post gender team to negotiate with the DFAT Pacific Women team in Suva regular tasking notes for PLP.

i. Why coalitions?

Coalitions are an important mechanism for overcoming the pervasive collective action problems that define most development challenges.³³ PLP understands coalitions to be alliances or groupings of individuals and/or organisations working together on a particular development problem or issue that they cannot address on their own. Coalition members bring different capabilities, resources, and social and political ‘capital’ to the coalition, which contributes to the achievement of shared objectives. Coalition members are primarily accountable to themselves and their communities, and are collectively responsible for determining the work and direction of the group as a whole.

PLP’s approach to component 2 will be informed by lessons from implementation in Solomon Islands and other Pacific Island countries, and evidence from leadership and development literature, which confirms that:

- Family violence in Solomon Islands is underpinned by a complex interaction of cultural, political, economic and other factors; and these factors will vary between different provinces and communities;
- Pervasive development issues like family violence are more likely to be addressed when individuals, groups or organisations come together and share knowledge and resources, rather than working in isolation;
- Legitimate and durable change is most possible when local leaders and stakeholders determine their own solutions – rather than imported or imposed ones – to priority development issues;
- Bringing about a shift in deeply ingrained attitudes and behaviours towards family violence in Solomon Islands will be a long term process, requiring sustained effort and support to local development actors.

³³ Adrian Leftwich and Chris Wheeler, *Politics, Leadership and Coalitions in Development: findings, insights and guidance from the DLP’s first research and policy workshop*, Frankfurt 10-11 March, 2011, p.8, *Developmental Leadership Program*, www.dlprog.org.

ii. Building and supporting coalitions

PLP's role in the implementation of component 2 will be as a *facilitator* and *supporter* of local coalitions or alliances to prevent family violence.³⁴ While the impetus and solutions to address the issue of family violence must be locally led, devised and owned, PLP, as an external agency, can play a valuable role in supporting coalitions by:

- Providing coalitions and other stakeholders with specific analytical and planning tools that can enhance their own understanding of the issue of family violence and ways this issue might be prevented, and facilitate a process of reflection and learning to inform ongoing implementation;
- Promoting communication, trust and collaboration between coalition members and other local stakeholders;
- Identifying synergies or opportunities in existing work that may be further improved or developed through a more coordinated or 'joined up' approach;
- Suggesting other stakeholders (such as poor, vulnerable or disabled women, or the private sector) who may be otherwise overlooked, that may bring diversity and value to the work of the coalition;
- Linking local level coalitions to provincial, national and regional level efforts to address family violence, and drawing lessons from these to inform local work;
- Providing tailored resources – such as advice, brokering, mentoring, research, specific technical assistance, and in some instances funds – to enable coalitions to build on exiting work or trial new approaches or initiatives; and
- Facilitating links between coalition members and activities and component 1 and 3 activities (refer *Links to components 1 and 3*, following).

Component 1 activities will provide a useful starting point for stakeholders to come together and identify priorities and arrangements for working collectively. However, where coalitions are not naturally forming, or are taking longer to form, PLP can assist with initial coalition building, by convening forums to bring stakeholders together; providing information and ideas about working collectively; and sharing examples of coalitions active in other locations.

iii. Coalition membership

The composition of the coalitions in each Program location should, to the greatest extent possible, be determined locally, by coalition members and other stakeholders working on family violence prevention. Several coalition members (e.g. chiefs, churches, women's groups and police) would already be active in this area and may be involved in implementing activities under component 1.

It is not the role of an external facilitator to select members, as this will undermine the internal cohesion and ownership of the coalition. However, as mentioned above, PLP can suggest potential members to assist the inclusivity of the group or take on the role of a 'critical friend' who is able to challenge the thinking of the group without undermining it.

iv. Coalition activities

Unlike traditional development projects and programs, coalitions are not provided with pre-designed inputs, activities or outputs. Instead, coalition members come together around a shared

³⁴ This action can include primary, secondary and tertiary prevention activities.

objective – in this case, the prevention of family violence – and collectively determine a course of action.

Because the issue of family violence is so complex, no single activity or intervention will be able to bring about durable change. However, the coalition will provide the space and opportunity for stakeholders to ‘join up’ or coordinate existing work; explore opportunities for scaling up certain initiatives (including component 1 initiatives); and pilot new interventions to address specific barriers or issues (e.g. legislative or policy change, or changing the attitudes of traditional leaders) that, cumulatively, can contribute to longer term institutional and behaviour change.

PLP’s locally engaged Broker will support the coalition to identify a range or series of interventions that draw on coalition resources and reach. Where additional resources are required – such as technical assistance, training, mentoring, funding or other support – these will be identified and provided by PLP. Support for coalition activities will be flexible to allow the coalition to take advantage of opportunities as they arise, and to build on changing behaviours and attitudes. A staged, iterative approach to activity implementation will also allow the coalition, with PLP support, to reflect and learn from activities as they are implemented, including documenting these lessons, before determining its next move.

v. Process for coalition support

An indicative process for building and supporting coalitions under component 2 is summarised in Table 1 (following). These activities and timeframes will be adapted to meet the specific requirements and conditions in the selected provinces.

The pace at which initial activities are devised and implemented under component 1 will be an important factor. As coalitions depend upon local leadership and commitment to drive them, timeframes are expected to vary from location to location and will be highly dependent upon a range of local conditions, including leadership and incentives structures, cultural norms, and geography.

The provision of support under component 2 will also depend upon the sequencing of activities under component 1, in particular whether activities in each province are implemented concurrently or one province after the other; as well as the number of program locations selected for each province.

Table 1: Indicative process for building and supporting coalitions for prevention of family violence

Step	Action	PLP Role	Resources / Support	Timing
1	In conjunction with component 1 Implementer, undertake Baseline Analysis in each Program location (at provincial and sub-provincial levels) to establish knowledge and understanding of context in relation to prevalence, attitudes towards, services available for and stakeholders currently engaged in family violence issues. This will help confirm selection of Program locations; inform initial engagement under components 1 and 2; and provide a starting point for ongoing M&E and learning under component 3.	Develop or contribute to Terms of Reference for Baseline Analysis, to ensure Analysis adequately addresses issues of cultural, political and structural factors impacting on family violence in each location, as well as analysis of stakeholder behaviours and incentives.	Locally engaged Facilitators in each province working closely with component 2 PLP Brokers	Month 1-3
2	Recruit locally engaged Broker(s) to provide dedicated support to coalitions under component 2. This individual will work closely with the component 1 focal point(s) in each Program location and with support from the PLP SI Country Rep (Honiara) and Country Program Manager (Suva). Refer <i>Managing the coalition</i> , following.	Undertake identification and contracting of coalition broker(s) in consultation with Australian aid program (Honiara Post), PLP support contractor and focal point (individual or organisation) subcontracted to support component 1 implementation.	Recruitment costs and salary(ies)	Month 1-4
3	Initiate engagement with stakeholders , including service providers, women's and community groups, CSOs, business, churches, government representatives and key individuals/ leaders (male and female) currently working, or interested to work collaboratively, on family violence issues. This stage of the process will also focus on identifying influential champions within each Program location (such as pastors, chiefs, senior bureaucrats or even MPs) who can be coached and supported to help drive some of the reform initiatives undertaken by the coalition. This will be informed by the Baseline Analysis in each location (above).	Work with and through component 1 focal points. Initial engagement should 'piggy back' on Local conversations under component 1, but should also seek to identify other stakeholders <i>not</i> involved in component 1 activities (understanding why some stakeholders are not participating is also important).	Locally engaged PLP Broker(s) (where recruited) working closely with component 1 focal point(s). Supported by PLP SI Country Rep.	Month 1 -6

Step	Action	PLP Role	Resources / Support	Timing
4	<p>Maintain engagement with stakeholders during initial implementation of component 1 activities; and (where relevant) identification of nascent coalitions already beginning to form around family violence issues. Document and analyse early progress and learnings in each Program location.</p> <p>This ongoing engagement with, and monitoring/ analysis of stakeholder activities and interactions will build an understanding of the dynamics within each (potential) coalition, and help identify opportunities for collective action.</p>	<p>Where coalitions are not yet beginning to form, commence sensitisation of stakeholders (via focus groups, facilitated community forums) to concept of collective action/ coalitions, where possible drawing on early success and lessons from other Program locations.</p>	<p>As above. Additional expertise to be provided by PLP Research and Learning Specialist (Suva based) and/or M&E resources engaged under component 3.</p>	<p>Month 2 – 18 & ongoing</p>
5	<p>Convene initial stakeholder groups and coalitions to identify and agree on specific issue(s) they want to tackle or are already working on.</p> <p>This is the point at which a coalition is most likely to be formed (if not before), although the manner in which this occurs, and the time it takes, will vary from location to location. This stage in the process is critical and should not be rushed. It may require sustained effort and support on the part of the PLP Broker over several weeks or months before.</p>	<p>Facilitate an inclusive process of problem analysis and (building on/ informed by initial Baseline Analysis) assessment of current status quo in each Program location. Tools such as Political Economy Analysis (PEA), stakeholder and resource mapping (within coalition) may be applied in these cases. Support stakeholders to confirm suitable governance and decision making arrangements for the ongoing operation of the coalition (recognising that these may vary from location to location). This may include facilitation of agreement on priority work areas or criteria for supporting specific issues.</p>	<p>Locally engaged PLP Broker(s). Additional expertise provided by PLP Country Rep, PLP Suva, Pacific Women Hub or Honiara Post as required.</p>	<p>As above (timing will vary from location to location)</p>
6	<p>Support coalitions on agreed initiative(s) and action(s), and provide additional tools and assistance to progress, refine and reflect on work.</p>	<p>Where needed, provide discrete funding or other support (mentoring, training, research, TA etc) to supplement resources available within the coalition for activity implementation. Design and convene intensive workshop on PEA tools, stakeholder and resource mapping, coalition building, developmental leadership, and outcome mapping.</p>	<p>Locally engaged PLP Broker(s). Expertise provided by PLP Country Rep, PLP Suva, Pacific Women Hub or Honiara Post as required.</p>	<p>Month 2 -24 (timing will vary from location to location)</p>

Step	Action	PLP Role	Resources / Support	Timing
7	Ongoing support activities and develop ideas about how to communicate what the coalition is doing.	Provide Help desk/ongoing support to facilitate process under steps 5 – 7. As above, flexible resources will be provided to support coalition during ongoing implementation and learning.	Locally engaged PLP Broker(s). Expertise provided by PLP Country Rep, PLP Suva, Pacific Women Hub or Honiara Post as required.	Month 2 – 36 & ongoing
8	Application of the iterative approach: learning by doing, and taking time out to reflect on what has happened, (what worked? what didn't? what have we learned? where to from here?) and plan next phase of action.	Facilitation of reflection and redevelopment workshops at agreed intervals (every 6-12 months, depending on pace of implementation). Assessment of progress against Baseline (Step 1), with support from specialist expertise under component 3.	As above. Specialist M&E/ Action Research expertise to be sourced through Pacific Women Hub under component 3.	Month 2 – 36 & ongoing

vi. Management and Coordination

Successful implementation of component 2 will require a flexible yet robust approach to activity management. As coalition activities and timeframes cannot be predetermined, PLP's support processes must be nimble enough to respond to the emerging – and changing – needs of coalitions in each location, while still ensuring necessary controls over technical and financial resources.

Protocols for formal and informal coordination and communication between components and with key Program stakeholders will be confirmed and agreed with Honiara Post prior to mobilisation. These protocols will likely include periodic (quarterly) program coordination meetings, as well as routine and ad hoc reporting. However, this section outlines some suggested approaches to this matter, particularly in relation to component 2.

▪ Links to components 1 and 3

Implementation across all three components must be well coordinated and integrated from the outset. This will minimise stakeholder confusion when interacting with different components, maximise opportunities for collaboration and information sharing, and ensure a streamlined and unified approach.

However, given the areas of overlap between all three components – such as sourcing of M&E and TA for coalitions – it will also be important to establish clear protocols and processes to determine the respective responsibilities and accountabilities for implementers under each component. The program will facilitate the implementers to agree to these protocols and processes early in implementation.

PLP and the Pacific Women Hub already have an established working relationship, with both programs sharing office space and, at time of writing, secretariat support services in Suva. Both programs are also overseen by Australia's regional aid program at Suva Post. These links will help facilitate open, practical and constructive working relationships from the outset.

It is anticipated that component 1 and 2 will mobilise simultaneously, or very close together, so that early lessons and trends emerging from the 'local conversations' under component 1 can be tracked and developed, where appropriate through the coalition building activities under component 2. It is proposed that personnel engaged to work directly with communities and coalitions under each component (ie the Facilitator, Financial Officer and PLP Broker) would be co-located in an office at the provincial level to ensure they work very closely together from the early stages of implementation.

Financial, recruitment and other support for component 2 will be delivered and overseen by the Suva-based Secretariat Support Contractor for PLP. However, as identified under 'Personnel' and 'Financial Management and Controls' (below), options will be explored early in the Program for the organisation implementing component 1 to provide some financial support of behalf of PLP. Also, depending on the availability of suitably qualified people to undertake the Broker(s) role and run the local conversations it may be appropriate to consider a resource- and personnel-sharing arrangement, whereby the organisation implementing component 1 and PLP contribute costs to personnel and office for them to operate from at the provincial level. Implementers must be mindful to avoid competition between components 1

and 2 for suitably qualified people and to present a united front to stakeholders at the community and provincial levels.

- **Links to Australian aid program**

Despite – and perhaps because of – the different management arrangements in place for each component, it is important to establish clear and consistent messaging and representation of the Program as a unified Australian aid initiative.

While practical delivery arrangements will be confirmed at component level in consultation with the respective support contractors for PLP and implementers of components 1 and 3, Honiara Post will play an important oversight and coordination role on the program. This will ensure lessons are being effectively captured and shared across components, as well as being fed into Australia’s other investments (e.g. health and education sectors). Honiara Post will also be responsible for scheduling and commissioning independent program reviews and other program evaluations under component 3.

The frequency of formal and informal communication between PLP and Post will be determined by the pace of implementation at different program locations, and is likely to be adjusted from time to time.

Day to day contact between PLP and Honiara Post will be through PLP’s Solomon Islands Country Representative. The Country Representative will be in regular contact with the Facilitator/Broker(s) at provincial level and will be able to provide regular updates on progress of component 2 activities.

PLP’s Suva-based Solomon Islands Country Program Manager and Deputy Director (Programs) will both interact with Post on a monthly basis (or more frequently if required) to confirm the forward work plan³⁵ and to discuss other issues pertaining to implementation. Agreement will also be reached between Honiara Post and Australia’s regional program at Suva Post regarding processes for tasking of activities and approval of expenditure for component 2 (as well as 3). Details of current activity and expenditure approvals for PLP are detailed under ‘Financial and Management Controls’ later in this section.

vii. Personnel

- **Brokers**

Working with development coalitions is a resource intensive approach requiring sustained engagement and support. A critical factor in the successful implementation of component 2 will be the identification and engagement of a suitably qualified local Broker in each province.

The Broker will be the primary point of contact for coalition members on all aspects of component 2 implementation, including facilitation of initial and ongoing coalition meetings; supporting problem analysis and prioritisation processes; identifying and fulfilling resource requirements (with support from PLP and others); and maintaining linkages with component 1 and 3 activities.

The Broker will be required to possess the following expertise and characteristics:

³⁵ Noting that approval to spend may come from Suva – this needs to be confirmed.

- Credible, respected individual with relevant and current networks in selected province including government (MPs and public service), media, CSOs, women's groups and community.
- In-depth understanding of the social, cultural and political context of target province, including factors influencing attitudes and behaviours around family violence.
- Pidgin language skills (native speaker level) and high level written and spoken English.
- Ability to work strategically *and* tactically, and to translate broad ideas or concepts into practical, implementable steps or activities.
- Excellent interpersonal skills and ability to support and mentor others to achieve their objectives.
- Experience facilitating stakeholder or community forums and workshops and ability to explain complex concepts in plain language.
- Strong program management skills, including financial management, planning, reporting.
- Understanding of the role and potential of coalitions in bringing about development change, and familiarity with a range of planning and analytical tools, or a willingness and ability to gain this understanding.
- Experience working with donor funded or other development programs at provincial or community level (desirable).
- Working knowledge of local dialects (desirable).

Recruitment of a Broker in each province will commence at the start of Program implementation (months 1- 4). This will ensure close engagement with key stakeholders (including potential coalition members, component 1 personnel and service providers) from the start.

There is a significant risk that the unique technical and personal specifications of the Broker will be difficult to find in each province. PLP must also be mindful of the risks involved in 'poaching' key stakeholders working in the area of family violence (who might otherwise be active coalition members) and competing with the component 1 Implementer for personnel. It is essential that the process of identifying the Facilitator / Broker commences as soon as possible after Program mobilisation. This will allow PLP to assess the market in each location and, if necessary, devise alternative approaches to recruitment. This could include joint recruitment with the component 1 implementer and sharing of personnel to oversee components 1 and 2.

Further discussions with Honiara Post prior to mobilisation will also confirm whether more than one Broker may be required in any province. It may be appropriate to recruit a small team of two or three Brokers, who can focus on specific constituencies or areas in a larger province.

Once recruited, the Broker(s) will undergo an intensive period of training and orientation, in order to understand PLP's conceptual framework, operating model, portfolio of activities, and approach to supporting coalitions. This will be undertaken by PLP's SI Country Program Manager and Deputy Director (Programs), based at the PLP Secretariat Office in Suva. Additional support will be provided by the Program's Honiara-based SI Country Representative.

- **PLP Country Representative**

PLP's Country Representative is responsible for overseeing and providing day-to-day support to all PLP partner and coalition activities in Solomon Islands. Reporting to the Suva-based Country Program Manager, this position will play an important bridging role between the provincial Broker(s), the Australian aid program in Honiara, and the PLP Secretariat office in Suva.

The Country Representative will assist the Broker(s) to scope and identify resource requirements; monitor and report on progress and emerging risks/ issues in each province (via regular updates and site visits); and provide additional advice and support as needed.

- **Other Personnel**

The iterative approach required to effectively support coalitions will require PLP to draw in additional expertise as needed to support coalitions. Where these needs cannot be fulfilled from within PLP's own team or networks (including networks within Solomon Islands), expertise will be sourced through PLP's leadership expertise database, or from the open market.

Where coalitions have identified the need for specialised gender and M&E support, PLP will liaise with the Pacific Women Hub to work with Honiara Post in identifying and engaging suitable candidates.

viii. Financial management and controls

Management and disbursement of funds to support implementation of component 2 will be the responsibility of the Support Contractor for PLP. It is expected that the budget for component 2 will be transferred to PLP prior to mobilisation (or in tranches) and, while earmarked for the purposes of component 2, will be managed as part of PLP's own program budget.

Agreement will be sought from DFAT on an appropriate approval process for the expenditure of program funds.

PLP's flexible 'facility' modality (part of which is focused on working with collations) means that long term work plans and fixed budgets are not able to effectively capture the emerging and changing needs of the program and its stakeholders. In response to this, financial arrangements on PLP require monthly approval from the PLP Director of a forward activity work plan/ budget for the Program. This approval authorises the Support Contractor to disburse activity funds in line with approved line items. If needed, amendments to the work plan can be made outside of the monthly cycle, provided Director approval is provided before spending against new line items commences.

PLP has established systems in place for disbursing and managing funds to a range of recipient organisations and entities. Where funds are disbursed directly to coalition members (rather than to a third party, such as a service provider) PLP's Honiara based Country Representative, an accountant and financial trainer, will be able to support coalition members in basic management and acquittal requirements.

However, the need to deliver funds flexibly, at short notice and down to community level (often in places where banking services may be non-existent) may require PLP using the organisation implementing component 1 to provide financial services and oversight. If this is not possible, PLP may need to use an intermediary organisation, such as a local firm or NGO, to provide some financial

services on PLP's behalf. PLP's Honiara based Country Representative, a qualified accountant, and the Support Contractor will explore these options further prior to and in the early stages of implementation.

Annex 10. Proposed approach to implement component 3 on monitoring and evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation is an important component of the Safe Families program, and it is therefore proposed that particular attention is given to a comprehensive set of monitoring and evaluation activities, adequately resourced, that will enable it to underpin the development and improvement of the program over time.

The intention of this program is to start implementation in two provinces working at two levels, both community level and provincial wide. Through a dedicated process of monitoring and evaluation the program expects to learn how to support effective change processes that will facilitate prevention of violence. It intends to build on the learning to expand program location and scope and contribute to influencing other programs both in Solomon Islands and across the region.

In addition this program takes place in combination with other activities both those funded by Australia and those implemented and supported by other stakeholders such as Government of Solomon Islands and other donors. A key assumption of the program is that it will contribute to prevention of family violence through its integration and interaction with these other activities. Understanding the progress and outcomes of other activities and how they impact upon outcomes and results for this program is therefore important. The monitoring and evaluation needs to assist with this process, enabling movement between a focus on program activities and outcomes and the outcomes and processes of various other interventions directed at improving women's equality and limiting the family violence in Solomon Islands.

This annex outlines the detailed processes for all monitoring and evaluation of the program, giving attention to purpose, approach, methodologies, roles and responsibilities and timelines. It also addresses the interaction between monitoring and evaluation and research and proposes how the two should work to complement each other over the life of the program.

i. Purpose and scope

The primary purpose for the program monitoring and evaluation is to **assess progress** towards the desired outcome of prevention of family based violence.

The second purpose of the monitoring and evaluation will be to understand and track the outcomes of activities, together with other changes and influences within the particular context, in order to provide **information for learning**. The learning will contribute to improvement of existing and new activities and will continue throughout the life of the program to shape the scope and focus of the program. The learning from the program should also contribute to wider discussions at the national and regional level about how to effectively prevent gender based violence.

The monitoring and evaluation will also need to provide information for **accountability** particularly at the level of specific activities. This will include tracking the resources utilised, activities undertaken and the intermediate outputs of those activities.

Finally monitoring and evaluation will help to **test and further develop the key assumptions** which underlie this program. These include assumptions about how change happens at community, provincial and national level in Solomon Islands and specific assumptions around how men and women can be influenced to change their behaviour, and over time their attitudes, towards family

and sexual violence. This component of the monitoring and evaluation overlaps with the learning process that will contribute to program improvement. It is also likely to overlap with dedicated areas of research into particular aspects of the program.

The scope of the monitoring and evaluation is significant. Given the nature of the program, monitoring and evaluation needs to occur at the levels of community, province, and the national level. At the national level there needs to be consideration of how this program is working with other programs funded under the Solomon Islands Gender Country Plan to achieve effective change for women. There also needs to be consideration of how this program is interacting with the work of others in Solomon Islands to influence gender equality in the country.

Finally, the monitoring and evaluation needs to contribute to the regional discussions and research currently underway looking at issues of gender equality and family based violence across the Pacific. While this area is beyond the immediate responsibility of the program it is expected that program outcomes and learning will make a valid and useful contribution into this wider debate.

ii. Approach and data collection

It is proposed that the monitoring and evaluation will utilise an action reflection approach to understanding and tracking change across several levels. An action reflection approach to monitoring and evaluation assumes that as information becomes available, is analysed, and implications identified, action will take place at the program level to change and improve implementation. In turn, these changed interventions will become the subject of future performance assessment and enquiry. The process builds a body of knowledge and learning while at the same time improves practice leading to more likely achievement of objectives.

In a practical sense this means that at community, provincial and national levels the following process will take place:

1. Assessment about what has taken place, for whom and in what way and what outcomes were achieved
2. Outcomes analysed and assessed against both the change being sought, the assumptions of the program and the implications for women. Unexpected and unplanned changes will also be identified
3. Regular reflection on this analysis and assessment, considering the implications for how the program needs to change or improve as well as the implications for wider learning to be shared with others
4. New actions identified in the program activity areas and included in the next stage of program implementation
5. For the purposes of accountability, information from all these steps readily communicated in accessible ways to all stakeholders.

This process will provide information for accountability as well as information that will contribute to learning and testing of program assumptions.

The specific methodologies for data collection under this approach will need to include both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Quantitative data provides for a clear understanding of the breadth of any activity, addressing questions such as: how many people were involved, in what locations, using what resources over what time period, and for how many people?

Qualitative data collection allows for in-depth understanding including what outcomes have been achieved and how these impact upon the lives of women, children and men. It provides methods to examine what features of the activities were most significant versus those which were less important or useful and how the activity came together with other features in a particular context to bring about the change identified.

Alongside enquiry about the specific activities and the outcomes, there also needs to be data collection that makes sense of the context into which activities take place. This includes information about other interventions and activities in the context as well as other features of the context which have influenced outcomes and likely ongoing sustainability of those outcomes.

iii. Monitoring

The program requires regular and comprehensive monitoring in order to support an action reflection approach to accountability and learning. The monitoring needs to gather information for several purposes. Data collection techniques need to be varied with a particular focus on techniques that are culturally and gender appropriate and which encourage women and children to give voice to their experience.

▪ Performance questions and program indicators

Given an applied process of action reflection it can be expected that the change being sought and performance questions being applied will also develop and change over time. Particularly as the underlying program theory of change is better understood, the program can become more rigorous about the indications of effective progress in a particular location and can become more precise in the questions that need to be applied.

As a beginning step however it is useful to consider the indicators and questions that should be applied to the work areas of the program to contribute to the initial process of reflection on progress.

The following are a set of guiding indicators and questions they could be applied to community level and coalition building activities to provide information for both accountability and learning.

As noted these should be further developed as the program is implemented and learns from that implementation.

	Indicators and performance questions that need to be asked on a regular basis for all activities to provide accountability information		Questions that address some of the key assumptions around program activities	Performance questions that identify the outcomes from program activities
Community based activities	<p>Numbers of communities actively involved in developing prevention activities?</p> <p>Numbers of women and children directly benefiting from prevention activities?</p> <p>Number of community and other leaders in the province actively supporting violence prevention activities?</p>	<p>What is the activity?</p> <p>Where is it taking place?</p> <p>Who is involved: who developed the idea; who is implementing it; who will it target?</p> <p>What happened as a result of this activity?</p>	<p>To what degree are men engaged in the activity?</p> <p>How widely has the activity and the associated messages about women, children and families engaged the whole community?</p> <p>In what way are leaders in the community and from outside the community supporting the activity?</p>	<p>What difference has this activity made to women and children?</p> <p>In what way has this activity been reinforced or not by other messages and actions including those from church, political leaders and service providers?</p> <p>How is the activity in this community joining up with other prevention activities or activities aimed to prevent violence against women and children?</p> <p>To what extent are changes in the context of this community impacting upon the outcomes of this activity?</p>
Coalition building	<p>Numbers of organisations and individuals engaged in the coalition?</p> <p>Inclusion of organisations or individuals representing people with disability?</p> <p>Which formal and informal provincial leaders are actively engaged in the coalition?</p> <p>What are the sources of funding and support being utilised by the coalition?</p>	<p>What are the issues around which the coalition has formed?</p> <p>What have been the activities and processes undertaken through the coalition?</p> <p>What are the reasons these activities were developed in this coalition?</p>	<p>Does the coalition have a clear objective or intent?</p> <p>Is the coalition contributing to activities and outcomes which go beyond the current responsibility of individual service providers or organisations?</p> <p>Does the coalition have established ways of operating which accommodate diversity and inclusion?</p> <p>Is the coalition moving towards a way of working that will see it able to operate independent of support from the program?</p>	<p>Who knows about the coalition activities?</p> <p>Who is impacted by the coalition activities and in what way?</p> <p>In what way to coalition activities contribute to prevention of family violence?</p> <p>In what way to coalition activities influence community based activities in the province?</p> <p>In what way to coalition activities interact with the national level programmes or changes related to family violence?</p>

- **Analysis**

Central to an action reflection approach is collation and preparation of information for the purpose of analysis and reflection by stakeholders. This is a critical step which sits between the process of data collection and reporting. In an action reflection approach considerable attention is given to ensuring that the process of analysis and reflection is inclusive, accessible and well informed.

For the monitoring of the program it is proposed that information is collected against the questions and indicators identified above at both community level and provincial level. This information would then be collated to make it accessible to the relevant audience. For example, community information would be collated into forms in either local language or visual presentations (such as use of photos or diagrams) that would make it easier for community members to engage with and discuss. At the provincial level information may also be in written form but needs to be summarised and easy to access for people with different degrees of education and English language literacy.

It is then important that space is provided for people to reflect on the findings, consider their meaning (and add to those findings as appropriate) and then identify the implications for the next stages of action.

Following this reflection process, reporting on both findings and next actions can be prepared both in accessible forms for those participating and in more formal documents for government and other stakeholders.

iv. Contributing to wider M&E processes

The program also needs to be assessed in relation to changes at the national level. While this program is directed at community and provincial levels, it is expected to interact with and complement the other work of the Australian Gender Country Plan. As part of monitoring for that Country Plan the outcomes from this program need to be considered in that wider context. The key question that must be regularly addressed is:

In what way does this program interact with other changes brought about by the Country Plan to bring about wider changes?

The Australian Gender Country Plan for Solomon Islands is subject to annual assessment and analysis. This process is facilitated by the Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development regional hub in collaboration with DFAT staff at post. The exact process for this performance assessment will vary in each location. In Solomon Islands it will be important that information is gathered from all six components of work under the Country Plan, assessment made about the value of each set of activities and then a more comprehensive investigation undertaken of the outcomes of this work and significantly how the work areas interact to reinforce and support each other.

It is proposed that an action reflection approach is maintained for this area of assessment and analysis. This would build upon the action reflection approach specific for this program and would contribute to the intended learning and change approach being fostered by the program.

At the country level in combination with the Government of Solomon Islands, other donors and organisations and stakeholders in the country, there is value in an annual process that encourages all stakeholders to bring evidence and information about the outcomes that they are achieving and the learning over the past 12 months. This program, as part of the Solomon Islands Gender Country Plan, could initiate and organise this type of national level analysis and reflection on an annual basis. This may well be

undertaken in partnership with the Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs. The emphasis would be upon providing clear information and evidence about outcomes and promoting rigorous and critical analysis of the implications of those outcomes and the implications for future action.

v. Evaluation

The program has a clear end goal and interim objectives. While the monitoring will consider progress towards these objectives, some careful judgement about outcomes achieved needs to be undertaken on a periodic basis.

To this end it is proposed that at the three year, six year and end of program points program review is undertaken which specifically examines the progress to date against the intended goal as well as information around progress towards objectives. This will provide a good basis for overall assessment of the value of the program as well as important information about the suitability of the program process and approach overall. While it is to be expected that the underlying action reflection process being undertaken more regularly in the program may also shift process and understanding of change along the way, reviews at the three year and six year mark would ensure that recommended program changes are being implemented and that the program remains on track to achieve the long-term goal intended.

End of program evaluation is important for accountability but also as a mechanism to identify the further work to be undertaken and the likely areas for further intervention.

vi. Research

While considerable work has gone into identifying existing information about change processes and about the nature of family in sexual violence in the Solomon Islands for the purpose of this design, much is still unknown. There are several assumptions made in the design, building from incomplete information about the nature of violence and family violence in the Solomon Islands, both its causes and how it can be prevented.

Therefore alongside the monitoring and evaluation proposed for this program it is also proposed that a process of focused research be undertaken to generate more detailed understanding in key areas.

It is important that this research operates in collaboration with the regular performance assessment. Ideally areas for research should be identified as part of the action reflection process where it is clear that larger questions remain which cannot be answered through the normal monitoring and assessment systems.

To this end dedicated research needs to be flexible and timely, of high-quality in order to provide a reliable base for further action, and applied to areas identified by stakeholders as central to program development and progress.

vii. Roles and responsibilities

It is proposed that a separate monitoring and evaluation team would be contracted for the purpose of managing and implementing the monitoring and evaluation for the program. Utilising the Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development Pacific hub, a monitoring and evaluation contractor would be identified and tasked with the responsibility of implementing the action reflection process at the activity level and facilitating the same process in collaboration with other stakeholders at the national level.

The monitoring and evaluation contractor would also be responsible for managing the program of research although it is likely that specialist organisations will be tasked to undertake the research. The contractor

would also be tasked with designing and managing the three-year and six year evaluation processes in collaboration with DFAT and other stakeholders.

The monitoring and evaluation contractor would be selected on the basis of their strengths against the following requirements:

1. Demonstrated experience in application of a range of data collection techniques and qualitative and quantitative methodologies in international development settings
2. Demonstrated experience in participatory and other data collection techniques that enable women and children to safely and competently give voice to their experience
3. Demonstrated experience in working with approaches to monitoring and evaluation that are able to identify and address differences in power, gender, ability and culture
4. Demonstrated experience in working in action reflection approaches, including the ability to collate information in various accessible forms
5. High degree of ability and experience in facilitation of cross cultural discussion groups and in facilitating groups where power, gender, ability and other differences are present
6. Demonstrated ability to work proactively to improve quality of monitoring and evaluation and to promote development and expansion of approaches as opportunities arise
7. Demonstrated ability to provide good quality and timely reports that are evidence-based and accurately represent findings and reflections.

The monitoring and evaluation contractor would work in collaboration with the implementer assigned to manage community level activities as well as with the Pacific Leadership Program. The monitoring and evaluation managing contractor would identify the information to be collected by both PLP and the community level implementer and would facilitate this collection assisting with methodologies and data collection methods as required. The monitoring and evaluation managing contractor would also provide support from early on in implementation to the implementer of component 1, as community activities are being developed and implemented, to assist with effectiveness and measurability of results.

The monitoring and evaluation contractor will work in collaboration with the monitoring and evaluation adviser at the Pacific Women hub. There would be active sharing of information at this level and opportunities for collaboration between Solomon Islands learning and approaches and those of other gender country programs supported by DFAT in the Pacific would be encouraged.

viii. Timelines and reporting

Monitoring and evaluation is a key component of this program, both to demonstrate accountability and thus further engage stakeholders, but also to provide learning and improvement for the program as it develops. It is therefore proposed that a monitoring report reflecting action, outcomes and reflection at the level of community activities and provincial level activities is produced every six months. The draft risk register at Annex 12 will also be revisited and refined by the monitoring and evaluation contractor at implementation and then after every six months.

A further report incorporating this information together with the national level findings and reflections would also be produced annually. This report may form one component of broader reporting within the Australian aid program and reporting by Government of Solomon Islands on its progress on gender equality. Where such overlap is possible it should be encouraged in form and content.

These reports sit outside the reporting which will be required by all programme implementers about the nature of their work and progress according to their agreements.

Annex 11. Draft terms of reference for monitoring and evaluation contractor

The following is a draft of what could be expected from a contractor implementing component 3 on monitoring and evaluation. This could be drawn upon by the DFAT Honiara Post gender team in negotiating terms of reference with the Pacific Women Hub. It is expected that the Hub would engage a small team of M&E experts to undertake the tasks described below.

Background

The Let's Make our Families Safe program (the Program) aims to prevent family violence in Solomon Islands. This is the first three year phase of a 10 year program with action at community and provincial levels, starting in two provinces and expanding over time across Solomon Islands. The **goal** for the Program is that family violence is no longer considered acceptable behaviour in Solomon Islands. One indicator of success will be a reduction in the incidence of family violence.

Through a dedicated process of monitoring and evaluation the Program expects to learn how to support effective change processes that will facilitate prevention of violence. It intends to build on the learning to improve Program and activity performance, expand Program location and scope and contribute to influencing other programs both in Solomon Islands and across the region.

The Program will contribute to the above goal through achievement of the following objectives:

6 year objectives:

- In targeted provinces men and women no longer consider violence to be acceptable in family relationships
- Action to prevent family and sexual violence is being taken beyond the initial two provinces targeted in this program

3 year objectives:

- In targeted provinces women report that they have options for dealing with family violence when it occurs and their communities have strategies to prevent family violence
- Service providers in targeted provinces are now identifying and responding to victims of family and sexual violence.

The Program consists of three components:

1. Support to existing and new community activities to prevent family violence
2. Facilitation of coalition activity at the provincial level
3. Rigorous monitoring and evaluation.

The M&E team will implement component (3) above but will be expected to work closely with the implementers of components (1) and (2). Component (2) will be implemented by the Pacific Leadership Program (PLP).

Services

The M&E team will design and manage the three-year monitoring and evaluation system and approach in collaboration with DFAT, PLP and the organisation implementing component 1.

The purposes are to:

1. Assess progress towards the goal and objectives,
2. Understand and track the outcomes of activities under components 1 and 2 to provide information for learning. This learning will improve the supported activities, contribute to revisions to the Program and contribute to national and international learning; and
3. Test the assumptions underlying the Program's theory of change.

To design and manage the monitoring and evaluation system and approach the M&E team's tasks will include:

1. Using qualitative and quantitative methodologies as appropriate to ensure wide ranging data collection in line with the indicators and evaluative questions specified in the Design. The M&E team will use data collection techniques which are culturally and gender appropriate and which encourage women and children to participate
2. Undertaking regular Program monitoring
3. Facilitating and managing the Program evaluation process with due regard to Program development and further improvement
4. Developing and implementing a stakeholder action reflection methodology to use at the community, provincial and national levels. This could include:
 - a. One national level workshop at the end of Years 1, 2 and 3,
 - b. A provincial level workshop in each of the two selected provinces held every six-months, and
 - c. Five sub-provincial level workshops in each of the two provinces held every year.
5. Developing a system of ongoing contextual assessment and analysis of relevance to the program activities to inform program performance assessment
6. Establishing a system of information analysis and dissemination which is inclusive and accessible and promotes learning for all stakeholders at community, provincial, national, regional and international levels
7. Undertaking regular reporting. This could include six-monthly reports to DFAT on action, outcomes and reflection for Components 1 and 2.
8. Providing advice and assistance to PLP and the organisation implementing Component 1 to meet their information collection obligations under the monitoring and evaluation system
9. Providing input to the development of community activities supported under Component 1 to increase their effectiveness and improve measurability of results
10. Designing and managing the three-year evaluation process in collaboration with DFAT
11. Providing recommendations for further research required and facilitating and managing the research process as directed by DFAT
12. Working in close collaboration with the monitoring and evaluation adviser at the Pacific Women Hub and with other monitoring and evaluation advisers from DFAT's sector programs.
13. Revising the draft risk matrix provided in the design the start of implementation and at the end of Years 1 and 2.

Outputs include:

1. Monitoring and evaluation framework and methodology
2. Documentation and summary of discussions in all workshops and results of any other qualitative data collection

3. Documentation and summary of results of all quantitative data collection
4. Six monthly reports on action, outcomes and reflection for DFAT
5. Six monthly reports on reflection disseminated in an appropriate format for program stakeholders
6. Revised risk matrix
7. 3 year evaluation report including recommendations for the next phase of implementation.

Annex 12. Risk Register

This draft risk register will need to be refined during the initial stages of implementation and revised six-monthly by the contractor implementing Component 3, M&E.

RISK REGISTER: Let's Make our Families Safe <i>(Date of Assessment)</i>	
Risk Owner:	
Date of Last Review:	Date of Next Review:
Do any risks need to be escalated? <i>(List the Risk No/s.)</i>	To whom are they being escalated?
Are any risks being de-escalated? <i>(List the Risk No/s.)</i>	To whom are they being de-escalated?
Risk Ratings and Treatments Approved by: <i>(Approver must be at appropriate level/position to accept responsibility for ratings and treatments)</i>	

Risk no.	Risk	Intended controls under the design [to become existing controls during implementation]	Risk rating with intended controls in place			Is risk rating acceptable Y/N? (if N, describe treatments)	Proposed treatments	Person responsible for implementing treatment/s	Implementation date for proposed treatment/s	Target rating when proposed treatments are in place		
			Likelihood	Consequence	Rating					Likelihood	Consequence	Rating
1	The Program's focus on preventing family violence is too narrow to achieve results	DFAT recruits Senior Social Development Adviser to improve gender equality outcomes across all sector programs including through improved policy dialogue on gender issues	Possible	Major	Moderate	Y						
2	Current SIG support for tackling violence against women and girls wanes For example, SIG reduces funding for family violence activities including SAFENET, police capacity building, education curriculum reform and health worker capacity building	DFAT maintains policy dialogue with relevant sector Ministries through its sector programs DFAT Gender Program supports MWYCFA to conduct its own policy advocacy with other Ministries DFAT continues policy dialogue at regional fora for SIG to meet its commitments to improving gender equality outcomes	Possible	Moderate	Low	Y						
3	Community activities fail to achieve results For example, there is insufficient interest	The selection process and agreement for the Implementer of Component 1 and the experience of PLP ensure that the people managing the program have and use strong community development skills	Possible	Moderate	High	Y						

Risk no.	Risk	Intended controls under the design [to become existing controls during implementation]	Risk rating with intended controls in place			Is risk rating acceptable Y/N? (if N, describe treatments)	Proposed treatments	Person responsible for implementing treatment/s	Implementation date for proposed treatment/s	Target rating when proposed treatments are in place		
			Likelihood	Consequence	Rating					Likelihood	Consequence	Rating
	from communities to run activities or join with others; the Local Conversations approach does not reach community consensus due to big man politics; communities lack the capacity to implement their ideas; legitimacy of community members leading activities are compromised by their own perpetration of family violence; Australia's support is rejected by community members for imposing a foreign agenda against custom or religion	<p>For example, the selection process ensures the Implementer involves local leaders including state, church and traditional leaders in the program to ensure activities are seen as inclusive and consistent with culture and religion</p> <p>Focussing on two locations for the first phase of the program will help to improve the quality of management and oversight</p> <p>If necessary the proposed location for implementation may be changed in order to find the necessary concentration of action</p>										
4	Community activities cause harm to women for example through backlash resulting in increased family violence against women participating	<p>The Implementer and PLP have strong community development skills including gender skills to recognise and manage this risk. For example, the agreement ensures the Implementer involves local leaders</p> <p>The program invests heavily in monitoring and evaluation to closely track activity progress during implementation including any harm done</p>	Possible	High	High	Y						
5	Coalition activities fail to achieve results because of lack of support from senior members of organisations	DFAT sector programs will be used to advocate for support from relevant Ministries and other organisations	Unlikely	Minor	Low	Y						
6	Inadequate response by service providers from church, police, schools or health providers adversely affects program outcomes	<p>The coalitions component of the program will aim to bridge the gap between communities and service providers and encourage service providers to work together to improve services</p> <p>Information on shortcomings of access and quality of SIG services will be provided to DFAT's sector programs to provide evidence for program reform and policy dialogue</p>	Possible	Moderate	High	Y						

Risk no.	Risk	Intended controls under the design [to become existing controls during implementation]	Risk rating with intended controls in place			Is risk rating acceptable Y/N? (if N, describe treatments)	Proposed treatments	Person responsible for implementing treatment/s	Implementation date for proposed treatment/s	Target rating when proposed treatments are in place		
			Likelihood	Consequence	Rating					Likelihood	Consequence	Rating
7	Unintentional or intentional financial mismanagement by implementing organisations	Any grant allocation will be managed through the Implementer of Component 1 complying with Australian Government financial and due diligence procedures both in deciding what organisations to fund and in monitoring how those organisations spend and acquit the funds The Implementer will retain financial control for community activities which are not implemented by a suitable organisation	Possible	Minor	Moderate	Y						
8	Lack of cooperation between DFAT and 3 implementing partners	Protocols for formal and informal coordination and communication will be agreed with DFAT prior to mobilisation These protocols will include quarterly program coordination meetings and routine and ad hoc reporting The monitoring and evaluation includes reflection on what is and is not working in the implementation model	Possible	Major	Moderate	Y						
9	Program results are not achieved and Australian commitment to long term program support wanes For example, the experimental and evidenced based approach quickly shows where the program is failing and commitment to disseminate negative findings causes reputational damage to Australia	The design as agreed articulates that change will be slow and incremental and failures are possible DFAT Gender Program will establish a strategy to communicate failure constructively to stakeholders, the public, senior management and the Minister. For example, the Gender Program will provide regular and contextualised information to DFAT managers and brief the Minister as appropriate to maintain long-term support	Possible	Major	Moderate	Y						