Terms of Reference

Final Independent Project Evaluation of the Enhancing Access to Justice in Solomon Islands through Paralegalism project
October 2021

Table of Contents

I. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Project number:	00117811
Project title:	**Enhancing Access to Justice in Solomon Islands through Paralegalism project**
Duration:	16 September 2019 – 31 December 2021
Location:	Solomon Islands
Linkages to Country, Regional and Thematic Programmes:	UNDP Strategic plan; UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document (2018-2022) for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories
To which UNDAF is the project/programme linked to (if any)	United Nations Pacific Strategy[1]
Executing Agency:	UNDP
Partner Organizations:	n/a
Total Approved Budget:	USD 3,197,904.22
Total Overall Budget	USD
Donors:	DFAT Australia
Project Manager/ Coordinator:	Grace Kiernan
Type and time frame of evaluation:	Final Independent Project Evaluation
Time frame of the project covered by the evaluation:	16 September 2019 – 11 October 2021
Geographical coverage of the evaluation:	Solomon Islands
Budget for this evaluation in USD:	USD 30,000
Number of independent evaluators planned for this evaluation:	One (1)
Type and year of past evaluations (if any):	n/a
Core Learning Partners (entities):	UNDP, DFAT

---

[1]https://ims.undg.org//downloadFile/8611d16530acd54e1f7557ac5603773f75784128233035fd90f7cfa8f20a01c3

Project overview and historical context

The Enhancing Access to Justice in the Solomon Islands through Paralegalism (A2J) Project supports the building and strengthening of the capacity of the Public Solicitor's Office (PSO) to enhance access to justice for the people of Solomon Islands at national and provincial levels, including women, youth and marginalized groups in communities outside urban centers. The project is implemented across the provinces of Solomon Islands through a two-tiered paralegal initiative: provincial paralegals and community legal advocates (CLAs).

The A2J Project has been implemented for over two years (September 2019 - December 2021). The overall objective of the end of project evaluation is to generate knowledge from the A2J Project's experience in collaborating with and supporting the PSO. The evaluation is intended to be forward looking which will capture lessons learned and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the impact of the A2J Project on the PSO and Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs.

The emphasis on learning lessons speaks to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future programming. As per the OECD/DAC criteria, this evaluation will assess relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, sustainability and impact of the project and of the results.

The evaluation will assess the intended and unintended outcomes of the A2J project and recommend strategies for future operational and programmatic effectiveness of similar initiatives in comparable situations. The evaluation serves as an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Solomon Islands with an impartial assessment of the results including gender equality results of this project. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation, namely the PSO, Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs, civil society organisations, UNDP and other UN agencies.

Project document

	Year	Please provide general information regarding the original project document.
Project document	2019	*It aims to support the building. and strengthening of the capacity of the Public Solicitor's Office (PSO) to enhance access to justice for the people of Solomon Islands at national and provincial levels, including women, youth and marginalized groups in communities outside urban centers*

Main objectives and outcomes

The A2J Project supports the building and strengthening of the capacity of the Public Solicitor's Office (PSO) to enhance access to justice for the people of Solomon Islands at national and provincial levels, including women, youth and marginalized groups in communities outside urban centers. The project is implemented across the provinces of Solomon Islands through a two-tiered paralegal initiative: provincial paralegals and community legal advocates (CLAs).

Goal of the project/programme (as per project document/revision):

Goal:	Strengthen the PSO and broader justice sector to deliver greater access to justice to women, men and vulnerable groups, particularly those outside urban centers

Outcomes of the project/programme (as per project document/revisions)

Output 1: The capacity, reach and breath of service delivery and awareness activities of PSO is increased through the development and rollout of Provincial Paralegals			
INDICATORS	**BASELINE**	**2020 ANNUAL TARGETS**	**2021 ANNUAL TARGETS**
1.1 Number of provincial offices supported with provincial paralegal services.	0	1	3
1.2 Number of provincial paralegals appointed and trained and appointed by gender.	0	6	6
1.3 Number of communities sensitized as a result of outreach activities.	0	25	25

Output 2: Community level access to justice enhanced through the pilot, rollout and review of Community Legal Advocates			
INDICATORS	BASELINE	**2020 ANNUAL TARGETS**	**2021 ANNUAL TARGETS**
2.1 Number of Community Legal Advocates identified in 4 selected priority communities.	0	6	6
2.2 Number of awareness activities undertaken by Community Legal Advocates in 4 selected priority communities.	0	0	50
2.3 Number of communities visited by the CLAs to undertake awareness activities.	0	24	48

2.4 Number of referrals from CLAs to the PSO.	0	12	24

Contribution to UNDP's strategic frameworks, country, regional or thematic programmes

Contribution to the following UNDP strategic plan and programmes:

The UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021 is vested in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and committed to the principles of universality, equality and leaving no one behind. The UNDP vision for the Strategic Plan 2018-2021 is to help countries achieve sustainable development by eradicating poverty in all its forms and dimensions, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development and building resilience to crises and shocks. Access to justice is one of the identified areas of support in Signature Solution #2: Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance- required for achieving peaceful, just and inclusive societies.

The project also contributes to the UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document (2018-2022) for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories – Outcome 5- Effective governance for service delivery. The project falls under outcome 5 in supporting the promotion of peaceful, inclusive societies by working with governments, justice and security sector institutions, and civil society, to strengthen the rule of law and access to justice. To further the implementation of the A2J project commitments, under Outcome 5 UNDP commits to build on successful UNDP experiences in the sub region, giving priority to measures for effective delivery of justice outcomes, enhancing legal aid provision, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, and expanding access to justice to remote areas, with a focus on women, youth and vulnerable groups.

Linkage to the UN Pacific Strategy and to Sustainable Development Goals

The Project/Programme contributes to the following Sustainable Development Goals, Targets and Performance Indicators:

Relevant UN Sustainable Development Goals	Target(s)	Indicator(s)
16 – Peace, justice and strong institutions	16.2	16.2.2
	16.3	16.3.2
	16.6	16.6.2
	16.B	16.B.1
5- Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls	5.2	5.2.1
		5.2.2
	5.3	5.3.1

Moreover, the Project contributes to the United Nations Pacific Strategy (UNPS) 2018-2022[2] which is a five-year strategic framework supporting 14 governments and peoples in the Pacific to advance a localized response to the global 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. This response is tailored to each country's national priorities and responds to the Pacific Leaders' call to the United Nations system to "align its work programmes and operations to support internationally agreed outcomes, including the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, in the Pacific region" (2015 GA res. 69/318).

The UNPS 2018-2022 is a multi-country, outcome level, strategic framework that presents a coordinated approach to support the PICs across the Pacific. The six outcomes address strategic priorities that promote mutual accountability for development results in the Pacific, further Pacific to Pacific cooperation, and enable the targeting of valuable UN resources to areas where they are most needed.

Outcome 5 of UNPS is dedicated to governance and community engagement. Its goal is the following: "By 2022, people and communities in the Pacific will contribute to and benefit from inclusive, informed, and transparent decision-making processes; accountable and responsive institutions; and improved access to justice".

UNPS states that, "the UN will support the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies by working with governments, justice, and security sector institutions as well as civil society to strengthen the rule of law and access to justice and by creating space for dialogue among stakeholders. Priority will be given to measures that ensure the effective delivery of justice outcomes, enhancing legal aid provisions, providing alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, and expanding access to justice to remote areas using models of centre-to-periphery service delivery with a focus on women, youth and vulnerable groups".

II.   DISBURSEMENT HISTORY

Time periods throughout the life time of the project	Total Approved Budget (USD)	Expenditure (USD)	Expenditure in %
16 September 2019- 31 December 2019	76,560	36,027.83	47%
1 January 2020- 31 December 2020	1,121,963.36	1,083,969.26	97%
1 January 2021- 31 December 2021 (Including cost extension)	2,077,065.59		

---

[2]https://ims.undg.org//downloadFile/8611d16530acd54e1f7557ac5603773f75784128233035fd90f7cfa8f20a01c3

III.   PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The aim of the final evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the design and relevance of the project. It will further assess the effectiveness of the project to date, including its good practices and successes as well as any failures, challenges and areas for improvement. Its results will be used to inform future programming in this space. The main users of the evaluation results will be project managers and donors.

The following DAC criteria will be assessed during the evaluation: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In addition, design, established partnerships and cooperation as well as aspects of human rights and gender mainstreaming will be assessed. Furthermore, lessons learned and best practices will be identified and recommendations based on the findings formulated.

The outcomes of the evaluation will inform as to what extent the project is contributing to the outcomes of the UNDP relevant corporate strategic documents, and above towards the operationalization of the SDG agenda.

IV.   SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

Unit of analysis (full project/programme/ parts of the project/programme; etc.)	Enhancing Access to Justice in Solomon Islands through Paralegalism
Time period of the project/programme covered by the evaluation	16 September 2019- 11 October 2021
Geographical coverage of the evaluation	Solomon Islands is covered by this project.

V.   KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted based on the following DAC criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, as well as design, partnerships and cooperation, human rights, gender equality and leaving no one behind as well as lesson learned and best practices. The questions will be further refined by the Evaluator.

Design
The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical framework approach was adopted.
1.   To what extent has the results based framework been a useful programme management tool and allowed for an assessment of project outcomes and impact? 2.   How well aligned are activities, outputs and outcomes in the logical framework?
3.   To what extent does the design of this project enable optimal use of resources and cooperation with other development initiatives?
4.   How effective has UNDP been in managing and implementing the project?
Relevance
Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
5.   How relevant is the project to target groups' needs and priorities, including target

groups of governments, development partners and CSOs?
6. To what extent are the outputs, outcomes and objectives of this project/programme relevant and contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and how have project activities supported partners in implementing the SDGs?
Efficiency *Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs.*
7. To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
8. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the A2J Project implementation process?
Effectiveness *Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.*
9. To what extent were the planned outputs and outcomes in the project document achieved?
10. Are there any good practices and successes, as well as failures, challenges and areas for improvement?
11. Were there any unintended results achieved beyond those included in the logical framework? If so, what were those results?
(Expected) Impact *Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.*
12. To what extend is the project likely to achieve/already achieved its objectives or parts of it beyond the delivery of activities and progress against output targets?
13. Which best fit can be identified for adaptation and replication (eg. in other projects or topics), up-scaling, or prioritization, to ensure achieving outcomes in the most effective way?
Sustainability *Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.*
14. To what extent has the ownership of key stakeholders been sought and institutionalized?
15. How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the A2J Project, including contributing factors and constraints?
16. Have the project's activities contributed to outputs, processes, networks etc. that are likely to have some enduring benefit? What have been the barriers to sustainability?
Partnerships and cooperation *The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/ programme as well as their functioning and value.*
17. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with and between governments, parliaments, the private sector, civil society and academia?
18. To what extent is the project/programme cooperating with other potential partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs?
19. To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind *The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of*

human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups.
Human Rights
20. To what extent are human rights considerations included in the project design and implementation?
21. To what extent was the project informed by human rights treaties and instruments?
22. To what extent did the project identify the relevant human rights claims and obligations?
Gender Equality
23. To what extent has the Project promoted women's participation throughout the Project activities and improved the active participation of women in discussions?
24. How could gender equality considerations be further included in the project design and implementation?
Social Inclusion
25. How did the project consider the needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged to promote social equity, for example, women, youth, disabled persons?
Lessons learned and best practices
Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/ programme.
26. What lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
27. What best practices, if any, in planning and implementing the project can be identified that should be replicated and/or scaled up in related future programming?

VI.   EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methods used to collect and analyse data

This evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the TOR and the availability of stakeholders. In all cases, the Evaluator is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, thematic programmes, programme files, financial reports and any other documents that may provide further evidence for triangulation, on which his/her conclusions will be based. The Evaluator is also expected to use interviews, surveys or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the key stakeholders of the project/ programme, the Core Learning Partners (CLP).

The present ToR provides basic information as regards to the methodology, which should not be understood as exhaustive. It is rather meant to guide the Evaluator in elaborating an effective, efficient, and appropriate evaluation methodology that should be proposed, explained and justified in the Inception Report.

In addition, the Evaluator will be asked to present a summarized methodology (including an evaluation matrix) in the Inception Report outlining the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards.

While the Evaluator shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure a gender-sensitive, inclusive methodology. Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. Indeed, information stemming from secondary sources will be cross-checked and triangulated through data retrieved from primary research methods. Primary data collection methods need to be gender-sensitive as well as inclusive.

The credibility of the data collection and analysis are key to the evaluation. Rival theories and competing explanations must be tested once plausible patterns emerge from triangulating data.

The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the Evaluator in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed.

When designing the evaluation data collection tools and instruments, the Evaluator needs to consider the analysis of certain relevant or innovative topics in the form of short case studies, analyses, etc. that would benefit the evaluation results.

The main elements of the evaluation process are the following:
- Preliminary desk review of all relevant project documentation (Annex II of the evaluation ToR), as provided by the Project Manager and as further requested by the Evaluator, as well as relevant external documents (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; UN and global/regional strategies; etc.);
- Preparation and submission of an Inception Report (containing preliminary findings of the desk review, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, sampling strategy, limitations to the evaluation, and timetable) to UNDP Integrated Results Management Unit of the Pacific Office in Fiji (IRMU) for review and clearance before any field mission may take place;
- Initial meetings and interviews with the Project Manager and other UNDP staff as well as stakeholders during the field mission;
- Interviews (face-to-face or by telephone/skype), with key project stakeholders and beneficiaries, both individually and (as appropriate) in small groups/focus groups, as well as using surveys, questionnaires or any other relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation;
- Analysis of all available information;
- Preparation of the draft evaluation report. The Evaluator submits the draft report to the Project Manager for the review of factual errors (copying IRMU) and the Project Manager shares with IRMU for review, comments and clearance. Subsequently IRMU, shares the final draft report with all CLPs for comments.
- Preparation of the final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager). The Evaluator incorporates the necessary and requested changes and finalizes the evaluation report in accordance with the feedback received from IRMU, the Project Manager and CLPs. It further includes a PowerPoint presentation on final evaluation findings and recommendations;
- Presentation of final evaluation report with its findings and recommendations to the target audience, stakeholders etc. (in person or if necessary through Skype).

- In conducting the evaluation the UNDP and the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards are to be taken into account.

The sources of data

The evaluation will utilize a mixture of primary and secondary sources of data. The primary sources include, among others, interviews with key stakeholders (face-to-face or by telephone), the use of surveys and questionnaires, a field mission for case studies, focus group interviews, observation and other participatory techniques. Secondary data sources will include project documents and their revisions, progress and monitoring reports, external reports and strategies (e.g. UNDAFs; SDGs; country/regional/global strategies; etc.) and all other relevant documents, including visual information (e.g. eLearning, pictures, videos, etc.).

Desk Review

The Evaluator will perform a desk review of all existing documentation (please see the preliminary list of documents to be consulted in Annex II of the evaluation ToR). This list is however not to be regarded as exhaustive as additional documentation may be requested by the Evaluator. The Evaluator needs to ensure that sufficient external documentation is used for the desk review.

Phone interviews / face-to-face consultations

The evaluator will conduct phone interviews / face-to-face consultations with identified individuals from the following groups of stakeholders:
- Member States (including recipients and donors);
- Relevant international and regional organizations;
- Non-State stakeholders working with the A2J Project, including non-governmental organizations, academia, private sector and the media;
- UNDP management and staff in the field;
- Etc.

Interviewees should be given the possibility to reflect on respective access to justice needs and priorities.

Questionnaire

A questionnaire (on-line) is to be developed and used in order to help collect the views of additional stakeholders (e.g. trainees, counterparts, partners, etc.), if deemed appropriate.

VII.   TIMEFRAME AND DELIVERABLES

Duties	Time frame	Location	Deliverables
Desk review and drafting of Inception Report	11-14 October *4 days*	Home based	Draft Inception report

Review of draft Inception Report by IRMU	15-19 October		Comments on the draft Inception Report to the Evaluator
Incorporation of comments from IRMU (can entail various rounds of comments from IRMU)	19-20 October 1 day	Home base	Revised draft Inception Report
Deliverable A: Final Inception Report	**By 20 October** *(total: 5 days)*		**Final Inception report to be cleared by IRMU at least one week before the field mission can get started**
Evaluation interviews and mission: briefing, interviews with UNDP staff (including by phone/skype); observation; focus groups; presentation of preliminary observations (if applicable)	25-29 October *5 days*	Home based	Interviews and data collection
Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to Project Management and IRMU	1-5 November 5 days	Home based	Draft evaluation report
Review of IRMU for quality assurance and Project Management for factual errors	*8-12 November*		Comments on the draft evaluation report to the Evaluator
Consideration of comments from the project manager and incorporation of comments from IRMU (can entail various rounds of comments from IRMU)	15-19 November *5 days*	Home based	Revised draft evaluation report
Deliverable B: Draft Evaluation Report	**By 19 November** *(total: 15 days)*	Home based	**Draft evaluation report, to be cleared by IRMU**

IRMU to share draft evaluation report with Core Learning Partners for comments	*22-26 November*		Comments of CLPs on the draft report
Consideration of comments from Core Learning Partners and preparation of draft Evaluation Brief	29 November – 1 December *3 days*	Home based	Revised draft evaluation report
Final review by IRMU; incorporation of comments and finalization of report and Evaluation Brief (can entail various rounds of comments from IRMU)	2-7 December *4 days*		Revised draft evaluation report; draft Evaluation Brief
Presentation of evaluation results (to be reviewed and cleared by IRMU)	Tentative: 10 December *3 days*	Home based	Presentation of evaluation results
Deliverable C: Final evaluation report; presentation of evaluation results; Evaluation Brief (2-pager)	**By 17 December** **(total: 10 *days)***	Home based	**Final evaluation report; Evaluation Brief and presentation of evaluation results, cleared by IRMU**
Project Management: Finalise Evaluation Follow-up Plan	By 22 December		Final Evaluation Follow-up Plan to be cleared by IRMU
Project Management: Disseminate final evaluation report	By 29 December		Final evaluation report disseminated to internal and external stakeholders
IRMU: facilitate the external Evaluation Quality Assessment of the Final Report	1st quarter 2022		

UNDP may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation-process.

VIII. EVALUATOR COMPOSITION

The evaluator will report to the A2J Project Manager and IRMU.

Role	Number of consultants/ evaluators (national/international)	Specific expertise required
Team leader	1 (international)	Evaluation methodology

The Evaluator will not act as representatives of any party and must remain independent and impartial. The qualifications and responsibilities for the Evaluator are specified in the job description attached to these Terms of Reference (Annex 1). The Evaluator will report exclusively to IRMU, who is the exclusive clearing entities for all evaluation deliverables and products.

Absence of Conflict of Interest

The evaluator must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation.

Furthermore, the evaluators shall respect and follow the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for conducting evaluations in a sensitive and ethical manner.

IX. MANAGEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

Roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager

The Project Manager is responsible for:
- managing the evaluation process,
- drafting and finalizing the ToR,
- selecting Core Learning Partners (representing a balance of men, women and other marginalised groups) and informing them of their role,
- recruiting the evaluator (through UNDP recruitment process) following clearance by IRMU, ensuring issued contracts ahead of the start of the evaluation process in line with the cleared ToR. In case of any delay, IRMU and the evaluator are to be immediately notified,
- providing desk review materials (including data and information on men, women and other marginalised groups) to the evaluators including the full ToR.
- liaising with the Core Learning Partners,
- reviewing the draft report for factual errors only,
- developing a follow-up plan for the usage of the evaluation results and recording of the implementation of the evaluation recommendations (to be updated once per year),
- disseminate the final evaluation report and communicate evaluation results to relevant stakeholders as well as facilitate the presentation of evaluation results;
- UNDP project manager to ensure that all payments related to the evaluation are fulfilled immediately following the approval by IRMU.

The Project Manager will be in charge of **providing logistical support** to the evaluator including arranging the field missions, including but not limited to:

- All logistical arrangements for the travel (including travel details; DSA-payments; transportation; etc.)
- All logistical arrangement for the meetings/interviews/focus groups/etc., ensuring interview partners adequately represent men, women and other marginalised groups (including independent translator/interpreter if needed); set-up of interview schedules; arrangement of ad-hoc meetings as requested by the Evaluator; transportation from/to the interview venues; scheduling sufficient time for the interviews (around 45 minutes); ensuring that members of the Evaluator and the respective interviewees are present during the interviews; etc.)
- All logistical arrangements for the presentation of the evaluation results;
- Ensure timely payment of all fees/DSA/etc.

<u>Roles and responsibilities of the evaluation stakeholders</u>

Members of the Core Learning Partnership (CLP) are identified by the project manager. The CLPs are the main stakeholders, i.e. a limited number of those deemed as particularly relevant to be involved throughout the evaluation process, i.e. in reviewing and commenting on the TOR and the evaluation questions, reviewing and commenting on the draft evaluation report, as well as facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action. Stakeholders include all those to be invited to participate in the interviews and surveys, including the CLPs.

<u>Roles and responsibilities of the Integrated Results Management Unit</u>

IRMU provides guidance, quality assurance and evaluation expertise, as well as interaction with the project manager and the Evaluator throughout the evaluation process. In consultation IRMU may change the evaluation process, timeline, approach, etc. as necessary at any point throughout the evaluation-process.

IMRU review, comment on and clear all steps and deliverables during the evaluation process: Terms of Reference; Selection of the evaluator, Inception Report; Draft Evaluation Report; Final Evaluation Report and an Evaluation Brief; Evaluation Follow-up Plan; publishes the final evaluation report and the Evaluation Brief, as well as sends the final evaluation report to an external evaluation quality assurance provider.

Payment Modalities

The evaluator will be issued a consultancy contracts and paid in accordance with UNDP rules and regulations. The contracts are legally binding documents in which the Evaluator agrees to complete the deliverables by the set deadlines. Payment is correlated to deliverables and three instalments are typically foreseen:

1. The first payment upon clearance of the Inception Report by IRMU;
2. The second payment upon clearance of the Draft Evaluation Report by IRMU;
3. The third and final payment (i.e. the remainder of the fee) only after completion of the respective tasks, receipt of the final report, Evaluation Brief and clearance by IRMU, as

well as presentation of final evaluation findings and recommendations.

80 percent of the daily subsistence allowance and terminals is paid in advance before travelling. The balance is paid after the travel has taken place, upon presentation of boarding passes and the completed travel claim forms.

IRMU is the sole entity to request payments to be released in relation to evaluation and payments will be processed in agreement with the Project Management.

Annex 1. Terms of Reference for Evaluators

TERMS OF REFERENCE

TITLE:	Final Evaluator
AGENCY/PROJECT NAME:	UNDP: Enhancing access to justice in Solomon Islands through paralegalism
COUNTRY OF ASSIGNMENT:	Home-based
TIMEFRAME OF ASSIGNMENT:	11 October- 17 December 2021 (30 Days)

1) GENERAL BACKGROUND

The Solomon Islands Access to Justice (A2J) Project supports the building and strengthening of the capacity of the Public Solicitor's Office (PSO) to enhance access to justice for the people of Solomon Islands at national and provincial levels, including women, youth and marginalized groups in communities outside urban centers. The project is implemented across the provinces of Solomon Islands through a two-tiered paralegal initiative: provincial paralegals and community legal advocates (CLAs).

The A2J Project has been implemented for over two years (September 2019 – December 2021). The overall objective of the end of project evaluation is to generate knowledge from the A2J Project's experience in collaborating with and supporting the PSO. The evaluation is intended to be forward looking which will capture lessons learned and provide information on the nature, extent and where possible, the impact of the A2J Project on the PSO and Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs.

The emphasis on learning lessons speaks to the issue of understanding what has and what has not worked as a guide for future programming. As per the OECD/DAC criteria, this evaluation will assess relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, sustainability and impact of the project and of the results.

The evaluation will assess the intended and unintended outcomes of the A2J project and recommend strategies for future operational and programmatic effectiveness of similar initiatives in comparable situations. The evaluation serves as an important accountability function, providing national stakeholders and partners in Solomon Islands with an impartial assessment of the results including gender equality results of this project. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation will inform the key stakeholders of this evaluation, namely the PSO, Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs, civil society organisations, UNDP and other UN agencies.

2) OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The aim of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of the design and relevance of the project. Its results will

be used to inform the implementation of the second half of the project, assess project's successes and good practices, as well as lesson learnt and areas of improvement. The main users of the evaluation results will be project managers and donors.

The following DAC (Development Assistance Committee) criteria will be assessed during the evaluation: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. In addition, design, established partnerships and cooperation as well as aspects of human rights and gender mainstreaming will be assessed. The evaluation will specifically assess how gender aspects have been mainstreamed into the project. Furthermore, lessons learned and best practices will be identified and recommendations based on the findings formulated.

The outcomes of the evaluation will inform as to what extent the project is contributing to the outcomes of the UNDP relevant corporate strategic documents, and above towards the operationalization of the SDG agenda.

3) SCOPE OF WORK

Under the guidance and supervision of the Head of the Integrated Results Management Unit (IRMU), the key responsibilities of the evaluator includes (i) development of the evaluation design with detailed methods, tools and techniques, sensitive to key gender as well as human rights issues (ii) ensuring adherence to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards, standards, guidelines and templates and the full evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR), and (iii) ensuring that all deliverables are submitted in a timely and satisfactory manner and in line with the quality criteria checklist.

The evaluation will be undertaken during the period of October to December 2021. The evaluation will cover programme conceptualisation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of results. The evaluation will also focus on performance of indicators agreed with the donors. In addition to assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the A2J project, the evaluation will explore the key factors that have contributed to the achieving or not achieving of the intended results; determine the extent to which the A2J project contributed to building capacities; addressing crosscutting issues of gender and human rights; forging partnership at different levels, including with government, donors, UN agencies, and communities; sustainability of the A2J project for continued realisation of results; and to draw lessons learned and best practices and make recommendations for future programming of projects of similar nature.

Specific evaluation objectives are:

1. To determine the relevance and strategic positioning of UNDP support to Access to Justice and whether the initial assumptions remain relevant for the project;
2. The progress to date under each output and what can be derived in terms of lessons learned for future UNDP support towards capacity building and service delivery in Access to Justice;
3. How the interventions succeeded to strengthen application of a rights-based approach, gender mainstreaming and participation of other socially vulnerable groups such as children and people with disabilities;
4. Assess the overall contribution of the project to the state of good governance, rule of law and human rights observance in the country.

The target audience are UNDP, donor (Australian Government), the project partners, beneficiaries, external

human rights and justice stakeholders, external donors and other relevant users of the report.

Given that this is a Final Evaluation of a pilot project, the emphasis will be on identifying lessons learned with a view to adjusting the future project design and implementation accordingly. The evaluation will therefore make recommendations for the way forward, based on progress thus far.

Findings and lessons learned:
- Outline, as logically and objectively as possible, findings and conclusions
- Highlight the major successes and good practices
- Highlight the major shortcomings, and weaknesses in order of importance

Recommendations:
- Present recommendations for a way forward and potential corrective actions; recommendations should be objective, realistic, practical, understandable and forward looking
- Link the recommendations logically to the findings

The following are the key evaluation questions to be included in the final evaluation:

Design
The Design of a project or programme measures the extent to which the logical framework approach was adopted.
1. To what extent has the results based framework been a useful programme management tool and allowed for an assessment of project outcomes and impact?
2. How well aligned are activities, outputs and outcomes in the logical framework?
3. To what extent does the design of this project enable optimal use of resources and cooperation with other development initiatives?
4. How effective has UNDP been in managing and implementing the project?
Relevance
Relevance is the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.
5. How relevant is the project to target groups' needs and priorities, including target groups of governments, development partners and CSOs?
6. To what extent are the outputs, outcomes and objectives of this project/programme relevant and contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and how have project activities supported partners in implementing the SDGs?
Efficiency
Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs.
7. To what extent were the human and financial resources and inputs converted to outputs in a timely and cost-effective manner?
8. What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the A2J Project implementation process?
Effectiveness
Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives.
9. To what extent were the planned outputs and outcomes in the project document achieved?
10. Are there any good practices and successes, as well as failures, challenges and areas for improvement?

11. Were there any unintended results achieved beyond those included in the logical framework? If so, what were those results?
(Expected) Impact *Impact is the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.*
12. To what extend is the project likely to achieve/already achieved its objectives or parts of it beyond the delivery of activities and progress against output targets?
13. Which best fit can be identified for adaptation and replication (eg. in other projects or topics), up-scaling, or prioritization, to ensure achieving outcomes in the most effective way?
Sustainability *Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.*
14. To what extent has the ownership of key stakeholders been sought and institutionalized?
15. How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the A2J Project, including contributing factors and constraints?
16. Have the project's activities contributed to outputs, processes, networks etc. that are likely to have some enduring benefit? What have been the barriers to sustainability?
Partnerships and cooperation *The evaluation assesses the partnerships and cooperation established during the project/ programme as well as their functioning and value.*
17. To what extent have partnerships been sought and established with and between governments, parliaments, the private sector, civil society and academia?
18. To what extent is the project/programme cooperating with other potential partners (including UN agencies, CSOs, academia, etc.) to contribute to the achievement of the SDGs?
19. To what extent were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of outputs?
Human rights, gender equality, and leaving no one behind *The evaluation needs to assess the mainstreaming throughout the project/programme of human rights, gender equality, and the dignity of individuals, i.e. vulnerable groups.*
Human Rights
20. To what extent are human rights considerations included in the project design and implementation?
21. To what extent was the project informed by human rights treaties and instruments?
22. To what extent did the project identify the relevant human rights claims and obligations?
Gender Equality
23. To what extent has the Project promoted women's participation throughout the Project activities and improved the active participation of women in discussions?
24. How could gender equality considerations be further included in the project design and implementation?
Social Inclusion
25. How did the project consider the needs of the vulnerable and disadvantaged to promote social equity, for example, women, youth, disabled persons?
Lessons learned and best practices *Lessons learned concern the learning experiences and insights that were gained throughout the project/ programme.*
26. What lessons, both positive and negative, can be learned from this Project?
27. What best practices, if any, in planning and implementing the project can be identified that should be

replicated and/or scaled up in related future programming?

Methodology and Approach

The evaluation will use methodologies and techniques as determined by the specific needs for information, the questions set out in the ToR for the evaluation and the availability of stakeholders. In all cases, the evaluator is expected to analyse all relevant information sources, such as reports, programme documents, thematic programmes, programme files, financial reports and any other documents that may provide further evidence for triangulation, on which his/her conclusions will be based. The Evaluator is also expected to use relevant quantitative and/or qualitative tools as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. While maintaining independence, the evaluation will be carried out based on a participatory approach, which seeks the views and assessments of all parties identified as the key stakeholders of the project/ programme, the Core Learning Partners (CLP).

The evaluation ToR provides basic information as regards to the methodology, which should not be understood as exhaustive. It is rather meant to guide the Evaluator in elaborating an effective, efficient, and appropriate evaluation methodology that should be proposed, explained and justified in the Inception Report.

In addition, the evaluator will be asked to present a summarized methodology (including an evaluation matrix) in the Inception Report outlining the evaluation criteria, indicators, sources of information and methods of data collection. The evaluation methodology must conform to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards.

While the Evaluator shall fine-tune the methodology for the evaluation in an Inception Report, a mixed-methods approach of qualitative and quantitative methods is mandatory due to its appropriateness to ensure an inclusive methodology. Special attention shall be paid to an unbiased and objective approach and the triangulation of sources, methods, data, and theories. Indeed, information stemming from secondary sources will be cross-checked and triangulated through data retrieved from primary research methods. Primary data collection methods need to be gender-sensitive as well as inclusive.

The credibility of the data collection and analysis are key to the evaluation. Rival theories and competing explanations must be tested once plausible patterns emerge from triangulating data.

The limitations to the evaluation need to be identified and discussed by the Evaluator in the Inception Report, e.g. data constraints (such as missing baseline and monitoring data). Potential limitations as well as the chosen mitigating measures should be discussed.

When designing the evaluation data collection tools and instruments, the Evaluator needs to consider the analysis of certain relevant or innovative topics in the form of short case studies, analyses, etc. that would benefit the evaluation results.

- **Scope of Work**

Specific responsibilities include:
- Documentation review and final framing of questions
- Draft inception report, containing: initial observations of the desk review, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments (including surveys/questionnaires and interview guides), sampling strategy, evaluation

matrix and limitations to the evaluation.
- Planning and execution of the assignment
- Incorporating the use of best practice with respect to M&E and results-based evaluation methodologies
- Leading interviews and consultations, as well as any debriefings to the stakeholders/partners
- Leading the drafting and finalization/quality control of the inception report and the draft and final report, as well as Evaluation Brief (2-pages)

The evaluator must not have been involved in the design and/or implementation, supervision and coordination of and/or have benefited from the programme/project or theme under evaluation. The evaluator will report exclusively to the head of the UNDP IRMU, who is the sole clearing entity for all evaluation deliverables and products. The evaluator shall respect the UNEG Ethical Guidelines.

4) DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT, DUTY STATION AND EXPECTED PLACES OF TRAVEL

This assignment will take place between 11 October- 17 December 2021 and is output-based. The Evaluator will be based in Solomon Islands or if abroad, the Evaluator will complete the entire evaluation remotely. Travel within Solomon Islands to provinces outside Honiara will be facilitated by UNDP as per UNDP's travel rules and regulations.

Timeframe:
- Inception report: by 14 October 2021
- Consultations: by 29 October 2021
- 1st draft report: 5 November 2021
- Final Draft report: by 19 November 2021
- Final report and Evaluation Brief: by 17 December 2021

The evaluation is expected to take a total of 30 working days:

Duties	Time frame	Location	Deliverables
Desk review and drafting of Inception Report	11-14 October 4 days	Home based	Draft Inception report
Review of draft Inception Report by IRMU	15-19 October		Comments on the draft Inception Report to the Evaluator
Incorporation of comments from IRMU	19-20 October	Home base	Revised draft Inception

			Report
(can entail various rounds of comments from IRMU)	1 day		
Deliverable A: Final Inception Report	**By 20 October** *(total: 5 days)*		**Final Inception report to be cleared by IRMU at least one week before the field mission can get started**
Evaluation interviews and mission: briefing, interviews with UNDP staff (including by phone/skype); observation; focus groups; presentation of preliminary observations (if applicable)	25-29 October *5 days*	Home based	Interviews and data collection
Drafting of the evaluation report; submission to Project Management and IRMU	1-5 November 5 days	Home based	Draft evaluation report
Review of IRMU for quality assurance and Project Management for factual errors	*8-12 November*		Comments on the draft evaluation report to the Evaluator
Consideration of comments from the project manager and incorporation of comments from IRMU (can entail various rounds of comments from IRMU)	15-19 November *5 days*	Home based	Revised draft evaluation report
Deliverable B: Draft Evaluation Report	**By 19 November** *(total: 15 days)*	Home based	**Draft evaluation report, to be cleared by IRMU**
IRMU to share draft evaluation report with Core Learning Partners for comments	*22-26 November*		Comments of CLPs on the draft report
Consideration of comments from Core	29 November – 1 December	Home based	Revised draft evaluation

Learning Partners and preparation of draft Evaluation Brief	*3 days*		report
Final review by IRMU; incorporation of comments and finalization of report and Evaluation Brief (can entail various rounds of comments from IRMU)	2-7 December *4 days*		Revised draft evaluation report; draft Evaluation Brief
Presentation of evaluation results (to be reviewed and cleared by IRMU)	Tentative: 10 December *3 days*	Home based	Presentation of evaluation results
Deliverable C: Final evaluation report; presentation of evaluation results; Evaluation Brief (2-pager)	**By 17 December** **(total: 10** *days)*	Home based	**Final evaluation report; Evaluation Brief and presentation of evaluation results, cleared by IRMU**
Project Management: Finalise Evaluation Follow-up Plan	By 22 December		Final Evaluation Follow-up Plan to be cleared by IRMU
Project Management: Disseminate final evaluation report	By 29 December		Final evaluation report disseminated to internal and external stakeholders
IRMU: facilitate the external Evaluation Quality Assessment of the Final Report	1st quarter 2022		

5) FINAL PRODUCTS

The final products for this assignment are as follows:

Inception report: The inception report should be prepared before going into the full-fledged evaluation exercise. It should include initial observations of the desk review, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments (including surveys/questionnaires and interview guides), sampling strategy, evaluation matrix and limitations to

the evaluation, in line with UNDP evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates.

1st and Final Draft reports: Draft evaluation report should be prepared in line with UNDP evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates, including an analysis of the performance of the project to adequately address gender equality as well as human rights issues, with concrete findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Final Evaluation report: The final report will be produced based on feedback received on the draft report. The final report will be shared with stakeholders and other partners. The final evaluation report and an Evaluation Brief (2-pager) should be prepared in line with UNDP evaluation norms, standards, guidelines and templates.

6) PROVISION OF MONITORING AND PROGRESS CONTROLS

The Evaluator will work under the supervision of the UNDP IRMU, who will consult with and seek inputs from other counterparts in line with the evaluation ToR.

The A2J project will support the logistical arrangements of consultant travels and stakeholder consultations. Although the A2J project is administratively responsible for the evaluator, it shall not interfere with analysis and reporting, except where requested and at opportunities for comments/feedback.

UNDP will share the final version of the report with the national stakeholder agencies and all partners of the project.

7) TEAM COMPOSITION, DEGREE OF EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS

The following are required qualifications for the evaluator:

Education:
- Master's degree in Law, Development Studies, Public Finance, Political Science, Social Sciences, Evaluation, or other relevant field and preferably formal training/education on evaluation methodologies and principles;

Experience:
- At least 7 years of relevant professional technical experience in the field of evaluation of projects/programmes, strategies, etc. at the international level, preferably with experience in conducting evaluations for the United Nations;
- Experience in the area of access to justice or related field is highly desirable.
- Experience with result-based management and program/project monitoring approaches, including gender and human rights-sensitive evaluations;
- Knowledge of quantitative and qualitative research methods;
- Experience leading review/Evaluators;
- Sound knowledge in the thematic area of common law justice systems;
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System and in particular of UNDP would be of advantage;
- Experience in the Pacific region would be an advantage

Functional competencies:
- Strong interpersonal skills, communication and diplomatic skills, ability to lead a team;
- Openness to change and ability to receive and integrate feedback;
- Strong analytical, reporting and writing abilities;
- Excellent speaking and presentation skills;
- Experience in presenting and communicating complex evaluation or research results in a structured manner (in reports, briefs, presentations, etc.);

Language requirements:
- Excellent spoken and written English language skills required
- Fluency in in Solomon Islands Pidgin is an asset.

8) REVIEW TIME REQUIRED

10 days after submission of each deliverable.

Payment Schedule:
Payment will be made after satisfactory acceptance and certification of the deliverables and in accordance with UNDP procedures:
- on submission of final inception report – 25% of the total value of the contract
- on submission of final draft report – 40% of the total value of the contract
- on acceptance of final report – 35% of the total value of the contract

9) CONSULTANT PRESENCE REQUIRED ON DUTY STATION/UNDP PREMISES

☐	☐	☐	■
PARTIAL	**INTERMITTENT**	**FULL TIME**	**NONE**

Annex 2. List of background documents for the desk review

This list is indicative only and will be further refined by the Evaluator.

1. UNEG standard for evaluation in the UN system, UNDP evaluation policy

2. UNDP handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluation of development results

3. United Nations Pacific Strategy 2018-2022

4. UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021[3]

5. UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025[4]

6. UNDP Sub-regional Programme Document for the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (SRPD) 2018-2022[5]

7. Project Document

8. Project annual work plans

9. Project progress reports

10. Project annual report 2020

11. Project board minutes

12. Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR)

13. Project knowledge products: Paralegal curriculum; Community Legal Advocate Curriculum; Outreach Toolkit

14. UNDP website: UNDP and the Sustainable Development Goals[6]

15. UNDP evaluation resource centre[7]

16. UNEG: Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation[8]

17. UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)[9]

18. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation[10]

19. United Nations Development Assistance Framework Guidance (2017)[11]

---

[3] http://strategicplan.undp.org/
[4] https://undocs.org/en/DP/2021/28
[5] http://www.pacific.undp.org/content/pacific/en/home/operations/legal_framework/_jcr_content/centerparsys/download_13/file.res/Pacific_SRPD_2018-2022.pdf
[6] http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/sustainable-development-goals.html
[7] https://erc.undp.org/
[8] http://www.uneval.rgdetail/980
[9] www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2601
[10] www.uneval.org/document/download/548
[11] https://undg.org/document/2017-undaf-guidance/

Annex 3. List of stakeholders

The list of stakeholders will be further refined by the Evaluator, in consultation with project/programme management IRMU. The Evaluator should also request interviews with other relevant stakeholders.

Type[12]	CLP[13] (mark with X)	Organisation[14]	Name	Designation[15]	Location	Email
UNDP field	X	UNDP	Berdi Berdiyev	Country Manager, UNDP Solomon Islands	Honiara, Solomon Islands	berdi.berdiyev@undp.org
UNDP field	X	UNDP	Grace Kiernan	Access to Justice Project Manager	Honiara, Solomon Islands	Grace.kiernan@undp.org
UNDP field	X	UNDP	Barbel Riti	IRMU, UNDP Solomon Islands	Honiara, Solomon Islands	barbel.riti@undp.org
UNDP field	X	UNDP	Mahezabeen Khan	IRMU, Pacific Office in Fiji	Suva, Fiji	Maheazabeen.khan@undp.org
UNDP	X	UNDP	**A2J team members:** Stella Tuhaika Archana Pratap	Deputy Project Manager Finance and Procurement	Honiara, Solomon Islands	stella.tuhaika@undp.org archana.pratap@undp.org

---

12 Please include the information, if this person is e.g. an implementing partner, donor, recipient, UN agency, etc.

13 **The CLPs** are the main stakeholders, i.e. a limited number of those deemed as particularly relevant to be involved throughout the evaluation process, i.e. in reviewing and commenting on the TOR and the evaluation questions, reviewing and commenting on the draft evaluation report, as well as facilitating the dissemination and application of the results and other follow-up action. Stakeholders include all those to be invited to participate in the interviews and surveys, including the CLPs.

14 Please include the name of the organisation the person is working for.

15 Please include the designation/job title of the person.

			Jilgina Kimisi	Assistant Administrative Assistant		jilgina.kimisi@undp.org
			Edward Suinao	- M&E Officer		edward.suinao@undp.org rashmi.chary@undp.org
			Rashmi Chary	- Access to Justice and Social Inclusion Specialist		
			Jone Raqauqau	-Communications Specialist		jone.raqauqau@undp.org
Donor	X	Australian High Commission	Kate Webb	First Secretary	Honiara, Solomon Islands	Kate.Webb@dfat.gov.au
Donor	X	Australian High Commission	Andrew Elborn	Governance Counsellor	Honiara, Solomon Islands	Andrew.Elborn@dfat.gov.au
Donor	X	Australian High Commission	Frank Fono	Project Manager	Honiara, Solomon Islands	Frank.Fono@dfat.gov.au
Recipient		Ministry of Justice & Legal Affairs	Dr Paul Mae	Permanent Secretary	Honiara, Solomon Islands	Paul.Mae@mjla.gov.sb
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	George Gray	Public Solicitor	Honiara, Solomon Islands	GGray@pso.gov.sb
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Martha Manaka	Principal Legal Officer	Honiara, Solomon Islands	MManaka@pso.gov.sb
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Rodney Manebosa	Principal Legal Officer	Honiara, Solomon Islands	SManebosa@pso.gov.sb

Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Benham Ifutoo	Principal Legal Officer	Honiara, Solomon Islands	BIfutoo@pso.gov.sb
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Daniel Kwalai	Principal Legal Officer	Honiara, Solomon Islands	DKwalai@pso.gov.sb
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Kathleen Kohata	Principal Legal Officer	Honiara, Solomon Islands	KKohata@pso.gov.sb
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Roria Sikua Karlson Kaekesa Eddie Gaza Alice Silas Jennifer Happylyn	Paralegals	Honiara, Solomon Islands	Roria: Roria.sikua@undp.org Karlson: Karlson.kaekesa@undp.org Eddie: gaza95.e@gmail.com Alice: allietimz@gmail.com Jennifer: happylyn22@gmail.com
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Tracy Aisa Haniel Max Natasha Sogabule Thompson Fiuga	Senior Legal Officer Senior Legal Officer Paralegal Paralegal	Gizo, Solomon Islands	Tracy: TAisa@pso.gov.sb Haniel: HMax@pso.gov.sb Natasha: Natasha.sogabule@undp.org Thompson: thompsonfiuga@gmail.com
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Michael Fagani Delilah Kukura Jutta Wale	Senior Legal Officer Senior Legal Officer Paralegal	Lata, Solomon Islands	Michael: Michael.fagani@pso.gov.sb Delilah: DKukura@pso.gov.sb Jutta: jutta.wale@undp.org

Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	John Resly Brooks Nelson Kere	Principal Legal Officer Paralegal	Kirakira, Solomon Islands	John: JResly@pso.gov.sb Nelson: nelson.kere@undp.org
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Andrickson Maqu	Community Legal Advocate	Vella la Vella, Gizo, Solomon Islands	andricksonmaqu@gmail.com
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Oxley Limeniala Godfrey Male Priscilla Manu Paul Gauwane	Senior Legal Officer Senior Legal Officer Paralegal Paralegal	Auki, Solomon Islands	Oxley: OLimeniala@pso.gov.sb Godfrey: GMale@pso.gov.sb Priscilla: manupriscilla569@gmail.com Paul: paul.gauwane@undp.org
Recipient		Public Solicitor's Office	Eddie Gaza	Paralegal PWD legal clinic	Honiara, Solomon Islands	gaza95.e@gmail.com
Recipient		PWDSI	Stella Waioha	A2J Officer	Honiara, Solomon Islands	stellawaioha@gmail.com
Recipient		PWDSI	Naomi Tai	Office Administrator	Honiara, Solomon Islands	tainaomi529@gmail.com
Recipient		PWDSI	Casper Fa'asala	Vice President	Honiara, Solomon Islands	genderalert@gmail.com
Recipient		Ministry of Health and Medical Services	Elwin Taloimatakwa	Community Based Rehabilitation Trainer	Honiara, Solomon Islands	ETaloimatakwa@moh.gov.sb
Recipient		National Judiciary	Justice Lawry	High Court of Solomon Islands (Previous Public	Honiara, Solomon Islands	howard.lawry@gmail.com

| | | | | Solicitor 2019-2020) | | |
| | | | | | | |

``

Annex 4: Structure of inception report

Introduction	1.1. Objective of the evaluation 1.2. Background and context 1.3. Scope of the evaluation
Methodology	2.1. Evaluation criteria and questions 2.2. Conceptual framework 2.3. Evaluability 2.4. Data collection methods 2.5. Analytical approaches 2.6. Risks and potential shortcomings
Programme of work	3.1. Phases of work 3.2. Team composition and responsibilities 3.3. Management and logistic support 3.4. Calendar of work
Annexes	1. Terms of reference of the evaluation 2. Evaluation matrix 3. Stakeholder map 4. Tentative outline of the main report 5. Interview checklists/protocols 6. Outcome model 7. Detailed responsibilities of evaluation team members 8. Reference documents 9. Document map 10. Project list 11. Project mapping 12. Detailed work plan

Annex 5: Structure for final evaluation report

Indicative Section	Description and comments
Title and opening pages	Name of programme or theme being evaluated Country of programme Name of the organization to which the report is submitted Names and affiliations of the evaluators Date
Table of contents	
List of acronyms and abbreviations	
Executive summary	This should be an extremely short chapter, highlighting the evaluation mandate, approach, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. Often, readers will only look at the executive summary. It should be prepared after the main text has been reviewed and agreed and should not be circulated with draft reports.
Chapter 1:	Introduce the rationale for the evaluation, including mandate, purpose and

Introduction	objectives, outline the main evaluation issues including the expected contribution at the outcome level, address evaluability and describe the methodology to be used. Refer to the outcome model and evaluation matrix, to be attached as annexes.
Chapter 2: The Development challenge	In addition to providing a general overview of historical trends and development challenges, specifically address the development challenge in the rule of law sector. Explain how issues surrounding the promotion of access to justice is addressed by government, and how it is reflected in national policies and strategies. Also provide information on the activities of other development partners in the area.
Chapter 3: UNDP response and challenges	Against the background of Chapter 2, explain what the project has done in this area (purely descriptive, not analytical). Provide the overarching outcome model, specifying the results frameworks for the project, descriptions of the main project activities, especially if they are going to be assessed later.
Chapter 4: Contribution to results	Against the background of Chapters 2-3, analyse findings without repeating information already provided. Also, minimize the need to mention additional factual information regarding projects and programmes (these should be described in Chapter 3). Focus on providing and analysing evidence relating to the evaluation criteria. Preferably, structure the analysis on the basis of the main evaluation criteria: • Relevance (of UNDP's involvement and the project approach) • Effectiveness (in contributing to the achievement of project outcomes, outputs). • Efficiency (in delivering outputs) • Sustainability (of the project outcomes, outputs) • Gender considerations • Social inclusion In addressing the evaluation criteria, the narrative should respond to the corresponding questions identified in the evaluation matrix and provide a summary analysis of the findings. Partnerships play a key role in ensuring that primary stakeholders achieve outcomes. As such, all evaluation criteria should cover relevant aspects of partnership: i.e., how were they relevant; how effective were they in contributing to the achievement of project outcomes, outputs; how efficiently were they managed; and how sustainable are they? Where appropriate, discuss cross-cutting themes separately using the main evaluation criteria. Do not allow the discussion to drift into conclusions and recommendations
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations	Conclusions are judgements based on evidence provided in Chapter 4. They are pitched at a higher level and are informed by an overall, comparative understanding of all relevant issues, options and opportunities. Do not provide new evidence or repeat evidence contained in earlier

	chapters.
	Recommendations should be derived from the evidence contained in Chapter 4. They may also, but need not necessarily, relate to conclusions. In line with the nature of the evaluation, some recommendations may be more strategic in nature, while others may be more action-oriented. Recommendations should be important and succinct.
Annexes	• ToR for the final evaluation.
	• List persons interviewed, sites visited.
	• List documents reviewed (reports, publications).
	• Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys, etc.)
	i) Assessment of the progress by outcomes and outputs, in relevance to the nationally defined goals.
	ii) Photos
	iii) Stories worth telling (most significant changes [MSC])

Annex 6: Sample Evaluation Matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub Questions	Data Sources	Data collection Methods / Tools	Indicators/Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis