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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION
i. UNICEF’s support in the Pacific from 2008 - 2012 has focused in particular on three of the Least Developed Countries in the sub-region, i.e. Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. The programmes in each of these countries was underpinned by a convergence approach, in which support on sub-national level was meant to be provided to the same selected underserved areas by all UNICEF’s programme components. The approach was meant to be a way to integrate programmes to holistically address the development needs of children at the sub-national level. Results were meant to be achieved across programme silos to enhance children and mothers’ well-being throughout the lifecycle. Focusing resources on the lowest performing sub-national areas, the approach was expected to contribute towards acceleration of achieving the MDGs. After four years of implementation in the Pacific, the convergence programming approach is being evaluated with the aim to inform UNICEF Pacific support for the upcoming programme cycle 2013 - 2017.

ii. The evaluation made use of a formative approach with the evaluation objectives focusing on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, which were further detailed for the specific requirements of the evaluation during the inception phase. A mixed methods approach was used in the methodology of the evaluation, with desk review of secondary data, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders and validation meetings at country and regional level to discuss findings. Combination of methods and participation of a wide range of stakeholders provided ample opportunity for triangulation. Country visits conducted included one selected convergence area in each of the focus countries. Ethical considerations were guided by the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards. Limitations to the methodology included the unavailability of some stakeholders which had moved position, some of which could be located and interviewed but some others could not be involved.

i. Implementation of the approach has been hampered by a lack of a common understanding amongst UNICEF staff and staff of partner agencies on what the core of the approach is and how it is to be implemented in the context of the Pacific, which was reinforced by a lack of UNICEF corporate guidance. This lack of common understanding is also reflected in the absence of a theory of change for the approach, detailing how the approach brings about better results for children and women. Convergence does, moreover, not appear to have been used as a key strategic principle across the UNICEF Pacific programme components and has not been included in key strategic documents. The relationship between Convergence and a focus on equity to enhance acceleration towards reaching the MDGs is not sufficiently clear and UNICEF staff has divergent opinions in this respect.

ii. The convergence approach was introduced as one of the key strategies for UNICEF’s programme cycle 2008 - 2012. In the implementation process the approach started off as an area-based approach but was adapted to include piloting and replication, an integrated approach to holistic child development and support to holistic planning for child development across sector agencies concerned. This has resulted in a variety of ways to enhance holistic child development.

EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Relevance
iii. Support provided to the convergence areas has addressed the needs of vulnerable children and women, with each of the selected areas scoring low on several child and women related indicators. Overall, however, the relevance of an area based approach to convergence in the Pacific, in which sub-
national programming focuses on selected geographical or administrative areas, has proved limited. As the approach was not linked to the UNDAF or national development strategies it remained focused UNICEF supported programmes and related social services. The area-based characteristic of the approach was not owned by key stakeholders, including National Governments, who need to address social services country wide, as well as several UNICEF programmes, to whom an area-based approach did not fit their programming focus and requirements. The ways in which the application of the approach has been adapted from a strictly area-based principle to a more diverse means of enhancing the holistic development of children has improved the relevance and applicability in the Pacific.

**Efficiency**

iv. Although field offices were set up in the focus countries, implementation of programme components in convergence areas was primarily steered by the programmes based in Suva, leaving the FO with few means to actually make convergence work in the field. The centralized UNICEF financial system further limited the management responsibilities of the Field Office while on the other hand they felt the consequences of multiple financial delays which occurred in practice and which at times undermined the credibility of UNICEF. Though these management constraints were identified in the MTR in 2010, these issues largely persisted during the second part of programme implementation.

v. Joint monitoring, the use of Most Significant Change technique and Sentinel monitoring (with overlap in convergence areas) have each proved to have added useful elements to programme monitoring. What has been missing is the regular collection of output and outcome level data on the indicators in the results frameworks of the various programme components. Though baseline data have been gathered in several of the programme components, no similar follow up data collection has yet taken place and reporting is primarily activity oriented. This has limited the use of results based management.

vi. So far efficiency has mainly been realized through application of an integrated approach to holistic child development as one of the applications of a holistic approach to child development. The EPI programme is a good example with the introduction of multiple services in addition to vaccination. Moreover, the use of learning of local interventions to inform national level advocacy and replication of initiatives has enhanced efficiency, and proved a useful way to make use of experience built in convergence areas. The development of Minimum Quality Standards for Primary Schools and the certification of Child and Mother Friendly hospitals are examples concerned. Such approaches did though not necessarily reduce transaction costs for parties concerned. These were in particular reduced through UNICEF’s participation in SWAps in Education with MoE and donors in each of the focus countries. However, the SWAps are nationally oriented and single sector focused and are not necessarily conducive with convergence or programming for holistic child development as such.

**Effectiveness**

vii. Results have been achieved in each of the programme components in the selected convergence area, and are likely to have contributed to the reduction of disparities in the countries concerned. Results in terms of children vaccinated through the EPI programme and the number of birth registrations are examples in case. Experiences obtained in the convergence areas have been used to inform national level legislation and policy-making and there have been various examples of replication of initiatives from the convergence areas to cover wider geographic areas. A holistic perspective to child development has been used to integrate multiple sector services in sector based programmes, bringing about multiple results for the same children and women. The organization of child health days is a good example of combining multiple services at a single event. Moreover, initiatives have focused on enhancing coordination at sub-national and local level in planning and delivery of social services with the support to the development of provincial and local level child development plans. This is of
particular importance with local level agencies lacking a tradition of attention to the delivery of quality social services.

viii. Constraining factors for reaching results have included limited capacities in coordination amongst the UNICEF programme components as well as government agencies and limited support to enhance such capacities so far. These constraints add to the geographical isolation and transport constraints that characterize large parts of the region.

ix. Strategies to enhance results include working through government systems and building capacities in the process. Attention to social and cultural aspects and recognizing the value in terms of identity for children and women can enhance programme implementation. Moreover, UNICEF’s engagement in SWAPs and expansion of the WASH programmes in Kiribati and Solomon Islands can provide new fora for UNICEF to promote a more holistic approach to child development.

Sustainability

x. Results so far cannot yet be considered to be sustainable with some of the capacities required not necessarily fully in place and government funding of programming costs of initiatives unlikely in the short term. Attention to disaster risk reduction and emergency preparedness is varying and needs to be enhanced to improve sustainability given the relatively high risk of natural disaster in the Pacific.

RECOMMENDATIONS (Abridged, for full version see details in Report)

Completing the work in the convergence areas

xi. UNICEF has committed support to the convergence areas in the three focus countries in the Pacific. Though an area-based approach as such appears not the best option for the UNICEF Pacific programme as argued in this report, discontinuation of support would need to be done step wise, in a phased approach. This on the one hand as processes started have often not been finalized and results achieved so far cannot yet be expected to be sustainable. Moreover, the capacity development initiatives started at the various levels need a substantial period of time in order to bring about the expected results. Therefore there is a need to continue UNICEF support to the convergence areas. Further support needs to focus on completing what has been started, further enhancing capacities, and sustaining results achieved so far. Several decision points will need to be included in the process, with the first being the 2015 Mid-Term Programme review.

Focus ‘Convergence’ on a wider set of ways in which to support holistic child development

xii. With the realization that an area-based approach is not necessarily the best way to support holistic child development in the Pacific, there is a need to develop other means to reach this objective and to shape UNICEF’s approach at the sub-national level, both within as well as outside of selected convergence areas. Use needs to be made of the approaches applied so far including the piloting of initiatives and the creation of linkages between experiences of sub-national level initiatives to support influencing of national level policy-making and legislation. Use also needs to be made of application of an integrated approach, adding on multiple activities to sector-based initiatives so that a more comprehensive set of services is provided and enhancing capacities of government and civil society agencies to take on and implement a more integrated approach.

xiii. These approaches need to be underpinned by support to enhanced coordination of planning and budgeting processes, in which child development issues and the provision of social services are addressed in a comprehensive rather than a single sector based approach. Support to capacity development for a more integrated approach to child development will require the creation of longer term partnerships in order to ensure a longer term process approach, required for such capacity related changes.
Adapt monitoring systems and develop capacities concerned

xiv. With at present UNICEF’s monitoring primarily oriented towards activities there is a need to reinforce the programme monitoring system and focus it on results. This in order to provide the programme with the means to assess what works and what does not work, which is needed in order to manage the various programmes and which can be used to inform lesson learning and replication of initiatives elsewhere in the Pacific. For a piloting approach to be able to work it needs to be underpinned by a sufficiently rigorous monitoring system.

xv. First of all there is a need to select a limited number of output level indicators in each of the programme components and indicators on aspects of coordinated service provision and to provide support to partners in gathering data regularly on this set of output level indicators. Once data on output level indicators come in regularly one could add data gathering on a limited number of outcome level changes. Next step would be to organize regular, six monthly or yearly, meetings to analyse data. This could be combined with field visits as presently part of the annual joint monitoring. The gathering of monitoring data and their analysis needs to be part of a wider M&E plan.

Develop means to enhance access to quality social services on outer islands

xvi. Selection of convergence has left out isolated outer islands with relatively small populations. This while there are many such islands in the Pacific focus countries. There is a need to address the delivery of quality social services to children and women on outer islands in the region.

xvii. One of the ways to reach this would be to enhance ‘one stop’ support, in which service providers would be able to provide several services as individuals or in teams. This would require enhanced coordination amongst the various government agencies concerned. In terms of UNICEF’s programmes there is an opportunity to make use of single sector programmes and the access to communities on outer islands that these provide to piggy back additional services onto single sector interventions in a strategic way.

Promote holistic child development in new fora that UNICEF has become part of and seek linkages with initiatives concerning holistic child development in the region

xviii. UNICEF’s positioning in Education SWAps in the three focus countries provides it with a voice and leverage in the education sector, which is an important achievement. Sector wide approaches are though not necessarily in line with UNICEF’s holistic vision of child development. UNICEF could, however, use its position within the SWAps to promote a more holistic development approach and include aspects of health, HIV/AIDS, and child protection in the education programming, making use of the SWAp coordination mechanisms that are put in place and that provide linkages with other Government Ministries and Departments, sub-national and local authorities and non-governmental organizations.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. UNICEF’s support in the Pacific from 2008-2012 has focused in particular on three of the Least Developed Countries in the sub-region, i.e. Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. The programmes in each of these countries made use of a convergence approach, in which support from all UNICEF’s programme components was meant to be provided to the same underserved geographical areas. After four years of implementation the convergence programming is being evaluated with the aim to inform UNICEF support during its next programme cycle 2013 - 2017. The present evaluation report provides the details of the evaluation findings and conclusions, identifies lessons learned and provides a set of actionable recommendations. The TOR of the evaluation is presented in annex 1.

BACKGROUND

1.2. UNICEF’s support in the Pacific concerns a multi-country programme, adapted to the heterogeneity of the Pacific Island Countries (PICs). While the countries share the challenges of Small Island developing states, economic indicators and human development aspects vary widely across them. In order to tailor support to the varying needs, UNICEF has developed a tiered approach in which it prioritizes three of the five LDCs in the region for the programming cycle of 2008 - 2012: Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. These three countries have the lowest Gross National Income per capita and the lowest Human Development Index values. They are amongst the countries with the lowest rates of child immunization, birth registration, primary school enrolment and access to water and sanitation and have high rates of Infant Mortality, under five Mortality and Childhood Malnutrition. The UNICEF programme includes sub-national engagement in these three tier 1 countries. Tier 2 countries consist of the two remaining LDCs and lower middle income countries\(^1\) while Tier 3 consists of middle income countries only.\(^2\) UNICEF maintains a minimum package of support across all the tiers and focuses on strategic policy engagement and systems building across all MTSP focus areas in Tier 2 countries and on policy advocacy through regional channels and events in Tier 3 countries.

1.3. Programming in the prioritized Tier 1 countries makes use of a convergence approach in selected sub-national areas, in addition to strategic policy engagement, advocacy and support to systems development at national level. In the convergence approach the various programmes across all the MTSP focus areas of UNICEF are meant to be implemented together in the same geographical or administrative areas, providing a holistic perspective to sub-national interventions and the development needs of children. The convergent areas are selected primarily based on the overall vulnerability of children and women and lack of access to and use of social services. Principles of the convergence approach as supported by UNICEF in the Pacific are presented in box 1 below. The mid-term review of the UNICEF programme, which was conducted in 2010, called for acceleration of the convergence approach, for more emphasis on the most vulnerable groups and the scaling-up of models developed to enhance results for children in the countries concerned.\(^3\)

1.4. The convergence approach is a way to integrate programmes to holistically address the development needs of children at the sub-national level. Working from a community-based approach, solutions are meant to reach across programme silos to enhance children and

---

\(^1\) Tier two countries include the LDCs Samoa (currently graduating from LDC status) and Tuvalu and the Middle Income countries of Fiji, Marshall Islands, Micronesia and Nauru. Tier 2 countries have certain child development indicators on which progress is comparable with Tier 1 countries.

\(^2\) Tier countries include Palau, Tonga, the Cook Islands and Niue and the New Zealand territory of Tokelau.

\(^3\) UNICEF Pacific, *Convergence Paper for Mid-Term Review*. 

---
mothers’ well-being throughout the lifecycle. With its focus on programming at the sub-national level and concentrating resources on the lowest performing areas, home to the most vulnerable children and women, the convergence approach aims to deliver results at scale at the sub-national level and to contribute to accelerating achieving the MDGs. Concentration of support in selected areas is considered to enhance efficiency of programme implementation. UNICEF Pacific has adapted the approach to the context of the Pacific amongst others by including aspects of ‘scaling-up’ and replication. A joint monitoring system has been put into place in order to track changes together with national counterparts.

Box 1: Principles of Convergence as supported by UNICEF in the Pacific

1. **Comprehensive Measurable Coverage**: providing support by all sector programmes in selected geographic areas

2. **Responding to the Most Vulnerable Populations**: selecting geographical areas based on underserved populations and worst-off groups

3. **Programme Approach**: with a first phase from 2008-2010, rolling out learning to other areas from 2011-2012

4. **National Response**: continue to provide support to national level planning, policy development, reporting, data collection and legislative reform processes

5. **Ownership and Participation**: ensuring appropriate consultation at all levels to ensure ownership

*Source: UNICEF Convergence Paper for Mid-Term Review.*

1.5. The convergence approach relates to UNICEF’s enhanced focus on equity, in reaching vulnerable children and women, which is also meant to accelerate achieving the MDG goals. An equity approach is considered not only right in ethical terms but also right in practice, as the benefits of such an approach are seen to outweigh the additional costs. Partnerships are at the centre of an equity approach based on the realization that more equitable development is only possible through a collective endeavour. There is recognition that different types of disparities overlap and interact and need to be addressed in an integrated way.

1.6. Various Challenges have been identified in the application of the convergence approach in the Pacific:

i. Identification of vulnerable and worst-off population groups and underserved areas is not always straightforward, with the distribution of some key inequities in human population groups showing disparate patterns, with groups scoring low on some but relatively high on other indicators

ii. In practice it has not always been clear whether the most vulnerable groups were reached, including logistical difficulties of reaching isolated groups in the specific geographical context of the sub-region

---

iii. Implementation of the approach in broader Sector Wide Approaches which have emerged in education and health sectors in some of the countries and under joint funding arrangements

iv. Though UNICEF’s location in national capitals facilitates its policy work at national level, it is not necessarily conducive to implement community based programming in convergence areas.

1.7. Application of the convergence approach in the Pacific is expected to have several advantages in programme implementation and to bring about enhanced results for children and women. Expectations of the approach in the Pacific are presented in box 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 2: Expectations of Application of the Convergence Approach in the Pacific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>To enhance results for children and women</strong> at the local level with the limited resources available to UNICEF and its partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Achieving better <strong>synergy</strong> between programmes in the convergence areas and realize results that cut across sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Use of lessons learned in pilot initiatives for <strong>replication</strong> elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Enabling the development of a <strong>common framework for monitoring and evaluation</strong> of models developed in convergence areas jointly with partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Minimizing transaction costs</strong> for government agencies, communities and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Reducing duplication, overlaps and ambiguity</strong> between programme interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Maximizing the potential <strong>use of extension workers</strong> to deliver multiple programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Interviews with UNICEF Senior Management and staff.*

**CONTEXT**

**Sub-regional context in the Pacific**

1.8. The Pacific is a geographically vast, culturally and ecologically diverse and, in human development terms, highly heterogeneous region. The development challenges in the Pacific are significant. The region counts five Least Developed Countries (LDCs) alongside middle income countries. While assessment of the status of reaching of the Millennium Development Goals is challenged by the weakness of statistical capacities in the region, what is unambiguous is: “**that more concerted effort is needed to accelerate and sustain progress towards achieving the MDGs by 2015**”\(^5\). Most of the countries in the region are off track on poverty and gender goals. Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, the three focus countries of UNICEF support, are not on track for most of the goals.\(^6\) Climate change is an emerging issue and a growing concern as it has the potential to derail progress on all fronts.

---


\(^6\) For details on MDG status of the UNICEF focus countries see Table in Annex 2.
1.9. The geographic isolation and small size of PICs has resulted in small, high-cost economies. Economic performance of PICs has been mixed, with low or negative rates of per capita income growth over the last ten years in most countries. High levels of population growth put pressure on available land and resources for rural productivity while urbanization is increasing, partly due to lack of opportunities in rural areas. Governments tend to dominate the economy, particularly in the smaller countries, leading to a relatively unfavourable environment for private sector development. There is a general lack of reliable statistical information systems to support decision-making and to assist monitoring of the MDGs.

1.10. While large part of the population of the PICs depends on the terrestrial, coastal and marine environments for their livelihoods, their environments are under threat by over exploitation, pollution as well as climate change. The region is vulnerable to disasters and various emergencies have occurred in the recent past.

1.11. Youth comprises more than half of the population in many of the countries. Gender inequality in the region is relatively high with unequal access to resources and property, high incidence of sexual and domestic violence, and under-representation of women in decision-making in public life and local and national politics.⁷

1.12. Alongside climate change the global economic crisis in considered as the most serious challenge to the achievement of the National and MDG goals in the sub-region. This view is shared amongst Pacific Island Forum Leaders and Development partners.

1.13. Details on the context in each of the three focus countries, including maps and location of convergence areas are presented in Annex 2.

Wider development context –UNDAF 2008-2012⁸

1.14. The UNICEF Programme in the Pacific is part of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), which covers the same period of 2008-2012 of the UNICEF Pacific Programme. The UNDAF of the Pacific brings together two UN Country teams (based in Fiji and Samoa) and a total of 15 agencies, funds and programmes and is driven by the priorities of 14 Pacific Island Countries, five of which are Least Developed Countries (LDCs). The regional aspect of the UNDAF is new with previously separate frameworks developed for each of the five LDCs. Almost 60 % of UN resources in the Pacific have been devoted to the five LDCs with the remainder addressing issues in the nine non-LDCs. Programmes have been focused on capacity development and policy support which are considered as the main comparative advantages of UN agencies. The MDGs are prioritized and mainstreamed throughout the UNDAF and its monitoring and evaluation framework. The UNDAF is meant to serve as a common programming tool for all UN agencies and is underpinned by a human rights-based approach and the mainstreaming of gender equality. For the four priorities of the Pacific UNDAF see box 3 below.

---


⁸Ibid.
Box 3: The Four Priorities of the Pacific UNDAF 2008 - 2012

1. Equitable economic growth and poverty reduction
2. Good governance and human rights
3. Equitable social and protection services
4. Sustainable environmental management


1.15. Progress is monitored making use of a joint results framework and annual reviews are conducted making use of joint monitoring and evaluation processes around the outcome areas. UNDAF monitoring and evaluation is aimed to be aligned with M&E of other regional strategies and plans, particularly the Pacific Plan.

**Aid Effectiveness in the Pacific**

1.16. With aid per capita in the region exceeding that of any other region, combined with high levels of poverty, low levels of economic growth and the MDGs not sufficiently on track in many countries, the UNDAF gives a high priority to improving aid effectiveness, in line with the Aid Effectiveness agenda⁹ and the Pacific Principles on Aid Effectiveness and promotion of the MDGs.¹⁰

1.17. In 2007 the countries in the Pacific adopted the Pacific Principles of Aid Effectiveness, which concern an adaptation of the Paris Declaration to the Pacific context. The leaders of the Pacific Islands Forum met in Cairn in August 2009 and agreed on a new Compact on strengthening development coordination in the Pacific.¹¹ In addition to principles of economic development, improved governance and service delivery, the compact includes enhanced coordination of development resources and improved aid effectiveness, as expressed in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action, and a revitalised commitment to the achievement of the MDGs in the Pacific. The Compact includes annual reporting on MDG progress and on effectiveness of overall development efforts in the region by the Forum’s Secretariat. The compact was further enhanced with the Port Vila Declaration on accelerating Progress on the Achievement of the MDGs.¹²

1.18. The support from a variety of development agencies and donors working at national and regional level easily overburdens the capacity of small Pacific Island Countries. The need for joint programme development and implementation is recognized in order to reduce transaction costs for Governments and partners. This is also meant to lead to increased coordination of programme strategies and inputs at sub-national and local levels.

1.19. The latest progress reports of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat mention good progress in improving development coordination, with enhanced attention to public financial management and increased incidence of more flexible forms of aid. As crucial factor for increased alignment and harmonisation strong political leadership is identified with aid management capacity in Forum Island Countries to guide such processes, making the pace of these processes dependent on country needs rather than on development partners’ internal regulations and preferences. The need for simpler and less fragmented aid delivery modalities is recognized with a need for more programme support

---


¹¹ *Fortieth Pacific Islands Forum, Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific.* August 2009.

¹² *Port Vila Declaration on Accelerating Progress on the Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.* August 2010.
and a reduced mission burden. Managing for development results is an area identified as requiring greater focus throughout the Pacific and in early 2011 a performance framework was developed for the Pacific Plan.\textsuperscript{13}

THE UNICEF PACIFIC MULTI-COUNTRY PROGRAMME

1.20. UNICEF’s involvement in the Pacific dates back to the 1950’s with limited involvement in the first 25 years and expansion from the mid 1970’s onwards. Over time the programme enhanced its strategic direction and developed its programme based on a multi-country framework, combined with country level programmes.

1.21. The UNICEF Program in the Pacific for the period 2008-2012 built on the previous country programme implemented from 2003-2007 and key learning obtained during that period. An important learning concerned the successful approach to prioritize three of the Least Developed Countries, i.e. Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu and the gains made from this approach. UNICEF has expanded its support to these priority countries in the period under review and plans to continue this support into the first part of the next programme cycle from 2013-2017.

1.22. The UNICEF programme for 2008 - 2012 was developed in tandem with the UNDAF for the Pacific and focuses UNICEF’s contribution on LDCs with incorporation of the priorities of the UNICEF Medium-Term Strategic Plan. Results reflect the goals of a World Fit for Children as adopted by the UN General Assembly at the twenty-seventh special session, 10 May 2002.

1.23. Systematic tracking of MDGs and other development goals is considered to have been relatively weak in the previous programme period with data capture being inadequate or uneven. Thus the programme includes building partnerships to facilitate a coordinated mechanism of data-generation centred on child–related indicators.

1.24. The programme is meant to address key constraints identified in the previous programme cycle, including: Government Departments that tend to work in isolation, despite emerging Sector wide Approaches, limited community involvement in government-led programmes and low absorption capacity. An integrated, participative and convergent programme is to overcome these challenges through engagement of local partners to leverage resources for children. The results framework of the programme is presented in Table 1 below, including the original results as well as the adaptations based on the Mid-Term Review conducted in 2010.

1.25. UNICEF Pacific is based in Suva, Fiji, with three field offices in Kiribati, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. Each field office is managed by a chief of field office, an international UNICEF staff member, and supported by a combination of international and national staff positions. As part of the UN Joint Presence Initiative UNICEF has lead responsibility in Kiribati and Vanuatu.

1.26. Convergence sites include the following (see maps in annex 2):

- Kiribati: South Tarawa and Abemama Island
- Solomon Islands: Western and Choiseul provinces
- Vanuatu: Tafea Province

1.27. UNICEF’s Pacific Multi-country Programme covering the period 2008-2012 consists of five programme components:

- Health and Sanitation
- Education
- Child Protection
- HIV and AIDS
- Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation
Table 1: UNICEF Pacific Programme Results Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Key results CPD / CPAP 2007/8</th>
<th>PCRs Adapted at MTR in 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and sanitation</td>
<td>In 14 PICs, at least 90% of boys and girls aged one year and under are immunized with potent childhood vaccines as per national schedules and at least 80% in all districts with a special focus on low-performing districts</td>
<td>At all times children, survive, grow and develop to their full potential, especially those from most vulnerable islands and communities in PICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governments of Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu have evidenced-based plans and programmes that progressively improve maternal and child health based on an evaluated essential package of interventions implemented in selected areas</td>
<td>Maternal and new-born health in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu is progressively improved through evidenced-based plans and programmes that are based on an evaluated essential package of interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children in selected provinces of the Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Vanuatu suffer fewer incidences of diarrhoea and other water related diseases</td>
<td>More schools and communities have access to sustainable and equitable WASH services and interventions to improve health, economic and human development outcomes in target PICTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Education and Gender Equality</td>
<td>At least 10% more children complete an 8 year basic education cycle or its non-formal equivalent in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
<td>Children aged 3 to 5, especially those most disadvantaged, benefit from improved access to quality early learning opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education sectoral programming and policy development at national and regional level draw from a rights-based approach to ensure equitable provision of quality education</td>
<td>Primary school aged children have access to schools which uphold minimum national quality standards, and which support student enrolment and retention to the end of the primary cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary school aged children attain national numeracy, literacy and life-skills learning outcomes by the end of the primary education cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministries of Education in 5 disaster-prone PICs equip children and schools with the knowledge and skills to cope when disasters strike and lead the provision of education services in post disaster settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Key results CPD / CPAP 2007/8</td>
<td>PCRs Adapted at MTR in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV / AIDS</td>
<td>Vulnerability to and impact of HIV and AIDS are reduced among the most at risk populations in at least Fiji, Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu with a special focus on children and women</td>
<td>Governments of 5 focus countries in PICs have and use sound strategic information for effective HIV programming, to reduce vulnerability to and impact of HIV and AIDS reduced among the most at risk population and most vulnerable populations, (with a special focus on children and women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most at risk and most vulnerable men, women and children in PICs have access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support services</td>
<td>Most at risk and most vulnerable youth, women and their partner in PICs engage in HIV-risk reduction behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>Children are increasingly protected by legislation and are better served by justice systems that protect them as victims, offenders and witnesses in at least Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
<td>Children are increasingly protected by legislation and are better served by justice systems that protect them as victims, offenders and witnesses in at least Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children are better served by well informed and coordinated child protection social services which ensure greater protection against and response to violence, abuse and exploitation in at least Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
<td>Children are better served by well informed and coordinated child protection social services which ensure greater protection against and response to violence, abuse and exploitation in at least Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children in selected geographical areas grow up in home and community environments that are increasingly free from violence, abuse and exploitation</td>
<td>Children in selected geographical areas grow up in home and community environments that are increasingly free from violence, abuse and exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation</td>
<td>Social and economic policies are evidence-based and progressively address the rights of children, youth and women through inclusive mechanisms in at least Kiribati, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu</td>
<td>By 2012, social and economic policies are evidence-based and progressively address the rights of children, youth and women, particularly those most vulnerable and at-risk in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality disaggregated children’s, young people’s and women’s social data are available and integrated into monitoring and evaluation systems in at least Kiribati, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu</td>
<td>By 2012, quality disaggregated children’s, young people’s and women’s social data are available and integrated into monitoring and evaluation systems in at least Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governments and communities engage in long-term strategic communication to promote social change in favour of achieving the rights of children, youth and women in selected areas of Kiribati, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu</td>
<td>Government and communities engage in long-term integrated, strategic communication fostering and sustaining behaviour and social changes to address the rights of children, youth and women in selected areas of Kiribati, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Results emphasizing focus countries ☐ Results covering all 14 countries ☐
1.28. The UNICEF Programme 2008-2012 planned to make use of the following strategies:14

a) Convergence, focusing UNICEF support on selected areas with a lack of adequate social services, bringing together support on all of the MTSP focus areas for the same vulnerable communities

b) Evidence-based advocacy to influence the development and implementation of laws and policies that recognize children’s rights and address sub national inequalities

c) Systematic capacity development of duty bearers at national and sub national levels through promotion of human rights-based programming, gender and youth mainstreaming, and results-based planning, management, monitoring and evaluation

d) Enhancements to basic service delivery through the participatory evaluation of models and approaches

e) Partnerships with and for children and young people at sub national, national and regional levels

f) Intensified community engagement, social mobilization and communication for behaviour change and social change

g) Partnerships with and leveraging of financial and/or technical resources of major development partners and regional organizations and institutions

h) Enhanced national and sub national capacities for emergency preparedness and response in a coordinated and integrated manner

1.29. Multiple stakeholders are involved in the programme and in the convergence approach that is being applied by UNICEF and its partners at sub-national level. A stakeholder overview is presented in figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Stakeholder Map

---

1.30. Total expenditure over the period 2008 – 2011 amounts to USD 43.3 million. An overview of expenses across programme components is presented in table 2 below.

1.31. In terms of UNICEF regular versus other (donor funded) resources, the health and sanitation, education and child protection programmes receive substantial donor support with donors contributing about ¾ of total spending. HIV/AIDS and PAPE programmes on the other hand depend to a larger extent on UNICEF’s own resources with donor contributions amounting to about 1/3 of expenses.\(^{15}\)

**Table 2: Annual Expenditure per Programme Component from 2008 – 2011 (in million USD)**\(^{16}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNICEF Programme</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Sanitation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (incl. cross sectoral costs)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Details for 2012 not available at the time of the evaluation

\(^{15}\)Calculations based on figures provided for the period 2008-2012 in UNICEF Pacific Annual Management Plan 2012.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1. The present evaluation is timed at the end of the 2008 – 2012 programme cycle. The Evaluation is meant to inform the development and implementation of UNICEF Pacific’s next Multi-Country Programme cycle from 2013-2017. Findings and recommendations are expected to be applied to the management of existing convergent programming, as well as to the design of new initiatives and activities. Moreover, results will inform work planning with governments and are expected to be used to further strengthen programme monitoring and partnership arrangements. Expected users of evaluation results include Governments of the three priority countries, UNICEF Pacific and its field offices, service providers in the convergence areas and community based and civil society organizations supporting the interests of vulnerable and worst-off groups.

2.2. The evaluation is meant to be a formative endeavour, providing lessons and recommendations to inform the next programme cycle. Use is made in particular of four of the five OECD DAC / UNEG Evaluation Criteria, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The criterion of impact is less applicable with the focus of the evaluation in particular on intermediate level results, rather than on impact level changes. Based on the guidance in the TOR, the objectives of the evaluation have been further worked out, adapted to the requirements of the evaluation and in particular to the focus of the evaluation on the convergence approach as an important strategy in UNICEF Pacific’s programme. The objectives were presented in the inception report and based on discussions with UNICEF Senior Management including the Evaluation Manager these were further adapted to meet the requirements of the evaluation.

2.3. Specification of the objectives and questions of the Evaluation along the DAC/UNEG Evaluation Criteria:

1. Relevance of the Convergence approach in the Pacific
   How relevant is the approach in the context of the Pacific
   - Alignment with National policies and plans, including National Development Plans, with UNICEF’s MTSP and with the UNDAF of the Pacific sub-region
   - The extent to which convergence is in line with UNICEF’s renewed focus on equity
   - Consistency of the approach with the needs and priorities of vulnerable and worst-off groups
   - Adaptation of the approach to the context of the Pacific and to changes in the context over time, including the global financial crisis and its consequences in the Pacific and aspects of climate change

2. Process of implementation and efficiency
   How has the approach been implemented in the Pacific region and in the focus countries, how efficient are processes in place and how well does the process itself include and reinforce aspects of reducing vulnerability and inequity?
   - Efficiency of processes of programme implementation, including human resource, financial and programme management systems and adaptation of UNICEF’s internal structure and management systems to implement the convergence approach and to provide support to sub-national level
• Extent to which programmes coordinate in the implementation of support activities and cooperate where needed in order to achieve the convergence of services to communities in selected areas
• Level of participation of stakeholders at Provincial and local level, including participation of sub-national level government, service providers and NGOs and capacities built on these levels as part of the process as well as participation of target groups in programme design and implementation and sensitivity to the social and cultural characteristics on sub-national level
• Adaptation of the approach to changes in aid modalities in the Pacific, including the shift towards Sector Wide Approaches and Joint Partnership and funding arrangements in particular in the Health and Education sectors.
• Integration of human rights and gender equality principles in programme implementation
• Adaptation of monitoring and evaluation to the requirements of the Convergence Approach and the extent to which programme decision-making has been informed by performance management in order to enhance development results

3. Results achieved so far making use of the approach in the Pacific

What have been the results so far of the application of the convergence approach in the Pacific on sub-national level?

• Results achieved at the sub-national level in convergence areas for the five programme areas: Health, Nutrition, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene, Education, Child Protection, HIV/AIDS and Policy Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation, including unintended results (positive changes as well as undesired effects)
• The way(s) in which lessons learned have been replicated and scaled-up from convergence areas to national level in order to enhance results
• The extent to which public and private service delivery systems reach vulnerable and worst-off groups and constraints to access and use of services in terms of both supply and demand side issues, taking into account that disparities can be uneven across relevant indicators
• The extent to which the approach has contributed to a reduction in national and sub-national disparities for children based on income, geography, gender and disability
• What conducive factors and what constraints can be identified in terms of the 'enabling environment' in the Pacific and its different parts
• How has programming been designed and informed by assessments including vulnerability and identification of worst-off groups

4. Sustainability of results achieved so far

The extent to which the benefits of convergence programming, including results for vulnerable and worst-off groups can be expected to continue after programme completion and the resilience of results to risks over time
• Ownership of the approach, including commitment of policy makers and other stakeholders at regional, national and sub-national levels
• Use made of existing capacities as well as capacities further developed as part of the implementation process at the national, sub-national and community levels
• Integration of environmental sustainability in programme design and implementation
• Scaling-up of the approach and learning obtained so far including resourcing of scaling-up processes
• Inclusion of emergency preparedness and disaster risk reduction as part of convergent programme design and implementation

2.4. With the main focus of the evaluation on the convergence approach of the UNICEF supported programme components in the Pacific focus countries, the main attention of the evaluation will be at the sub-national level of the convergence areas that have been selected. National level aspects will be confined to those that have a direct relationship with the programming at sub-national level and those that have resulted from and are informed by the various programme components at the sub-national level.

2.5. The evaluation will focus on results achieved so far in applying a convergence approach, in particular looking at the programme activities that cut across MTSP focus areas, the level of synergy created and their effects at the sub-national level. The theory of change of the programme and the results frameworks of the various programme components will be used in this process as these describe the outputs and outcomes that are meant to be achieved.

2.6. The evaluation provides an assessment of the process of programme implementation and the contextual aspect that affect this process, including identification of enabling as well as constraining factors. The evaluation pays attention to the extent to which the various programmes coordinate in order to reach convergence of support and services at the local and provincial level.
3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1. For the present evaluation a mixed methods approach was used. The methodology was designed to cover a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods and tools. The use of multiple methods allowed for the use of triangulation of data from a variety of means and perspectives. The participation of a wide range of stakeholders enabled the inclusion of a variety of viewpoints on the design and implementation of UNICEF’s Convergence Programming in the Pacific in the three focus countries. The use of a variety of methods allowed for foci on both in-depth as well as broader based data gathering as part of the evaluation process.

3.2. In terms of methods and tools for data gathering, the evaluation combined desk review, with country visits in which semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were conducted with a variety of stakeholders of the convergence programme. Details on the methodologies applied and characteristics of each of these are presented in Annex 3.

3.3. Quantitative data gathering was limited to secondary data. Part of this included review of available materials as part of the desk review. This included regular quantitative data gathering exercises including MICS, Household Income and Expenditure Survey and Demographic and Health Survey. Moreover, during the country visits additional secondary quantitative data were gathered.

3.4. The country visits included the UNICEF Sub-regional office in Fiji, Suva. After an initial briefing in which the inception report was discussed, an introductory meeting was conducted with senior management and programme staff in order to inform participants of the details of the evaluation and to obtain their support. A similar meeting was conducted at the end of the evaluation process, on October 16th, to discuss and validate findings and preliminary conclusions. Meetings were conducted with the UNICEF Pacific Representative and with the Chiefs and staff of each of the five programme sections as well as with the Chief of Operations.

3.5. Country visits consisted of visits to the country capitals and visits to one convergence area in each of the three focus countries. The country visits usually started with a meeting of UNICEF Programme staff to inform participants of the evaluation and obtaining their support in the evaluation process. A similar meeting was conducted at the end of a country visit, in order to report on the findings and preliminary conclusions and to validate these. Validation meetings could not be realized in Solomon Islands due to the short schedule and in Kiribati due to launching of the WASH programme on the last day of the visit, which occupied most of the UNICEF staff members. Country office staff was invited to participate by teleconference in the Suva based validation meeting.

3.6. Country visits included meetings at the national level with Government officials of Ministries and Departments and with the Chief of the UNICEF Field Office and UNICEF staff of the five programme components as well as with staff of other development partners. Each of the country visits included data gathering at one convergence area: Tafea province in Vanuatu, Western Province in Solomon Islands and South Tarawa in Kiribati. A scheduled visit to Abemama Island could unfortunately not be realized due to logistical difficulties. In each of these convergence areas discussions included Government officials, UNICEF staff, and staff of key local partners.

3.7. For data analysis use was made of various approaches. This included analysis of the theory of change, in particular in terms of how change is envisaged on the level of the convergence areas and how experiences and learning are meant to be used in scaling up of interventions to the national level. Analysis of the theory of change was linked with analysis of the results chain of individual programme components. Understanding the
theory of change and the results chains of the programme components informed the analysis of the effectiveness of the programmes, comparing actual results with intended changes on the level of initiatives as well as on the level of the overall convergence approach.

3.8. The evaluation moreover made use of process analysis, examining the way in which the programme and its components have been implemented and comparing the actual implementation with the programme design.

3.9. As part of the assessment of aspects of effectiveness and efficiency, contextual analysis was included in order to identify constraints and conducive factors in terms of programme implementation and in reaching programme objectives. This informed the understanding of contextual aspects required for implementation of the convergence approach as well as constraints faced and how these have been addressed.

3.10. The evaluation used a comparison across the three priority countries to compare both processes as well as the results that have been achieved across the countries, in the contexts concerned. Analysis across the priority countries was used in particular to obtain insights in what works and what does not work and the reasons why, including contextual as well as process issues in the analysis.

3.11. Regarding the ethical aspects, the evaluation process was guided by the UNEG Evaluation Norms and Standards, which pay particular attention to sensitivity to beliefs, manners and customs of the social and cultural environments concerned, integrity and honesty in relationships with stakeholders, anonymity and confidentiality of individual information, contact with individuals characterized by respect and the evaluator’s responsibility for evaluation products and their timely delivery.17

3.12. The evaluation process was conducted within a three months period. Details concerning the timeframe of the evaluation are provided in annex 4.

3.13. Limitations to the methodology include the relatively short timeframe for the country visits, which included field visits to one convergence area in each of the three focus countries. Time of these field visits was relatively short and focused on UNICEF staff, Government stakeholders and other implementing agencies. There was no opportunity to include community visits and interviews with targeted children and women to obtain their viewpoints on processes and results concerned.

3.14. Another limitation concerns the transfer of government staff as well as changes in UNICEF staffing. In some instances it was possible to arrange for phone or on site interviews with staff who had been involved in the implementation of the convergence approach but had moved on to other positions, unfortunately this proved not possible in various other cases.

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF UNICEF’S CONVERGENCE APPROACH

Outlining the Change Process

4.1. Though UNICEF promotes the use of results based management and makes use of results frameworks, there appears to be no clear theory of change concerning the convergence approach. What can be reconstructed is a number of results and their presumed linkages. Results frameworks of the UNICEF Pacific programme are single programme oriented, which provide few opportunities to identify results across sectors. Though there is an IMEP in place, which is specified yearly, there is no clear monitoring and evaluation strategy and plan focusing on aspects of the convergence approach.

4.2. Results frameworks for each of the programme components have been developed for each of the focus countries, which are virtually identical and vary only in some details on the level of outputs concerned. There is no overall framework of how the various programme components are meant to interrelate at the local level and how the combination of the support of the various programme components is meant to provide better results for women and children. This lack of a clear theory of change concerning the convergence approach has resulted in a lack of attention to the monitoring and evaluation of the approach itself and has resulted in a focus of monitoring on individual programmes.

4.3. What can be developed is a framework based on key results mentioned in the Convergence Paper developed for the mid-term review of the programme. The result is presented in Box 4 below with the results for children at a higher level than the other results. The advantage of such a framework is that it provides opportunities for monitoring of aspects of the convergence approach itself and in this way inform management of the implementation of the approach.

**Box 4: Results Framework focusing on Aspects of Convergence**

- Significant changes in children’s survival, protection, participation and development in convergence areas
- Commitment for support to convergence areas by Government Ministries at national and sub-national level
- Results achieved and lessons learned in convergence areas are adopted as part of national policies and programme strategies and rolled out to other provinces
- Sub-National authorities and partners have developed and are actively monitoring child-centred development plans for integrated services and programme delivery

*Developed from Results for Kiribati and Vanuatu as identified in UNICEF Pacific, Convergence Paper for Mid-Term Review*
Different ways to implement the approach in practice

4.4. The convergence approach was introduced as one of the key strategies for UNICEF’s programme cycle 2008 - 2012. At the start of the programme cycle the approach was considered to be an area based approach: “addressing all the rights of children, at the same time in a select number of the most vulnerable provinces within countries”\(^{18}\). This was meant to be achieved by having all of UNICEF’s programme components provide support in the same underserved geographical areas. This would result in concentration of UNICEF’s sub-national efforts in selected geographical or administrative areas, with high levels of vulnerability, rather than having them spread out within the three focus countries concerned, based on the different ways of targeting of each of the individual programme components. The convergence approach was meant to sit side by side with UNICEF support to national planning, information collection, policy development, international reporting and legislative reform.\(^{19}\)

4.5. From the start it was clear that the approach could not work in the same way for all UNICEF programme components. The EPI programme for example, part of the Health and Sanitation component, is meant to be implemented nation-wide rather than focusing on selected areas and to increase vaccination coverage at national level. Also for the HIV/AIDS programme geographically confined convergence did not appear to work, with UNICEF’s move to focus on most at risk populations, in particular most-at-risk and especially vulnerable adolescents and young persons\(^{20}\), which are not confined to the geographical areas targeted through the convergence approach and are in particular located in urban areas within but also outside of the three focus countries. Moreover, the programme needed to support the development of capacities at national level in terms of planning, implementation, monitoring and supervision of HIV/AIDS programming.\(^{21}\)

4.6. The limitations of the approach for some of the programme components meant that for these programmes convergence became much more a way to try out and pilot certain ways of working in the convergence areas with the aim of replicating them outside of the areas or making use of the learning in advocacy for national level policy changes. This pilot oriented interpretation of convergence is, however, not necessarily in line with the original concept. The piloting conducted proved programme component oriented and in practice the variety of pilot initiatives would not necessarily cover the same communities. Also in the process of making use of the learning of pilot initiatives, such endeavours proved component oriented, focused on enhancing access and quality of a single service.

4.7. Some of the UNICEF programmes were experimenting with an ‘integrated approach’ in which several services were supported by the same programme, rather than just a single sector service. The EPI programme is a good example of this way of working, as it started to engage in activities beyond merely vaccinating children to add a range of additional services including vitamin A supplementation, de-worming, hand-washing promotion and the encouragement and facilitation of birth registration. As this integrated approach also
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\(^{18}\) UNICEF Pacific, *Convergence Paper, for mid-term review.*

\(^{19}\) Ibid.

\(^{20}\) The term adolescent refers to youth ages 15-19 while young people describes the 20-24 age group.

\(^{21}\) The HIV/AIDS programme focuses on support to countries in developing evidence based strategies for HIV/AIDS, to build systems in relation to HIV/AIDS related health services and to work with most at risk groups using peer education and create demand for services like PPTCT. Studies conducted in the three focus countries to gather baseline data and inform programming included part of the convergence areas as well as other parts of the countries concerned, including urban areas. UNICEF Pacific, *I No Bin Gat Protection. Understanding HI V and AIDS Risk and Vulnerability among Vanuatu Youth.* UNICEF Pacific, *Bad sickness, Rubbish sicki. Understanding HIV and AIDS Risk and Vulnerability among Solomon Islands Youth.* UNICEF Pacific, *I feel I can never get infected! Understanding HIV and AIDS Risk and Vulnerability among Kiribati Youth.*
meant providing a variety of social services (though less than all those covered through UNICEF programme components), this integrated approach became to be considered as part of the convergence approach.

4.8. In the early stages of the implementation of the convergence approach, support to the provincial government on the formulation of a child development plan was an important part of UNICEF support. This support ran across sectors to cover the whole of the development policy of a province and was meant to bring attention to and support child and women related issues. In the early years of the programme child development plans were prepared while in a later stage support focused on incorporation of child development issues in the regular provincial and local development plans, as it was feared that separate child development plan could easily be shelved. This support to planning and budgeting across sectors included the same holistic perspective as present in the convergence approach and can be considered as a kind of systemic approach, supporting sub-national government to integrate delivery of a variety of high quality social services in their development plans.

4.9. Thus a variety of ways of looking at the convergence approach can be identified, which are summarized in box 5 below. All of these perspectives focus on a holistic approach to child development, but differ in how such holistic support can be realized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 5: Perspectives on Convergence Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Area based programming</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of all UNICEF programmes in selected geographical or administrative areas providing holistic support across social sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Piloting for Replication and Application of Learning on National Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for piloting of UNICEF programmes in the same area with replication to other areas and scaling up to national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Integration of multiple sectors in a programme and working across sectors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing multiple social sector issues in a single programme and working across sectors in a single programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ <strong>Enhancing Coordination of Planning and Delivery of Social Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting provincial and local level government agencies on cross sector planning, budgeting and coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reference to the Approach in Key Documentation**

4.10. When looking at the detailing of the approach in the various documents related to UNICEF’s programme it appears that the convergence approach has not been used across the board in UNICEF’s programming. In key documents there appears to be no or insufficient attention to the approach. This has resulted in a lack of clarity on both its importance as part of UNICEF’s strategy in the region as well as on how it was to be implemented in the various parts of the programme. Though the approach is seen as a corporate initiative, no corporate guidance could be located on the substance of the approach and how it is meant to be implemented in programme design and implementation. None of the UNICEF staff interviewed during the evaluation could provide any reference to manuals, guidelines or tools concerned and indicated that they had insufficient guidance on how to implement the approach.
4.11. In the Country Programme Document of the period under review, i.e. 2008-2012, the convergence approach is only mentioned once: “UNICEF will facilitate integrative, convergent and participatory programming...” while it is not made clear what convergent programming is, nor how it is expected to be implemented.

4.12. The strategy document on UNICEF support to child protection in the Pacific describes the approach of UNICEF to child protection programming and includes results-based programme planning as well as the work planning process. No mention is, however, made in the document of the convergence approach and its use in Child Protection programming.

4.13. With the cross-cutting focus of policy, advocacy, planning and M&E of the PAPE section, one would expect convergence to be included in the agenda of the PAPE section. However, there is no reference to convergence and an integrated approach in the PAPE Policy paper of 2008 in which it sets out the key issues to be addressed and supported by the section in the period under review. Thus it is not made explicit whether and how the various processes of planning, monitoring and evaluation are geared towards the requirements of the convergence approach.

4.14. The UNICEF Pacific Advocacy Strategy to protect vulnerable children, women and youth in the Pacific, focuses on cross sector priority areas with a set of holistically focused objectives including recognition of the multi-dimensionality of poverty and characteristics of deprivation and disparity in the Pacific and advocacy for a holistic poverty alleviation strategy for children. As part of the central action messages an integrated strategic vision that goes beyond a sector approach is included as well as the need for special measures to protect children suffering from severe (supposedly including multiple) deprivation. One of the programmatic outcomes is meant to be enhanced cross-sectoral coordination in implementation of interventions as well as area focused cross-sectoral interventions for children experiencing multiple deprivations. Though all of these aspects are included in the convergence approach, there is no mention of the approach and linkages remain implicit, rather than being stated explicitly in the document. In this way it does not become clear how UNICEF’s use of the convergence approach in the three focus countries relates to the implementation of the advocacy strategy in these areas. Though use of the Convergence Approach is meant to generate learning which is to be used in advocacy in order to scale up initiatives to national level, there is no explicit mention of this aspect of the approach in the strategy.

4.15. Convergence was part of the analysis of the MTR but does not figure as such in the Annual Reports of 2008-2010. The most comprehensive overview of the use of the convergence approach by UNICEF in the Pacific is presented in the Convergence Paper which was prepared for the MTR process in 2010, once the programme was half way into its implementation. In this paper the convergence approach is presented as one of the key strategies for programme implementation and it includes principles for convergence, selection criteria for convergence areas and implementation modalities. Moreover, details on programme implementation in the selected convergence areas in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu from 2008 - 2010 are included.

24UNICEF Pacific, Proposal for advocacy strategy to protect the vulnerable children, women and youth in the Pacific.
26UNICEF Pacific, Convergence Paper, for mid-term review
4.16. There is, moreover, attention to convergence in the draft CPD for the period 2013-2017. Though in the main document it is only mentioned that “The 2010 midterm review recommended acceleration of programme convergence and the integration of services at the subnational level in tier-one countries”, in the Supplementary Note that is annexed to the Multi-Country Programme Document it is stated that “Convergent programming will continue to be a foundation of UNICEF’s programme approach in the Multi-Country Programme 2013-2017.” There are some broad indications on how this will be done: with a view on continuity and maximizing impact, UNICEF will maintain its presence in the convergence sites until the planned MTR in the next cycle in 2015; within the convergent areas there is meant to be a greater focus on disadvantaged children and use of community based social mobilization which implies more attention to ‘demand side issues’. Moreover, an enhanced focus on monitoring and evaluation is planned to support scale-up of best practices.27

4.17. In the period under review UNICEF started to pay increasing attention to equity as a way to accelerate reaching the MDGs and as a strategic direction for UNICEF’s programming. It is however, not clear how equity relates to a convergent approach as applied in the Pacific. In discussions with UNICEF staff different perspectives were presented. On the one hand there is the view that convergence can be combined with equity as both approaches try to address aspects of vulnerability. The focus of convergence on underserved areas is seen as contributing towards achieving equity. Another perspective which is held by some of the staff does not regard the approaches compatible. In this view convergence focuses on selected underserved areas. This is considered inconsistent with the equity approach which advocates leaving no child behind. In the practice of the application of the approach in the Pacific it is moreover realized that the choices of convergent areas do represent vulnerable children and women, though not necessarily ‘worst off groups’ as promoted by UNICEF’s equity approach.

5. EVALUATION FINDINGS

RELEVANCE

5.1. In order to establish the relevance of the convergence approach in UNICEF’s country programme for the period 2008 – 2012 in the context of the Pacific, the assessment focused on the alignment of the programme with National policies, the Pacific UNDAF and UNICEF’s MTSP as well as the responsiveness to the needs of vulnerable children and women. Moreover, the extent to which the programme has been informed by relevant assessments and the adaptation of the approach to the specific context of the Pacific sub-region was focused on.

5.2. **Finding:** The convergence approach applied by UNICEF in terms of selecting geographical areas for sub-national interventions is mostly valued by Government officials at provincial and local level of selected convergent areas and much less so by Government officials at national level as the focus on geographical selected areas is not part of the Government programme in the countries concerned. The approach was also not taken up in the Pacific UNDAF and thus remains based on UNICEF interventions, which results in a focus on social services supported by UNICEF, without explicit attention to economic development and governance aspects.

5.3. The UNICEF Country Programme was developed in tandem with the development of the UNDAF, with both covering the same period of 2008-2012. UNICEF support focuses on social development aspects which are part of UNDAF outcome area 3. Moreover, UNICEF is to a more limited extent involved in UNDAF outcome area 2 on governance, with UNICEF support to development of capacities to ratify and implement core international human rights treaties, support to enhanced participation of women in decision-making and building capacities for Disaster Risk Reduction. The UNICEF Pacific programme follows the UNICEF MTSP focus areas and aligns in this way with UNICEF’s regional and global objectives.

5.4. When looking at the perspective of the various Government actors on convergence, the approach is in particular supported on provincial and local government level of the selected convergence areas concerned with more ambiguous views from national level government level, from which point of view the selection of specific areas is a less useful approach given their responsibility for all administrative areas concerned. At a national level, UNICEF support to selected geographical areas combined with limited government budgets for programming, can easily result in re-allocation of government spending to other areas, which would be counter-productive to a convergence approach. Though the approach is agreed with for UNICEF support and programming, it is not an approach that has been taken up by Governments themselves and as such not in line with National development strategies and plans.

5.5. Looking at convergence as an approach, the concentration of sub-national interventions in selected underserved areas has not been taken up by other UN organizations and is not incorporated in the UNDAF. This means that at the sub-national level convergence includes only those social services that are supported by UNICEF and does not include social
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29 The UNICEF Medium-Term Strategic Plan, 2006-2013.
services provided by other UN agencies and services under other UNDAF outcome areas, including those focusing on economic development and governance. This considerably limits the approach and leads to a focus on those services that UNICEF supports, rather than the services that might be required from a demand driven perspective.

5.6. **Finding:** The UNICEF support provided to the selected convergent areas has meant addressing social issues of vulnerable and underserved groups and has responded to needs of children and women in deprived areas. The mix of selection criteria applied to identify convergent areas has, however, resulted in selection of populated and reachable areas though not necessarily the ‘most deprived areas’ with the target groups reached not regarded as the ‘worst-off groups’. In specific areas, part of the service provision supported by UNICEF is not necessarily considered as responding to people’s needs as in some instances local people do not consider those services relevant to and sufficiently aligned with their socio-cultural system.

5.7. Each of the selected convergent areas in the focus countries concerned proves to be deprived of a variety of social services. As such the application of the approach does respond to identified needs in the field concerning underserved populations. For details on some of the social indicators of children in selected convergence areas see box 6 below.
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**Box 6: Aspects of Vulnerability in Focus Countries and Convergence Areas**

**Vanuatu: Tafea Province**

- 11.8% of children (0-17 years) in Tafea living below US $ 1.25 per day compared to the national average of 9.2% and one of three provinces above 10%
- Children with at least one severe deprivation > 40% in Tafea
- Water deprivation highest in Tafea province at 23%
- Education deprivation most common in Tafea with the highest incidence of children (7-17 years) who have never attended school at 12.8%
- Infant and under five mortality rates are amongst the highest in Tafea province


**Solomon Islands: Western and Choiseul Provinces**

- Under five mortality rates are high at 35 and 37 per 1000 in Western and Choiseul provinces respectively
- Neo-natal mortality, infant mortality and child mortality rates are all relatively high in Western province at 17, 22 and 35 respectively with high prevalence of underweight in children under five years at over 16%
- High level of stunting in children 0 - 5 years of age at 33.4% in Choiseul province
- Low level of children aged 12 – 23 months with all basic vaccinations at below 70% in Western Province


**Kiribati:**

- Infant Mortality rate at 45 for boys and 43 for girls in 2000
- Immunization overage in 2000 at 73%
- Percentage of new-borns weighing less than 2500 gram at birth 5.4% in 1998

5.8. The focus on vulnerable groups is undercut by the inclusion of additional criteria for the selection of convergence areas besides aspects of vulnerability and access and quality of social services (for details see box 7 below). These other criteria include accessibility of the geographical locations concerned and UNICEF’s presence in the areas at the start of the programme period. The issue of accessibility has resulted in less focus on outer islands which are much harder to reach given a multitude of logistical constraints.

5.9. Also UNICEF’s field presence at the end of the previous programme cycle affected the selection of convergence areas. This is most obvious in the Solomon Islands, where the selection of Western and Choiseul provinces was based in particular on UNICEF’s field presence after the 2007 tsunami, which hit these areas particularly hard.

5.10. Needs as identified by UNICEF are not always acknowledged as such by vulnerable groups concerned and in some instances specific groups appeared not to value and welcome support on selected social services, including immunization of children and aspects of child protection programming. This was in particular the case in ‘kastom villages’ on Tanna Island in Vanuatu, where the local population oppose a variety of aspects of modernization and actively try to preserve their social and cultural identity. Though the situation of ‘kastom villages’ is extreme it does show the social and cultural sensitivities that relate to some aspects of social development and the need to take these into account in programme design and implementation. This issue was also brought up outside of Tanna Island in Vanuatu as well as Solomon Islands.

5.11. Finding: In the application of the approach in the context of the Pacific one of the adaptations has been to make use of the convergence areas to pilot aspects of the various UNICEF programme components, making use of learning to inform replication in other areas and national level policy-making. This proves a relevant response to the limitations of a geographical focus in the specific context of the Pacific. However, given the socio-cultural diversity that characterizes each of the focus countries, one needs to be prudent in terms of replication and pay sufficient attention to contextual aspects.

5.12. In addition to the convergence approach bringing together different types of support to social services to the same geographical areas and local communities, the application of the approach in the Pacific has included piloting of initiatives which could be replicated elsewhere or which could be used to inform national level policy-making.
5.13. Though the experiences of the past four years of programme implementation at sub-national level in the convergence areas have created knowledge and experiences which could be used elsewhere, there is a snag. In the very diverse context of the Pacific the level of replication can be expected to have clear limitations. Some of the selected convergence areas, moreover, are quite specific, with Tanna island of Tafea province in Vanuatu for example having a relatively high population density and ‘kastom villages’ which are not common in other parts of Vanuatu. The replication and scaling up of experiences will need to be applied with sufficient flexibility, applying learning and experiences to different contexts.

5.14. In this respect there is a need to look at the assessments that inform UNICEF’s programme design. The situation analysis that is conducted intermittently focuses on the situation regarding children and women in the countries concerned and pays attention to some vulnerable groups, including the distinction rural – urban, youth and children with special needs. The information on vulnerability remains general and is usually not specific enough for any programme to adapt its design and implementation to the specific characteristics, needs and requirements of identified groups. There is moreover a need to pay attention to socio-cultural differences in particular the most outstanding ones. The atlases on social indicators for Solomon Islands and Vanuatu that have been prepared recently focus on demography, socio-economic development, education, health, disability and child protection. Though these are important data, what is missing is a focus on socio-cultural aspects and characteristics of distinct groups which could inform the way in which these groups could be targeted through programming. This review of the situation analysis is conform level 1 of the new MoRES system which is being mainstreamed in UNICEF and which includes a review of the equity focus of the situation analysis.

31 MoRES stands for Monitoring Results for Equity Systems, a monitoring system that is being mainstreamed in UNICEF.
Efficiency

5.15. The evaluation criterion of efficiency focuses on how the convergence approach has been implemented in the selected countries in the Pacific region and how efficient processes in place have been. Focus will include UNICEF’s programme management and implementation systems and mechanisms and how well these have been adapted to facilitate a convergent programme perspective, participation of key stakeholders in the design and implementation of the approach and ways in which programme processes and results have been monitored and evaluated and information concerned used to enhance results based management.

UNICEF’s Programme Management and Implementation Systems

5.16. **Finding:** In order to support programme implementation at the sub-national level UNICEF has established Field Offices (FOs) in each of the focus countries, with FO staff amounting to 44% of all UNICEF Pacific staff positions. Management arrangements remained largely programme component oriented which left FO staff with few opportunities to guide convergence across sector programmes.

5.17. In order to support programme management and implementation UNICEF has established field offices in the capitals of Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Field Offices are headed by Chiefs of FO, which are International positions. Each of the FOs has sector specific officers for each of the programmes. With UNICEF heading the UN shared office in Kiribati and Vanuatu these offices have a UN Affairs Officer. The Vanuatu office is the only office with a designated M&E Officer, in response to a request of the Government of Vanuatu while the Solomon Islands office has a Social Policy officer, which position has though been vacant for a considerable time. In Kiribati, PAPE programme issues have been taken up by the UN Affairs Officer. For an overview of staffing in the FOs see figure 2 below.

5.18. The field offices are located in the capitals of the respective countries. In Kiribati the field office is located in one of the convergence areas, i.e. South Tarawa in which the capital is located. In Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, however, the field office is located relatively far from the convergence areas. Especially in Vanuatu, where Tafea province is the only convergence area, and where there is an on-going process of decentralization, there was a plea to have some UNICEF staff located in the provincial capital to support programme implementation.

5.19. Though each of the Field Offices operates at the level of a country, in UNICEF organizational terms they function as a Field Office, with many of the decision-making located at the level of the Country Office, i.e. the office in Suva, Fiji. In terms of programming the programme staff in the Field Offices is primarily responsible towards the Chief of the respective programme in the Suva office, which is in line with funding streams, which are programme specific and flow from the country office to the respective partners in the field.

5.20. With the present programmatic and financial arrangements, the Chief of Field Office has relatively few leverage over programmes and their implementation. The leadership at the FO level depends mostly on the persuasion capacity of the chief. Resources available at the FO level are mostly related to programmes and their work plans. Cross sector funds are limited and Chiefs of Field Offices often depend on programmes to resource their travel
expenses. With programme implementation depending largely on the programmatic guidance of each of the sector programmes in Suva, the Chief of Field Office does not avail of the means to guide the implementation of a convergence approach.

5.21. Several of these shortcomings were identified in 2010 at the Mid-Term review, where UNICEF Management was mentioned as a challenge for the implementation of the convergence approach. There is mention of the lack of adoption of convergence as a programme strategy and a lack of staff capacity development on how to implement the approach and few resources for staff and local government to plan an integrated and convergence programme at the sub-national level. Moreover, the limited role of the Chief of the Field Office is mentioned in budgeting for and managing resources for convergence processes. These issues appear not to have been addressed in a substantial way in the period since the MTR, from 2010 – 2012.

Figure 2: Staffing Structure of UNICEF Field Offices in Kiribati, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands

5.22. Finding: The finance and administration system is centralized in the Suva office, with field offices making use of the services of the centralized country office system. Though this provides efficiency on an organizational level, there appear to be various drawbacks. Many
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32 UNICEF Pacific, Convergence Paper, for mid-term review.
delays in the payments of cash advances have been reported which at times has undermined the credibility of UNICEF at sub-national level. Within the centralized system, the Field Offices appear to have lacked an overview of financial expenditures to inform financial programme management.

5.23. The financial management system in UNICEF Pacific is centralized with the system operating from the country office in Suva, serving all the field offices in the focus countries. Field office programme staff and their partners send requests for cash transfers to the UNICEF country office in Suva. After approval funds are transferred making use of the Government financial system to reach counterpart agencies. This has in practice led to many delays, both on UNICEF as well as on Government side, and there is a general dissatisfaction about the timely receipt of funds, which at times has undermined the credibility of UNICEF at sub-national level. Moreover, the need to liquidate outstanding cash advances before any new advances can be approved is resulting in delays in implementation.

5.24. The centralized system has meant that the overview of total programme expenses is managed from the UNICEF country office in Suva, with the Field Office only aware of the Direct Cash Transfers that they requested. This results in Field Office staff and partners lacking an overview of the total expenses of a programme with expenses directly made from Suva often not fed-back to them. The new online Vision financial management system is meant to overcome these shortcomings by making financial details available on-line to Field Office staff.

5.25. **Finding:** Several aspects of application of a convergence approach have resulted in enhanced efficiency, though often within a single programme rather than across multiple programmes. The integration of multiple services into the immunization campaigns and the child health days has meant reaching target groups with multiple services rather than a single service. Also the use of Health and Education staff in birth registration proved to enhance efficiency as well as timeliness of registration services delivered. The expected efficiency in C4D across programmes was not realized with each of the programmes arranging for their own communication activities.

5.26. As part of the Expanded Programme on Immunization (EPI) UNICEF introduced support to integrated delivery of child interventions in partnership with WHO in which immunization campaigns included distribution of Vitamin A and deworming tablets and a hand washing campaign in addition to providing Measles / MR vaccinations. Moreover, birth registration was included in the intervention. A similar integrated approach was applied to the organization of Child Health Days in the three focus countries, which days have now become recurring events.

5.27. Birth registration has been promoted as part of the Child Protection programme. This also is an example of an integrated approach that reaches across sectors. Nurses and midwives have been given the mandate to fill in birth notification forms for which they were provided with training. The same has been done with teachers, who have the authority to fill in notification forms for those pupils entering Primary School but who do not avail of a birth certificate. After a notification form has been sent to the Civil Registry, this agency prepares the birth certificates for the children concerned. UNICEF support to birth registration of children has included building capacities of the nurses, midwives and
teachers as well as providing support to the Civil Registry in enhancing its systems and processes.\textsuperscript{33}

5.28. Communication for Development activities were assumed to be amongst the efficiency gains of a convergent approach, with several programmes being able to make use of the same communication staff and initiatives. However, in practice this did not materialize with each of the UNICEF programmes conducting their own Communication for Development activities. This can be understood by the UNICEF programme, notwithstanding the convergent approach, in practice remaining sector programme oriented, with each of the sector programmes responsible for their own Programme Component Results (PCRs) and related intermediate results, including those on C4D. Moreover, the small number of C4D staff limited overall the opportunities to work on community mobilization. This is meant to be addressed in the coming programme cycle with the planned recruitment of three C4D officers, one to be stationed in each of the field offices of the focus countries.

Stakeholder Participation in Programme Design and Implementation

5.29. Finding: Participation of UNICEF partners in programme design appears focused on consultation processes. Support to planning processes focuses on the development of provincial child development plans. The lack of bottom-up planning has limited the options for participation at grass roots level. Programme implementation is largely done through Government partners and in partnership with few NGOs. Most of UNICEF’s support focuses on capacity development of a variety of duty bearers to provide services and much less on support to right holders to claim their rights to services concerned.

5.30. Participation of stakeholders in programme design mainly concerns consultation in particular of Government agencies concerned. There is no direct engagement with vulnerable and ‘worst off’ groups. Programme design appears quite uniform across the three focus countries, and in each of the sector programmes use is made of virtually the same results framework for monitoring and evaluation.

5.31. Support to local planning has focused in particular on the provincial level with UNICEF support to the formulation of child development plans in convergence areas of the focus countries and at a later stage incorporating children’s issues in the main provincial development plans. In Kiribati support has included focus on a child development plan for Betio Town Council with issues concerned integrated in the overall area council development plan at the time of the evaluation. No use has been made of ‘bottom-up’ planning on the local level. Such planning processes are also not used by the governments in the focus countries. However, in Vanuatu there appear to be future opportunities in this respect with the local area councils in Tafea province provided with additional resources and expected to be developing local level development plans.

5.32. When looking at the balance between duty bearers and rights holders, focus in UNICEF programming has been in particular on building capacities of duty bearers to provide the social services concerned, developing capacities on policy level, on organizational level as well as on individual level. Much less focus has been devoted to the rights holders and providing support for them to claim their rights. This has also meant less participation of target groups in the design and implementation of the various programmes.

Use of Results-based Management

\textsuperscript{33}In Vanuatu a Memorandum of Understanding was made between Ministry of Internal Affairs (Civil Registry) and Ministries of Education and Ministry of Health for Promoting Birth Registration in Vanuatu in which the roles and responsibilities of each of the parties are specified and agreed.
5.33. **Finding:** A variety of monitoring tools have been introduced for the UNICEF programme in the focus countries including joint monitoring, baseline studies, use of the Most Significant Change tool and Sentinel monitoring. Moreover, regular activity monitoring has been conducted guided by annual and two year work plans. What has been lacking is regular monitoring of output level changes and intermittent monitoring of outcome level changes as identified in the results frameworks of the various programme components. The lack of data on output and outcome level changes has limited the opportunities for results based management. The open-ended approach of MSC has meant that some data on outcome level and some unintended change could be identified and insight could be gained in which changes children value most and why. Analysis of these data gathered could provide additional insights.

5.34. For monitoring of the UNICEF programme joint monitoring with partners has been conducted in the three focus countries. In practice joint monitoring was implemented by UNICEF PAPE together with staff of Government agencies of National and Provincial level and other partners. The process varied across the countries concerned. It involved a substantial time investment of a group of 13 persons in Vanuatu in October 2010 for a four day period.\(^{34}\) In this instance use was made of a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods for data gathering and tools were developed for this purpose. No use appears to have been made of the programme results framework and quantitative data gathered were not representative but were used in an indicative manner.

5.35. In other cases of Joint Monitoring\(^{35}\) the preparation appeared more limited, with few attention paid to the objectives of the monitoring exercise, what methods to use and what issues and questions to prioritize and no clear task division amongst monitoring team members. In most cases joint monitoring reports were prepared. None of the monitoring reports reviewed made use of any regular monitoring data gathered on activities and output levels of the programmes.

5.36. The joint monitoring visits appeared to work well in terms of process, bringing the various parties together around the programme issues concerned and reviewing progress to date. However, the results of the visits are limited in coverage and not meant to be representative and cannot replace a regular monitoring system in which data are gathered recurrently on selected output and outcome level changes.

5.37. Several baseline studies have been conducted, including for Child Protection and HIV/AIDS programme components. The studies focus on key indicators of the respective programmes. Moreover, baseline studies were used to generate recommendations for programme implementation.\(^{36}\) The baseline studies for Child Protection focus on the output level changes of the results framework of the Child Protection programme and include recommendations for programme interventions.\(^{37}\) Given the inputs and resources needed to conduct this baseline study it is unlikely for comparably comprehensive data on output
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\(^{35}\) Kiribati Joint Monitoring Trip Reports of UNICEF staff members. October 2010.

\(^{36}\) In the OECD DAC definition a baseline concerns: “An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made”. OECD DAC, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. Paris, 2002.

level changes to be available beyond a four to five year timeframe. This severely limits the opportunities for results based management of programme interventions in the child protection programme and limits regular monitoring to the level of activities. With the contextual diversity in the Pacific and the sampling methods used, the HIV/AIDS baselines are not considered to be representative for the countries concerned but provide data for the selected study sites, which were identified as intervention areas for UNICEF support. No follow up studies have been conducted so far for comparison of results achieved.

5.38. Use of the Most Significant Change technique was introduced as part of the Monitoring system and was practiced in particular in the Child Protection programme, with less take up of the tool in the other programme components. The technique was mainly used to gather stories from a variety of stakeholders including government officials, service providers and children. Only in few cases the technique was used to involve participants in the selection of stories gathered, which is an essential part of the methodology and which can bring out the reasons why participants consider certain stories of change as more important than others as well as the differences across the stakeholders in terms of valuing aspects of change. No contents analysis of the stories gathered has taken place nor have stories gathered been analysed otherwise, which has limited the value of using the technique.

5.39. In order to be able to assess changes in livelihood security at household level based on the effects of the global economic crisis a sentinel monitoring system was set up. The system covers both rural and urban location in selected Pacific Island countries including the three focus countries as well as Fiji, Tonga and Tuvalu. In Vanuatu and Kiribati the sentinel cites include convergence areas. It gathers data from most vulnerable groups and service providers and is meant to provide an early warning mechanism to be able to respond to adverse effects of the global economic crisis at the local level in the Pacific Island countries. The tools include a combination of secondary data gathering, informant interview and focus group discussions. With the focus on early warning sentinel monitoring is not meant to produce statistically representative data. So far three data gathering rounds have been conducted which have resulted in comparable data in multiple sites. Several reports have been produced on country and regional level and an exercise is underway to analyse all sentinel data gathered to date, together with an assessment of Government policies in relation to the global economic crisis. Though sentinel monitoring has provided useful data on vulnerability, uptake and use by programmes has so far been limited.

5.40. In addition to the various specific means of data gathering mentioned above, there is the regular gathering of monitoring data on output and outcome levels. This kind of data is particularly important in order to assess whether UNICEF support is making progress in terms of output and outcome level changes that are needed to occur in order for the support provided to reach its objectives. The indicators used on the level of the programme components’ results (PCRs) and presented in the consolidated results report are mostly not available on an annual or bi-annual basis and thus not on hand regular enough to inform programme management. In addition the output level changes are not necessarily easy to obtain on a regular basis. An example is the Child Protection programme where data on output level indicators have been gathered in the baseline studies conducted in the three focus countries in 2009, but which exercise has so far not

38 For references see note 6.
been repeated so that one could systematically compare results with baseline information. Thus regular data gathering on outputs and outcome level changes is limited and much of the progress reporting is oriented towards activities considered necessary to reach related output and outcome level changes in the future.

5.41. In monitoring the response to the earthquake and tsunami disaster that hit the Solomon Islands on 2nd April 2007 UNICEF, government partners and other agencies have made use of a tool called the Omnibus Survey, which was designed to measure initial targets set for key child survival interventions 10 weeks after the disaster struck. The exercise revealed that some of the intended results were realized while others were not and provided early insight in how well elements of the response supported by UNICEF worked in practice. The omnibus survey was one element of an integrated monitoring and evaluation framework, including a range of other data sources for the humanitarian response to this disaster.41

Reduction of Transaction Costs

5.42. **Finding**: The way in which the convergence approach has been implemented appears hardly to have reduced transaction costs for government partners.

5.43. An important rationale for the use of the convergence approach includes minimizing transaction costs for government agencies as well as for communities and target groups. This is of special importance in the Pacific, where small island states are easily overwhelmed in terms of transaction costs of dealing with multiple donors. With the implementation of the convergence approach remaining sector programme driven, the approach appears hardly to have contributed towards reduction of transaction costs.

5.44. **Finding**: UNICEF’s support to a Sector wide approach in education has been of more importance in reducing transaction costs, though participation in a SWAp is not conducive to a convergent approach.

5.45. UNICEF has been actively engaged in the development of a SWAp in particular in Education programming. The education SWAp in the three focus countries has contributed substantially to reduction of transaction costs and the results achieved so far have been inspiring Ministries of Health in the region to follow suit. SWAps, however, are not in line with a convergent approach with their national perspective, single sector focus and their application of a sector driven road map.

---

41 UNICEF Pacific, Monitoring the early response to a humanitarian crisis: the use of an Omnibus Survey in the Solomon Islands.
5.46. In order to assess the evaluation criterion of effectiveness, use will be made of the results framework of the country programme, which was adapted during the Mid-Term Review in 2010 and which has been presented in Table 1 above (p 7-8). In line with the objectives of the evaluation, focus will be on the level of output and outcome level changes. Assessment will include results achieved at the sub-national and national level including unexpected results, contribution to the reduction of disparities and results of non-area based ways of achieving holistic child development. Moreover, conducive and constraining factors to achieving results will be identified.

5.47. As the implementation of the convergence approach did in practice not follow merely an area-based approach and included the application of an integrated approach as well as the use of piloting and replication, results at times do go beyond the selected convergence areas concerned. Moreover, UNICEF’s monitoring does often not specify data by area. Education and part of the health programming are nationally oriented in approach, while HIV/AIDS programming focuses on specific vulnerable groups. Therefore results presented below are based on the three countries concerned and specified for convergence areas where possible.

5.48. In the discussion of results achieved use will be made of a description of aggregated results achieved for each of the programme components in each of the three focus countries, which is presented in table 3 below and of the Programme Component Results and their indicators, an overview of which is provided in annex 5. The latter one refers to national level data as these indicators are not further specified for the convergence areas.

**Results achieved**

5.49. **Finding**: Results have been achieved in each of the programme components and in each of the convergence areas in the three focus countries. Moreover, results have been achieved in terms of child development planning across the various line agencies. Assessing results is constrained in various ways. Results across sectors have not been included in the results framework of the programme and no regular monitoring data is gathered on those aspects. Monitoring data available does not necessarily distinguish between convergent areas and other parts of the countries concerned.

**Health and Sanitation Programme**

5.50. In Young Child Survival and Development important achievements have been reached including introduction of integrated child interventions in immunization campaigns and child health days. Enhancement of the cold chain for vaccines and support to immunization capacity has further enhanced vaccination rates in convergence areas and beyond. Coverage rates in measles campaigns have been higher in convergence areas compared to other areas. In Kiribati demonstration gardens have been established in the convergence areas and micro-nutrient food intake of infants promoted and the awareness raised on food and nutrition security for infants, which are important aspects in the context of Kiribati in which vegetables and fruit are hard to get.
### Table 3: Results Achieved in Focus Countries including Convergence Areas 2008-2012*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Component</th>
<th>Results Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Sanitation</strong></td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 1:</strong> At all times children, survive, grow and develop to their full potential, especially those from most vulnerable islands and communities in PICTs</td>
<td>Introduction of integrated child interventions including vaccination, Vitamin A and deworming tablets distribution, birth registration and hand washing promotion in Measles campaign and child health days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical, supply and financial support for the adaptation of Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses modules to include infants of 0-2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrated improved micro-nutrient food intake through household food gardens in Abemama Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raised awareness on food and nutrition security for infants and other vulnerable groups through presentation in national summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 2:</strong> Maternal and new-born health in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu is progressively improved through evidenced-based plans and programmes that are based on an evaluated essential package of interventions</td>
<td>Number of Baby Friendly Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maternal and neonatal policies and guidelines for community-based maternal and neonatal care updated (in cooperation with WHO and UNFPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2 neonatal Intensive Care Units set up in hospitals in Kiribati with UNICEF technical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 3:</strong> More schools and communities have access to sustainable and equitable WASH services and interventions to improve health, economic and human development outcomes in target PICTs</td>
<td>Rainwater harvesting systems, latrines and hand washing facilities installed in 13 primary schools and one secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministries of Public Works, Education and Health adopted the VIP toilet design for convergence area, and approved it for roll-out to all islands in Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline data for schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Component</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community groups equipped with knowledge and skills to operate and maintain WASH facilities, hygiene promotion and safe water storage and handling practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 1: By 2012, children aged 3 to 5, especially those most disadvantaged, benefit from improved access to quality early learning opportunities in 5 Pacific Island Countries</strong></td>
<td>Early Childhood education policies launched, resulting in increased MoE budgetary and management commitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PCR 2: By 2012, primary school aged children have access to schools which uphold minimum national quality standards, and which support student enrolment and retention to the end of the primary cycle in 4 Pacific Island Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Quality Standards for Primary schools developed and adopted</td>
<td>Language policy drafted which recognises the importance of mother tongue instruction in the early years in a multilingual society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation and/or reconstruction of 212 schools benefiting about 12,000 students and 350 teachers</td>
<td>Inclusive education policy launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School self-assessments made and school improvement plans developed and implemented</td>
<td>School self-assessments made and school improvement plans developed and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAp in Education and UNICEF’s role</td>
<td>Education in emergencies policy developed outlining key education sector preparedness and response accountabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 3: By 2012, primary school aged children attain national numeracy, literacy and life-skills learning outcomes by the end of the primary education cycle in 4 Pacific Island Countries</td>
<td>School library policy launched and disseminated with an accompanying essential primary school reading package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School library policy launched and disseminated with an accompanying essential primary school reading package</td>
<td>Draft life-skills assessment tools developed as a means of gauging non-academic skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 4: By 2012, Ministries of Education in 5 disaster prone PICs equip children and schools with the knowledge and skills to cope when disasters strike and lead the provision of education services in post disaster settings</strong></td>
<td>Education in emergencies policy developed outlining key education sector preparedness and response accountabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing education clusters established under MoE leadership and increased capacity of central and provincial education authorities on disaster preparedness and response for school systems</td>
<td>Standing education clusters established under MoE leadership and increased capacity of central and provincial education authorities on disaster preparedness and response for school systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Component</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 1: Governments of 5 focus countries in PICs have and use sound strategic information for effective HIV programming, to reduce vulnerability to and impact of HIV and AIDS reduced among the most at risk population and most vulnerable populations, (with a special focus on children and women)</td>
<td>Pacific regional and national HIV/AIDS strategic plans developed with monitoring frameworks of national HIV and other STI responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 2: Most at risk and most vulnerable men, women and children in PICs have access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support services</td>
<td>Regional guidelines, policies, minimum standards and training modules for both PPTCT and Youth friendly health services developed as well as regional HIV testing and counselling policy guidance developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 3: Most at risk and most vulnerable youth, women and their partner in PICs engage in HIV-risk reduction behaviours</td>
<td>Baseline information on HIV/AIDS made available including most at risk and vulnerable young people’s knowledge, attitudes and practice in relation to HIV and AIDS, which information has informed targeted interventions for adolescents in the National HIV/AIDS plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information made accessible through trained peer educators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Child Protection

#### Programme Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PCR 1: Children are increasingly protected by legislation and are better served by justice systems that protect them as victims, offenders and witnesses

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline information on Child Protection available and endorsed by Cabinet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Child Protection Bill drafted</td>
<td>New Child Protection Bill drafted</td>
<td>New operational procedures of police finalized and police trained in how to handle cases involving children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better monitoring and reporting of children’s cases along with improved collaboration between police and other stakeholders (social welfare and NGOs)</td>
<td>Guidelines and ‘practice directives’ for the judiciary in the process of finalization</td>
<td>Greater engagement of police in crime prevention, diversion and community policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater engagement of police in crime prevention, diversion and community policing</td>
<td>Guidelines and ‘practice directives’ for the judiciary in the process of finalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PCR 2: Children are better served by well informed and coordinated child protection social services which ensure greater protection against and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New policies for the child and family social services systems have been articulated through consultative processes. These policies outline roles and responsibilities of Government stakeholders (incl. social welfare, police) and ‘informal’ stakeholders (incl. church and traditional leaders) in relation to children’s protection from violence, abuse and exploitation (inclusion of roles and responsibilities for child protection is new in the Pacific)</td>
<td>Increase in children being registered, with a birth registration system in place including MoUs which specify responsibilities of various stakeholders including Civil Registry, MoE and MoH. Usually free of charge for first application or first 12 months for which UNICEF advocated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates in Abemama apply juvenile justice principles and diversion policy to young people in conflict with the law, police officers apply diversion in youth related cases</td>
<td>Diversion policy for young offenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection Officer in place in MISA</td>
<td>Child Desk Officer in Department of Women’s Affairs (under MoJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PCR 3: Children in selected geographical areas grow up in home and community environments that are increasingly free from violence, abuse and exploitation

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness of child protection, attitudinal and behavioural changes amongst parents, communities and traditional leaders through establishment of new partnerships with Church-based organizations, corporate sectors, traditional and provincial/divisional leaders and Pacific events including the <em>Hibiscus</em> festival</td>
<td>Engagement on child protection with new means including ‘one minute junior’ videos, ‘key messages’ and training resources</td>
<td>Family and community based social changes as reported through Most Significant Change stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and community based social changes as reported through Most Significant Change stories</td>
<td>Emergence of child protection issues in National Development Plans and sector plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Component</td>
<td>Results Achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 1: By 2012, social and economic policies are evidence-based and progressively address the rights of children, youth and women, particularly those most vulnerable and at-risk in Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Tonga, Tuvalu, Samoa and Fiji</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New policies for youth have been developed.</td>
<td>An emphasis on mainstreaming of youth policies has led to the integration of youth policy objectives in parliament briefings</td>
<td>An emphasis on mainstreaming of youth policies has led to the integration of youth policy objectives in corporate sector strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to child development plans and integration of children’s and youth issues in provincial development plans</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three rounds of sentinel monitoring implemented in order to assess the impact of the global economic crisis and to provide an early warning mechanism</td>
<td>UNICEF spearheaded the UN, PIFS, SPC, USP and ADB sponsored Pacific Conference on ‘the human face of the global economic crisis, hosted by the government of Vanuatu in February 2010</td>
<td>NACC toolkit has been developed and used for training and review processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 2: By 2012, quality disaggregated children’s, young people’s and women’s social data are available and integrated into monitoring and evaluation systems</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Atlas produced in partnership with government and CSOs</td>
<td>Social Atlas produced in partnership with government and CSOs</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic study on National planning, monitoring and evaluation systems in partnership with UNFPA and technical support for implementation of the recommendations provides to Ministries of Women and children’s Affairs</td>
<td>Joint monitoring on UNICEF supported programmes and implementation of Provincial Development plans</td>
<td>Most Significant Change tool used in monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 3: By 2012, government and communities engage in long-term integrated, strategic communication fostering and sustaining behaviour and social changes to address the survival, development and rights of children, youth and women especially in Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Tonga, Tuvalu, Samoa and Fiji</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key social protection, health partners and emergency/disaster institutions have been engaged and supported to plan for emergencies</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening of media to produce media for, with and about children resulting in Audio-visual and print productions distributed locally, regionally and globally</td>
<td>Capacity strengthening of media to produce media for, with and about children resulting in Audio-visual and print productions distributed locally, regionally and globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific knowledge management network established and used to communicate and share relevant information on key UNICEF advocacy and programme priorities</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.51. Results have also been achieved in improved access to and quality of services for mothers and new-borns, with an increasing number of hospitals within as well as outside of convergence areas gaining ‘baby friendly’ status, maternal and neonatal policies and guidelines for community-based maternal and neonatal care updated and capacities to manage obstetric and new born emergencies enhanced in 57 health facilities.

5.52. The changes in Programme Component Result indicators for Health show decreasing rates of infant and under 5 mortality for Solomon Islands and Vanuatu though data are only available for 2007 and 2009. Figures prove less favourable or are missing for Kiribati. Also maternal mortality rates show improvements for Solomon Islands and Vanuatu but actually appear to increase for Kiribati. Also here data are limited and available for 2007 and 2009 only.

5.53. In Water, sanitation and hygiene results were achieved in terms of water facilities installed in selected schools in the three focus countries and the adoption of the VIP toilet design by the MoPW, MoE and MoH in Abemama Island of Kiribati, which was an important achievement as other options were likely to contaminate the shallow ground water sources on the island. Ministries of Public Works, Education and Health adopted the VIP toilet design for roll out across the country. Baseline data on water and sanitation in schools and health facilities were collected which informed programming in convergence areas. PCR indicators show an increase in access to improved drinking water sources in Vanuatu and Kiribati but no changes in use of improved sanitation.

**Education Programme**

5.54. In the schools in the convergence areas improvement plans are increasingly in place informed by school self-assessments and there is an enhanced application of child-friendly principles in primary schools. Informed by the work with child friendly schools, minimum quality standards for primary schools have been developed and adopted in each of the three focus countries. These standards include aspects of access to education, quality of education, gender equality, child protection and health and hygiene as well as linkage to the community and aspects of school infrastructure and management. Language policy was drafted and a school library policy was launched in Solomon Islands and life skills assessment tools were drafted to gauge non-academic skills.

5.55. Development policy, standards and curricula for ECD were supported in Kiribati and Vanuatu. Attention was moreover provided to education in emergencies including the development of policies outlining aspects of preparedness and accountabilities for emergency response and the establishment of standing education clusters for emergencies under the leadership of MoE in Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. When looking at the PCR indicators for education, changes are mostly hard to identify and some of the indicators actually regress for Kiribati.

5.56. Important aspect of UNICEF support to education in the three focus countries is UNICEF’s involvement in the development of a sector wide approach for education in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Though UNICEF’s resources are relatively small compared to other Development Partners, UNICEF’s expertise is highly valued as is its participation in SWAp management. Taking part in a SWAp changes the perspective of UNICEF’s approach, which becomes oriented towards co-management of the SWAp and influencing the direction of its programming. This often diverts attention away from convergence, in which

---

42 The Vanuatu Minimum Quality Standards for Primary Schools consists of 15 standards while the Kiribati Minimum Quality Standards contain 37 standards divided into five categories. The latter have, moreover, been specified in terms of four indicators which identify increasing levels of quality.
the education programme would focus more on its linkages with other sector based interventions.

**HIV/AIDS Programme**

5.57. HIV/AIDS programming has supported the development of regional and national HIV/AIDS strategic plans including monitoring frameworks of national HIV and other STI responses. Moreover, regional and national policies and guidelines for PPTCT\(^{43}\) and youth friendly health services were developed, monitoring and evaluation tools for youth friendly health services put in place and HIV prevention messages prepared and communicated. PPTCT has been integrated in ante natal care in selected locations, including convergence areas.

5.58. In terms of behaviour change of most at risk populations, baseline studies were conducted in each of the focus countries, including knowledge, attitudes and practices of most at risks and vulnerable groups of young people (i.e. the age group of 15-24), which information was used in the development of national HIV/AIDS plans. Baseline studies included the convergence areas in their sampling frameworks. Moreover, peer educators were trained and information made accessible through peer education. PCR indicators for the HIV/AIDS programme show an increase in women who were tested in the last 12 months and know their results in Vanuatu and Kiribati. Data on knowledge, attitudes and behaviour was only gathered once so far, during the baselines of 2009, so that no data for comparison is available yet.

**Child Protection Programme**

5.59. On national level new child protection bills have been drafted in Kiribati and Solomon Islands, which need to go through an approval process. Greater engagement of the police has been reached in crime prevention and diversion of youth in contact with the law in Vanuatu and Kiribati. In Solomon Islands guidelines for the judiciary in dealing with youth as victims, offenders and witnesses are in the process of finalization. Improvements have been made in monitoring and reporting of children’s cases in Kiribati where improved collaboration between police and other stakeholders was reached.

5.60. In terms of capacities of child protection services, new policies for child and family social service systems have been developed through consultative processes, including identification of roles and responsibilities of Government stakeholders and informal actors like church and traditional leaders. The birth registration system has been enhanced in each of the three focus countries, with procedures in place for late registration which has greatly increased the number of registered children across the three countries.

5.61. At the community and household level there appears to be an increased awareness of child protection with attitudinal and behavioural changes amongst parents, communities and traditional leaders and establishment of new partnerships with church based organizations, corporate sectors and traditional as well as formal leaders.

5.62. With the socio-cultural diversity that characterizes the Pacific and the focus countries concerned and the different views that various social groups have regarding child rearing and protection, there is a need for the CP programme to be aware of the specific social and cultural issues concerned and to provide context specific responses. This goes in particular for areas where community members have an outspoken view on modernization and actively try to preserve socio-cultural identities and values, like Tanna Island of TAFEA

\(^{43}\)With the inclusion of the role of fathers in the PMTCT activities the acronym got changed to make explicit that it concerns Parents, rather than only the mother involved, so PPTCT for *Prevention of Parent to Child Transmission*.\n
province in Vanuatu, but was also considered necessary outside these areas, in particular in Vanuatu and Solomon Islands.

5.63. Indicators on the level of legislation, systems and community and household practices have been assessed in 2008 with an extensive baseline study, covering output as well as outcome level indicators. In the absence of data gathering on the same indicators after 2008 there is no way to compare the data and to quantitatively assess results achieved after 2008.

5.64. Most significant change stories have been gathered, in particular in the field of child protection. Aspects of change in child protection that the stories refer to include diversion of young offenders, use of positive and alternative means of disciplining, youth representation at high level fora.

Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation Programme

5.65. The results of the policy, advocacy, planning and evaluation (PAPE) programme combine enhancement in evidence based policy making with the increased availability of social data and stakeholder engagement in communication for development. UNICEF support to youth policies has led to separate youth policies\(^{44}\) and the integration of youth policy objectives in national development plans, corporate sector strategies and parliament briefings. Support to child development plans in the three focus countries has led initially to the formulation of separate child related plans on provincial and council level and at a later stage enabled the incorporation of child issues in mainstream provincial and local development plans.\(^{45}\)

5.66. Social atlases for Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, a study on Child Poverty and Disparities for Vanuatu and Kiribati, and the MICS for Vanuatu meant an increased availability of child and youth related data for planning and policy making, with a focus on sub-national level data which is used to identify deprived areas in terms of access to social services and children’s conditions.\(^{46}\) Sentinel monitoring has so far provided three rounds of data in particular on vulnerability for economic change which with three data points in time has started to work as a benchmark and early warning system. Part of the sentinel sites cover convergence areas. Multiple other studies have increased the data available on a range of child related subjects including urbanization, climate change, global economic and food crisis and state of the Pacific Youth.\(^{47}\)

5.67. Support to CRC reporting has resulted in less of the PICs overdue with their initial and periodic CRC reports. Capacity has been strengthened of media to produce information for,
with and about children, resulting in audio-visual and printed productions. Evaluations of communication initiatives in WASH were conducted though did not include reference to social change given a lack of baseline data.

5.68. An assessment of the capacity of Monitoring and Evaluation was made for the three focus countries. This study recommends the strengthening of the government PME systems and to make use of carefully selected data points collected by line Ministries on a regular basis, which are women and child focused and can be informative to policy makers making use of simple but relevant performance reporting templates.  

**Contribution to Reduction of Disparities**

5.69. **Finding:** The question whether the convergence approach has contributed to reduction of disparities is not easy to answer, though it is most likely that it actually did contribute to reduction of disparities.

5.70. Selection of the three focus countries from amongst the 14 countries in the Pacific and the selection of convergence areas within each of the focus countries certainly means that underserved areas are being targeted. Inclusion of population size and accessibility as selection criteria, not necessarily prioritizing only criteria of vulnerability, has meant in practice that selected social services could be promoted for relatively large groups of people in a relatively efficient way, likely to reduce disparities. This approach, however, has not targeted ‘worst off groups’ and implementation could be enhanced by identifying the ‘worst-off’ groups within these areas and over time increasingly shifting resources to reach these groups.

5.71. The selection of the areas affected by the 2007 tsunami in Solomon Islands meant that disparities based on the disaster and its effects could be mitigated and addressed and emergency response followed by reconstruction and development programming.

5.72. On the other hand the selection of convergence areas leaves out several other underserved areas and groups, in particular low density populations living in geographical isolated conditions. There is a need to develop an approach to reach the people living under these conditions in the Pacific.

**Ways to achieve Holistic Child Development**

5.73. **Finding:** The convergent approach appears to have been implemented, in particular from the start of the programme, from an area-based approach rather than working from the requirements of the different programme components and the specific ways in which they target their support. While an area based approach to holistic child development has not been able to engage some of the programme components in UNICEF Pacific, a more heterogeneous approach to achieving holistic child development appears to have a lot of potential.

**Making Use of an Integrated Approach**

5.74. **Finding:** A more holistic approach to child development can be achieved through the use of an integrated perspective. In this approach multiple services are provided to children and women, which can expand beyond traditional sector boundaries. This has had been practiced in several of the UNICEF Pacific’s programme components and has proven

---

beneficial for target groups. Such an integrated approach to multiple social services represents an importance means to reach more holistic child development.

5.75. The approach taken in immunization campaigns and Child Health days was one of integration of a variety of health and other services, including vaccination, distribution of Vitamin A and deworming tablets, hygiene promotion and support to birth registration. This meant that a range of services became available to the same target groups which could be accessed at the same event, during the same day. 49

5.76. The Minimum Quality Standards for Primary Schools show aspects of an integrated approach with attention to issues of student health and hygiene and aspects of protection of children while at school, in addition to aspects of access to and quality of education. Moreover, in the education sector the attention to water and sanitation facilities at schools, support to inclusion of life-skills into the curriculum and promotion of non-violent forms of discipline in school are important aspect of a more holistic approach.

5.77. In the HIV/AIDS programme one of the initiatives concerns the support to Youth Friendly Health Services, which are meant to be integrated in public health facilities, linking with community based interventions in the provinces. Such integration could be considered an important part of a holistic child development approach, making such services accessible through the mainstream health system.

**Linking work in Convergence areas with support to National level policy-making and implementation**

5.78. **Finding:** In various instances the experiences from the convergence areas have been used to inform support to national level policy-making and related issues. In this way experiences in the convergence areas have contributed to enhance aspects of the wider enabling environment. 50

5.79. An example of the use of learning from programming in convergence areas to enhance national level policy-making is the development of National Quality Standards for Primary Education. The development of such standards was supported by UNICEF in each of the focus countries, based on the experiences with enhancing access to and quality of primary education through child friendly school programmes implemented in each of the countries which started before the period under review. Some of the CFS projects, like the one in Tafea, Vanuatu, was launched in late 2001.51 National level application of project experiences was greatly facilitated by the establishment of working relations at multiple levels over a longer period and the development of capacities of the various stakeholders. This kind of use of experiences at the national level appears to be enhanced by the longer term engagement of UNICEF in its support to education.

5.80. Also in the case of UNICEF support to birth registration there has been this linkage between working on local and national level. Here though the situation was different as for the support to local level birth registration in convergence and other areas one needs a national birth registration system in place. Thus UNICEF support has focused on both

---

49 Resistance to immunization is often dealt with by providing health related information to people concerned. It is argued by some that opposition to immunization would be easier to overcome if targeted groups were considered in their wider social, economic, political and cultural context. With its coverage of both convergence and non-convergence areas the EPI programme was actually in a position to assess whether it would be easier to convince people of the need for immunization when one effectively delivers other health and non-health social services to them.

50 This wider enabling environment is the highest of three levels on which capacity building can take place. UNICEF’s definition of capacity development distinguishes individual, organizational and societal levels. Economic and Social Council E/2010/6 E/ICEF/2010/3, 16 November 2009.

51 The project concerned was evaluated in 2006, Evaluation of the Vanuatu Child Friendly Schools Project in Tafea Province.
levels, supporting national level agencies, most notably the civil registry, to conduct its task and to be equipped, while at the same time supporting local level agencies to promote and assist in birth registration and to fill out the birth notification forms that are required for the issuing of a birth certificate by the relevant authorities. UNICEF has worked with midwives and nurses and provided training so that they could fill out the birth notification form. Moreover, UNICEF has worked with teachers in order to enhance late registration of children that enter into primary school but are without a birth certificate. The experiences gained in the convergence areas with support to local level notification for birth registration were used to replicate this process in other provinces, beyond the convergence areas in the focus countries. Birth registration in Vanuatu was adopted as a national goal following the successful implementation in Tafea province.

5.81. The convergence areas have though not been the only areas in which UNICEF Pacific has piloted initiatives in order to apply learning elsewhere. In the Child protection programme many of the learnings were obtained in Fiji, where several of the capacities concerned were already relatively well developed and where UNICEF had been working earlier.

5.82. Finding: Experiences in the convergence areas have been used for replication, i.e. making use of the learning to implement the same kind of project or support in other locations. Though in several instances working beyond the convergence areas was planned from the start, it appeared that such initiatives could still benefit from experiences gained in convergence areas.

5.83. Baby Friendly hospitals have been scaled up beyond convergence areas in Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. Moreover, the concept of ‘baby friendly’ was expanded to include ‘Mother-and-Baby Friendly’ and the first hospital in the Pacific to meet these expanded standards for both mother and baby friendliness was the National referral Hospital in Honiara, Solomon Islands which delivers up to 5,000 babies every year.

5.84. In the WASH programme component the use of the VIP toilet has been promoted by UNICEF in Kiribati, used for schools on Abemama Island. This model is considered the option that least threatens the groundwater quality in the geographical context of Kiribati. The use of the VIP model was adopted by the Government of Kiribati and was incorporated into the National Sanitation Implementation Plan and became part of the National Sanitation Policy endorsed in April 2010. Moreover, with new EU funding the WASH programme component has recently been expanded to cover 16 islands in Kiribati and areas beyond the selected convergence provinces in Solomon Islands.

Enhancing Coordination of planning and delivery of social services

5.85. Finding: A holistic approach to child development has also been supported through enhancing mechanisms for coordination of planning, budgeting and delivery of social services, in order to enhance access of local communities to all required social services of adequate quality. Some results have been achieved in this respect in terms of support to social development planning at sub-national (convergence area) level and enhancing cooperation across UNICEF sector programmes, and with relevant Ministries and Departments at national and sub-national levels. Coordination in emergencies proves not yet necessarily sufficient.

5.86. UNICEF has supported the development of local Child development plans in Betio, South Tarawa and Abemama in Kiribati and Choiseul and Western Provinces in Solomon Islands.

52 The accreditation includes establishing policies and practices that encourage maternal and child health, with core practices including safe birthing practices, the protection of breastfeeding as the only source of food and fluid for babies, up to six months, and complementary feeding in combination with breastfeeding up to two years.
and supported the provincial level child development plan of Tafea in Vanuatu. The latter is more comprehensive, makes use of the MICS data to set priorities and identifies a set of strategies for the issues to be addressed. The local child development plans are more limited and include a set of activities with performance indicators attached.

5.87. The Tafea provincial plan mentions the stakeholders at provincial level including Provincial Council, PTAG, Provincial Departments, NGOs and INGOs. There is less attention to the roles of each of the stakeholders as well as the building of capacities on policy, organizational and individual levels during the period concerned, i.e. 2010-2012. Also the linkage with the area councils and their role in implementation is not made explicit, nor the development of their capacity over time. Several of the plans in Kiribati as well as the two provincial plans in Solomon Islands include incorporation of the plan into the wider Island or Provincial Development Plan. The plans of the two provinces in Solomon Islands include details on communication for development, while several of the plans in Kiribati include monitoring and annual review of the plan’s implementation.

5.88. The importance of these initiatives was in particular that social development issues were included in plans of agencies that did not necessarily pay attention to these aspects of development before hand. The role of local councils in Vanuatu as well as Kiribati appears to have developed rapidly in recent years. The position of Local Area Councils in TAPEA was enhanced over the last decade with infrastructure made available and with councils in the process of developing local plans. A review of local councils in Kiribati in 2000 found that the demands on the councils had grown but the institution had remained static and mostly dependent on the 1996 Local Government Ordinance which required them to focus on maintenance of peace and security. Nowadays, however, councils are expected to facilitate island development, implement development projects and address social issues, something for which they are not necessarily sufficiently equipped. With this in mind it is important for the development plans to include ways to support the development of the local governance capacity, which is missing so far.

5.89. Such kind of support can easily be linked to the attention that there is to issues of local governance and related capacities in the region. The Third Pacific Local Government Symposium, hosted by the Government of Vanuatu in 2010, included attention to aspects of sub-national and local government and their role in service-delivery and economic development. The declaration of the meeting called for raising the profile of local government, including articulation of its role in supporting the delivery of regional and international commitments and programs, including the MDGs. It was recognized that for local government to play a meaningful role, local government policies, structures and systems will need to be enhanced and that strengthening of the institutional and service delivery capacity of local governments remains a critical and on-going objective for which monitoring systems need to be in place.

5.90. A programme component in which there is more attention for cross sector linkages, enhancing coordination and cooperation amongst multiple agencies, is the child protection programme for which implementation the support of a wide range of actors is required, beyond any single sector. An overview of parties concerned in Kiribati is provided in figure 3 below. The child protection programme has put much effort in working with multiple partners across sectors on selected issues in child protection and getting systems for coordination and cooperation in place.

---

54. CLGF Pacific, Port Vila Declaration on Building Vibrant & Resilient Local Economies & Communities in the Pacific.
Outcomes of the Pacific Local Government Symposium and Annual general Meeting of the CLGF Pacific Technical Advisory Panel held in Port Vila, Vanuatu from 11-14 October 2010.
5.91. In the WASH programme component use has been made of a Core Technical Group in which staff of the health promotion unit and environmental sanitation unit of the Ministry of Health, staff from local government division of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, staff from environment division of the Ministry of Environment and Agricultural Development, the water engineering unit of Ministry of Public Works and Utilities and the NGO association KANGO are brought together to support WASH programming in Kiribati. The Core Technical Group is expected to play an important role in the new UNICEF supported WASH programme to be implemented on 16 islands in Kiribati, funded by the EU.

Figure 3: Graphic Overview of Inter-Agency Collaboration in the Kiribati Social Welfare System and indication of some of the roles in child protection


5.92. The enhanced attention for Early Childhood Development as part of the Education programme is another example of cross sector perspectives with ECD focus on education, nutrition, WASH as well as child protection issues.

5.93. Coordination amongst government agencies and UN and other partners is also important in emergency situations. A rapid survey conducted 10 weeks after the earthquake and tsunami that hit Solomon Islands in April 2007 to assess the results for the first 10 weeks of emergency response revealed a lack of sector coordination in health and nutrition, water and sanitation, child protection and education at provincial and national levels.\textsuperscript{55}

5.94. Options for coordination and enhanced integration across UNICEF programme components exist in communication for development, which provides support to communication activities across the various sector programmes and the M&E section which provides support to monitoring and evaluation. Though both support sections on C4D and M&E are

\textsuperscript{55} UNICEF Pacific, Monitoring the early response to a humanitarian crisis: the use of an Omnibus Survey in the Solomon Islands.
part of the PAPE programme, activities concerned are implemented by the various sector programmes. A stronger support role of PAPE linked to a stronger mandate for PAPE to ensure quality of C4D and M&E conducted by sector programmes could provide a more strategic use of these functions in line with the programmatic approach of the country office.

**Constraining Factors in reaching Results**

5.95. **Finding:** A variety of constraining factors has limited results achieved so far, which includes unfinished programme implementation and limited follow up in a variety of cases, limited capacities for coordination amongst UNICEF programme components as well as amongst government agencies and limited support to enhance such capacities, and less than optimal use made of information gathered and made available on a variety of child issues so far. These issues add to the geographical difficulties of reaching isolated populations in outer islands in the focus countries and the costs and efforts involved in transportation.

5.96. Programme implementation has not been finalized in many instances. After training and other support aspects there appeared not always sufficient follow up after initial activities. This was observed for example in terms of the education programme, where some of the training had not been followed up in terms of how to apply learnings in practice and under the constraints concerned.

5.97. The way the Governments are structured is limiting in terms of coordination at the local level with Provincial and local level Departments primarily responsible to their Line Ministries. UNICEF only recently started to work through the concerned line ministries for local government to support the various sub-national agencies in the convergence areas. Working in this way could enhance capacities of the Ministries concerned and enhance opportunities for coordination.

5.98. Use of data made available and studies conducted remains limited as there is no strong tradition of making use of evidence based data to inform decision-making in data scarce environments. There is often more support needed for the information made available to be used in programme design, planning and policy decision-making.

5.99. Geographical isolation remains one of the constraints specific to the geographical context of the Pacific. This is most severe in Kiribati where the capital of Tarawa is more than 3,000 km from the Christmas and other Line islands that are part of the eastern island group of the country. Aspects of geographical isolation and transportation difficulties are present in all of the countries of the Pacific.

**Enabling Strategies in reaching Results**

5.100. **Finding:** There are several factors that have proven to have the ability to enhance results. These include working through government systems and building capacities in the process, as well as working through local formal as well as informal authorities and partners. The recruitment of C4D officers for each of the field offices appears to be able to cover a gap in the support to community demand side issues so far. Attention to social and cultural aspects and recognizing the value in terms of identity for children and women can enable the use of culture for change rather than merely viewing these issues in terms of constraints. UNICEF’s engagement in sector wide approaches and recent funding for substantial WASH programmes in Solomon Islands and Kiribati provide new opportunities to promote holistic aspects of child development.

5.101. Working through existing Government systems and building capacities, including those for coordination, in the process is an important strategy. This includes working through the
Local Government Ministry at the National level and through the Local Area Councils in Vanuatu and the town and Island Councils in Kiribati. This kind of support is in line with the support to building capacities for local government in the countries concerned.

5.102. With often relatively weak formal government systems in particular in isolated locations, it is important to work with informal leaders at the local level, including village chief and elders, church based organizations, pastors and women’s groups.

5.103. Staffing arrangements, including recruitment of C4D officers at the Field Office, could enhance outreach to communities, working on ‘demand side’ issues.

5.104. Paying attention to culture and recognizing the value of culture for children’s well-being and identity, while at the same time trying to address inconsistencies with CRC within the context of the social system. In this respect it will be important to look at the underlying shared objectives of cultural practices and CRC and to assess how these shared objectives can be used to enhance results for children and women.

5.105. The granting of EU support for large WASH programmes in Solomon Islands and Kiribati has created new opportunities to advocate for and enhance a holistic approach to child development. With these programmes meant to cover large geographical areas, including outer islands, this provides an opportunity for UNICEF Pacific to expand the approach of these programmes through strategically tagging on additional aspects related to water, sanitation and hygiene, which can enhance results for children and women.

5.106. In the same line of thought UNICEF can make use of its position in the Education SWAps. Though these concern sector based programme approaches, there is space to include relations to other sectors including Health and Child Protection and UNICEF is well positioned to advocate for a more holistic approach to education.
SUSTAINABILITY

5.107. Sustainability refers to the probability of continued long term benefits. The issue of sustainability will be addressed in terms of the ownership of the convergence approach, and capacities required for its implementation. Moreover, attention will be paid to financial aspects of sustained results and inclusion of disaster risk reduction and preparedness in programme components which is of particular importance given the relatively high level of emergency proneness of the focus countries.

Ownership of the Convergence Approach

5.108. Finding: The area based aspects of convergence were never fully owned by most parts of Governments who opt for a national rather than an area based approach. Also the support for an area based approach in UNICEF has diminished over time with enhanced involvement in SWAs in Education and engagement with new sector specific WASH programmes in Solomon Islands and Kiribati. This does, however, not mean that there would be no support for holistic child development. UNICEF as well as Government partners, in particular those at sub-national and local level, are eager to invest in integrated approaches and enhancing coordination of planning and delivery of social services.

5.109. The ownership of the convergence approach varies both amongst the various stakeholder concerned as well as for the various stakeholders over time. The area based approach started off in particular promoted by UNICEF and much less owned by government agencies, except for the administrative units targeted in the selected convergence areas. Also in UNICEF the support to the area based approach was not unanimous, with this perspective challenged by both the EPI and the HIV/AIDS programmes. UNICEF’s engagement in Education SWAs in the focus countries over time and most recently new EU funding for two UNICEF WASH programmes, which operate from a sector perspective, has further limited UNICEF’s ownership of an area based perspective. It also shows that donors have not really bought into the approach so far.

5.110. That does though not mean that there would not be ownership of a holistic perspective to child development, and of integrated aspects of programming, combining a variety of sector aspects in a single intervention. That aspect is considered useful both by UNICEF programmes as well as increasingly by Government agencies. Also the ‘systemic’ approach, focusing on aspects of coordination across stakeholders in planning and implementation of social service delivery is promoted by UNICEF, in particular by the Child Protection programme, and is considered beneficial in particular at sub-national and local level, which are more closely related to communities were all social services in the end need to come together to produce benefits for children and women.

Financial Aspects

5.111. Finding: In financial terms results achieved so far cannot yet be considered to sustain without further support as in most cases Governments are not in a position to take up the financial costs concerned. Government budgets are limited and cover mostly recurrent costs with much of the programming costs covered by donor funding.

5.112. Government budget covers mainly recurrent costs which includes human resources and infrastructure, not programming costs which highly depend on donor support. Most of the programmatic interventions depend on on-going investments which are unlikely to be
covered by Government budgets in the near future. In the past some of the human resource costs supported by donors have been incorporated into the government budget but this is less likely to occur with programme funding. The main strategy to address termination of specific donor funds is to try to obtain support from other donors. The dependency on donor funding is highest in Solomon Islands where donor support represents 61% of GNI for 2010. This dependency on donor resources for programming has undermined the area based strategy of a convergence approach as with focused funding in a specific geographical area, the regular government response would be to reallocate programmatic resources to invest in other geographical areas.

5.113. UNICEF is looking at the issue of budgeting and how to package budgets for child policies and programmes and submit these to MoF in order to make a clear investment case. This could also be done for investment in convergence areas as underserved areas in terms of social services.

Capacities developed

5.114. Finding: In terms of capacities built the various programmes pay attention to the policy level (enabling environment), systemic aspects (organizational issues) and individual level capacities. This focus across these capacity levels enhances aspects of sustainability. This could be further enhanced by monitoring output and outcome level changes on these levels and make use of monitoring data to inform programme management across these levels. Moreover, clear exit policies are needed for programme component initiatives.

5.115. Most of the UNICEF programmes aim to support development of capacities across the three capacity levels: enabling environment, systemic level and individual level. The results frameworks of the Child Protection and the HIV/AIDS programme are organized around these different capacity levels and thus the approach is explicit in these programmes. In other programmes, the approach remains implicit, though present.

5.116. Capacities built at enabling environment level include support to the Family and social welfare policy and bill, Gender based violence policy development and development of quality standards for Primary Schools. In the various programmes support to the establishment or further development of systems has included Birth notification and registration systems with enhanced capacities of civil registry, health workers and teachers, cold chain in place for immunization, and a Child desk officer in Department of Women’s Affairs under MoJ.

5.117. Capacities built at individual level include many trainings conducted for government staff members, teachers, nurses, etc. Disadvantage concerning training is that much training has been organized as one-off events with insufficient follow-up. There is a need for UNICEF to pay more attention to systemic issues, like support to teacher training college and police academy, i.e. supporting the regular training institutes rather than directly providing training. More attention is needed to evaluation of training, with attention to the four levels of evaluation of training that are often distinguished: reaction, learning, behaviour and results.

5.118. There has been limited attention so far to building capacities for coordination across Departments and Agencies. Systems for coordination across sectors within the Government system are often limited.

---

56 ODA as part of GNI in 2010 represents 11% in Kiribati and 15% in Vanuatu. Source: OECD and World Bank.

Addressing Emergency related Issues

5.119. **Finding**: Inclusion of aspects of Disaster Risk Reduction and Emergency Preparedness vary across the different programmes and initiatives. Given the high level of disaster proneness of the focus countries and the sub-region at large there is a need to further enhance attention to these aspects in order to enhance sustainability of results.

5.120. The UNICEF Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action articulate the agency’s mandate to respond to and role in emergencies and are an integral component of UNICEF’s country programmes. The Pacific region is particularly vulnerable to natural disaster. In the UNICEF Pacific risk profile for 2011 natural environment is identified as the highest risks for the country programme. However, inclusion of emergency preparedness and DRR is considered by UNICEF staff themselves not sufficiently present across the board in the programme components, including in the convergence areas.

5.121. There are nonetheless useful examples of work in DRR and emergency preparedness. In Communication for Development a guide has been prepared to provide a rapid means for monitoring of C4D initiatives, in particular those in emergency situations. The manual was developed based on the experience with the Avian Influenza in the Asia and focuses on ‘strategic communication’, which is described as an evidence-based and results oriented blend of advocacy, social mobilization and behaviour change communication aimed to change people’s behaviour in response to specific circumstances, like the onset of an epidemic like Avian Influenza. The manual contains toolboxes on data collection methods and sampling and an overview of assessment instruments which can be further adapted to suit local needs.

---

6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1. The relevance of an area-based approach to convergence in the Pacific, in which sub-national programming would focus on selected geographical or administrative areas, has proved limited. The area based characteristics were not owned by the National Governments of the focus countries. With the approach not been adopted in the UNDAF, convergence remained focused on social development aspects of UNICEF’s programme at the exclusion of economic development and governance (which are outcome areas 1 and 2 of the UNDAF respectively and which are much less part of UNICEF support). This limited the set-up of the convergence approach as an area-based programme approach from the start.

6.2. The support provided to the convergence areas has addressed the needs of vulnerable children and women, with each of the selected areas scoring low on selected child and women related indicators. However, the combination of considerations used in the selection of the convergence areas has resulted in reaching relatively large vulnerable groups in accessible areas, though has not explicitly targeted worst-off groups. Situation assessments that inform programming do not identify aspects of vulnerability and worst-off groups below the provincial level. In some locations support services provided by UNICEF have not been considered as responding to local people’s felt needs and in line with their socio-cultural systems and practices. Sensitivity to such systems and practices remains an important priority for programming.

6.3. Adjusting the application of the approach from a strictly area-based principle to a more diverse means of enhancing the holistic development of children has improved the relevance and applicability of the approach in the Pacific. Piloting of implementation in convergence areas for replication elsewhere and making use of learning to inform National level policy-making have proved useful. Another application concerns integrating multiple services in selected sector interventions and creating linkages across sectors. Finally, support to enhance planning for child development and coordinate delivery of social services has been provided. In these ways the underlying convergence objective of holistic child development has been applied in a variety of ways, based on programme opportunities as well as responding to requirements in the field.

6.4. Implementation of the convergence approach has been hampered by a lack of a common understanding amongst UNICEF staff and staff of partner agencies on what the core of the approach is and how it is to be implemented in the context of the Pacific. This has been enhanced by the lack of clear guidance from UNICEF corporately on what the approach entails and how it can be implemented. Several programme staff rightly recognized from the start that an area-based approach to convergence would not work for their programme. This limited the buy-in to the approach from within UNICEF programme components.

6.5. Consistent guidance for the approach is also lacking in key programme documentation as the approach is not included in a variety of key documents on UNICEF Pacific’s strategy and programme approach. In this way several interpretations of how to make use of convergence have emerged in practice. Moreover, the relationship of convergence to the more recent focus of UNICEF on equity in relation to acceleration of MDG achievement is not understood in the same way across UNICEF staff.

6.6. The lack of a common understanding is also reflected in the absence of a clear theory of change in relation to the approach, identifying how the approach can bring about better results for children and women. The results frameworks used for programme implementation are the results frameworks of the various programme components, which
however do not enable to assess the results of applying a convergent approach itself and results achieved across programme components.

6.7. Though Field Offices were set up and staffed in each of the focus countries, the management approach of the programme remained primarily sector programme oriented with the Chiefs of FO neither having the financial nor the management means to enable them to shape the programme to the requirements of the approach. The centralized financial management system of UNICEF has further limited the management opportunities for FOs. Though these management shortcomings were highlighted in the MTR process in 2010, no substantial changes to programme management appear to have been put into place and these constraints largely remained during the second part of the programme period.

6.8. Results based management has been limited in practice and with the lack of a theory of change underpinning the convergence approach itself, monitoring of results have been limited to the individual programmes. In practice monitoring proved primarily focused on activities with the annual or bi-annual workplan as the guiding document. Data on output and outcome level changes are usually not available at sufficiently regular intervals so that they can be used to inform management decision-making.

6.9. Joint monitoring has provided a useful perspective, in particular in bringing parties together around monitoring of progress and creating interest in programme performance management. Sentinel monitoring has created additional data with a focus on specifically vulnerable groups and areas. The use of the Most Significant Change technique has added a qualitative perspective to monitoring though used in particular by Child Protection and less in other programme components, with a focus on story gathering and less on story selection and content analysis.

6.10. Against the expectation, efficiency was not reached across communication activities, with each of the programme components organizing their own C4D activities. In practice it has been primarily through integration of a variety of interventions in the same programme component which has led to enhanced efficiencies. Moreover, the use of learning from local interventions on national level and replication of initiatives has proved efficient. Implementation of various forms of more holistic programming does not appear to have resulted in an immediate reduction of transaction costs. The latter was mostly realized through UNICEF’s participation in SWAps in education in the three focus countries. However, SWAps have national coverage and are sector-oriented and as such neither conducive with an area-based convergence approach, nor necessarily with a more holistic programme approach.

6.11. Results have been achieved in each of the programme components and have been realized on national level in terms of the enabling environment, including legislation and policy development, while in convergence areas organizational (or systemic) aspects, in particular in terms of development of capacities of government agencies and systems have been addressed as well as capacities and behaviours of community members in each of the programme components.

6.12. Experiences obtained in the convergence areas have been used in various ways to inform national level legislation and policy-making. The development of National Minimum Quality Standards for Primary Education was informed by the implementation of child friendly programmes in the focus countries. UNICEF support to birth registration has included both the national and the local level, focusing on support to get a registration system in place and at the same time supporting local level actors in convergence areas to build capacities to promote registration and to fill in birth notification forms. Moreover, there have been various examples of replication, including the baby friendly hospital
initiative, which was expanded beyond the convergence areas and the promotion of the VIP toilet design, which was taken up based on experiences in Abemama Island in the National Sanitation Implementation plan in Kiribati.

6.13. In addition to an area based approach, a holistic perspective to child development has been used to integrate multiple sector services in single sector based programmes. Vaccination campaigns and child health days are examples of the application of such an integrated approach, which bring about multiple results for the same children and women.

6.14. Another perspective on holistic child development that has been included in UNICEF’s support in the focus countries concerns enhancing coordination at sub-national and local level in planning and delivery of social services. Results have been achieved in particular in planning for social development with support to sub-national level child development plans in convergence areas. In particular local level agencies previously did not focus on planning for social service delivery. The support to cooperation across sector agencies at sub-national level in Child Protection as well as WASH and more recently in ECD has created additional opportunities for coordination and linkages across services delivered.

6.15. The focus on convergence areas and their selection is likely to have contributed to the reduction of disparities in the countries concerned. Especially the focus on more populated vulnerable areas that are accessible by transport has meant efficient targeting. However, this can be further enhanced by more focus over time on particularly vulnerable groups. Moreover, the selection has left out low density populations in geographical isolated conditions, of which there are quite a number in the countries concerned. There appears to be a need to find ways to reach these groups.

6.16. Constraining factors for reaching results have included limited coordination amongst the UNICEF programme components and limited capacities for coordination across sectors in government agencies as well as limited support to enhance such capacities so far. These constraints add to the geographical isolation and transport constraints that characterize large parts of the region.

6.17. Enabling strategies include working through government systems, in particular those that provide the opportunity to better coordinate social service delivery at the local and sub-national level, while building capacities in the process. Attention to social and cultural aspects and recognizing their value in terms of identity for children and women can further enhance programme implementation.

6.18. UNICEF engagement in SWApS in Education in the three countries provides a seat at the table of the management of these sector wide programmes with opportunities to promote a more holistic view of child development in the implementation of these programmes. UNICEF’s more recent opportunities for expansion of the WASH programmes in Kiribati and Solomon Islands can provide additional opportunities to promote a more holistic approach to child development in WASH programmes and to piggyback additional aspects of an integrated approach to child development, based on UNICEF’s comparative advantage.

6.19. Results so far cannot yet be considered to be sustainable. The area based aspects of the convergence approach were never fully owned by most parts of the Governments concerned and support in UNICEF itself has been diminishing. The underlying holistic approach to child development has been able to count on much more support from both Government and UNICEF Pacific staff of the various programme components. This goes for an integrated approach to holistic child development; for making use of convergent areas for piloting and replication of successful initiatives; as well as for the development of capacities for coordination of planning and implementation of social development plans at sub-national level.
6.20. In financial terms the limited programming resources of all three governments severely limits the possibilities for government to take over the programming costs of initiatives in the short term. There is a need for the development of exit strategies to address these issues. Attention to disaster risk reduction and emergency preparedness varies across the programme components and is much needed to enhance sustainability of programming with the high risk of natural disaster in the Pacific countries.
7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

7.1. Recommendations of the evaluation focus on what is required in terms of UNICEF’s ongoing support to the convergence areas as well as how to develop a more differentiated holistic child development approach in the Pacific, moving away from a primarily area-based perspective. For all these types of support UNICEF will need to enhance its monitoring systems and support the development of monitoring capacities in Government and civil society organizations. One of the aspects outside of the present convergence areas concerns the many isolated outer islands with relatively small populations that are often underserved areas. There is an urgent need to address how children and women in such circumstances can get better access to social services and establish what role UNICEF can play in this respect. Over the years UNICEF Pacific has become an important player in the development and implementation of SWAps in education and it has been able to expand considerably on its support to WASH programmes, with recently increased donor funding for large programmes in both Kiribati and Solomon islands. Though these opportunities are sector based, UNICEF needs to make use of these opportunities to promote a holistic approach to child development.

I. Completing the work in the convergence areas

7.2. UNICEF has committed support to the convergence areas in the three focus countries in the Pacific. Though an area-based approach as such appears not the best approach for the UNICEF Pacific programme as argued in this report, discontinuation of support would need to be done step wise, in a phased approach. This on the one hand as processes started have often not been finalized and results achieved so far cannot yet be expected to be sustainable. Moreover, the capacity development initiatives started at the various levels need a substantial period of time in order to bring about the expected results. Therefore there is a need to continue UNICEF support to the convergence areas.

7.3. Further support needs to focus on completing what has been started, further enhancing capacities, and sustaining results achieved so far. More attention needs to be paid to monitoring and evaluation in the convergence areas, assessing results achieved in particular on the level of outcomes and their relations to outputs concerned. This in order to inform programme management as well as lesson learning on what works and what does not work, which can enhance the piloting function of the convergence areas. There is a need to document learning obtained in order to enhance their application in replication and scaling-up.

7.4. The support to the convergence areas need to be adapted over time to reflect results achieved and capacities built, which will often allow for further targeting of most vulnerable groups of children and women and include phasing out of support which is no longer required. Moreover, an overall exit strategy needs to be developed for the convergence areas, indicating how long UNICEF expects to be able to provide support to these areas and what the process of phasing out will look like. Phasing out of support could be linked to support on planning and budgeting for child development with appropriate allocation of resources.

7.5. Several decision points will need to be included in the process, with the first being the 2015 Mid-Term Programme review, at which the status of the results of the support can be assessed based on monitoring data gathered in the coming two – three year period (see monitoring below).
7.6. In terms of staffing of the FOs in the focus countries it would be useful to have one PAPE staff, in particular given the need to reinforce monitoring of programme results as outlined below. Moreover, the planned C4D staff to be based in FOs could play a critical role in combining messages from various programmes in an interrelated communication effort.

7.7. In terms of further support to the convergence areas, each of them needs to be considered by itself, taking into account the different characteristics of the areas concerned, the reasons for their selection and their different national contexts. Rather than taking decisions on ‘the convergence areas’ as a whole, it would be useful to take their differences into account and tailor UNICEF’s position on an area by area basis.

II. Focus ‘Convergence’ on a wider set of ways in which to support holistic child development

7.8. With the realization that an area-based approach is not necessarily the best way to support holistic child development in the Pacific, there is a need to develop other means to reach this objective and to shape UNICEF’s approach at the sub-national level, both within as well as outside of selected convergence areas. Use needs to be made of the approaches applied so far including the piloting of initiatives and the creation of linkages between experiences of sub-national level initiatives to support influencing of national level policy-making and legislation. Use also needs to be made of application of an integrated approach, adding on multiple activities to sector-based initiatives so that a more comprehensive set of services is provided and enhancing capacities of government and civil society agencies to take on and implement a more integrated approach. These approaches need to be underpinned by support to enhanced coordination of planning and budgeting processes, in which child development issues and the provision of social services are addressed in a comprehensive rather than a merely single sector based approach.

7.9. Support to capacity development for a more integrated approach to child development will require the creation of longer term partnerships in order to ensure a longer term process approach, required for such capacity related changes. Such partnerships need to include both selected Government and Civil Society partners so that the programme can support on both the Government capacities to deliver services as well as the civil society side of demand for services. Working with civil society could moreover enhance opportunities for accountability towards the people that need to receive services and could be used to provide for feed-back mechanisms on the reach and quality of services concerned.

III. Adapt monitoring systems and develop capacities concerned

7.10. With the present UNICEF’s monitoring primarily oriented towards activity there is a need to reinforce the programme monitoring system and focus it on results. This in order to provide the programme with the means to assess what works and what does not work, which is needed in order to manage the various programmes and which can be used to inform lesson learning and replication of programmes and components elsewhere. For a piloting approach to be able to work it needs to be underpinned by a sufficiently rigorous monitoring system.

7.11. First of all there is a need to select a limited number of output level indicators in each of the programme components and indicators on aspects of coordinated service provision and to provide support to partners in gathering data regularly on this set of output level indicators. Data on output indicators needs to be disaggregate as much as possible on
criteria of vulnerability. This is in line with level 2 of the MoRES system that is being mainstreamed in UNICEF.61

7.12. Once data on output level indicators come in regularly one could add data gathering on a limited number of outcome level changes. In accordance with level 3 of the MoRES system, these outcome level indicators would address issues of enabling environment barriers, supply and quality bottlenecks and financial and social bottlenecks. This can be linked to the use of the MSC tool, which is a more open-ended way to collect outcome level changes from the perspective of a variety of stakeholders. With several of the UNICEF programmes having identified these community, organizational and enabling environment levels explicitly in their results frameworks there is an opportunity to make a clear linkage with these frameworks in monitoring of outcome level changes.

7.13. Next step would be to organize regular, six monthly or yearly, meetings to analyse data. This could be combined with field visits as presently part of the annual joint monitoring. These meetings would in particular focus on output and outcome level results and the linkage between them and provide inputs for management decision-making. Discussion would need to focus on what works and what does not and how programme implementation can be improved rather than on aspects of performance of individuals for which organizations have their separate systems as part of HR policies and practices.

7.14. The gathering of monitoring data and their analysis needs to be part of a wider M&E plan which identifies key aspects of monitoring and evaluation including monitoring policy; roles and responsibilities regarding data gathering, management and analysis; location of monitoring positions within the organizations concerned; processes and systems for data gathering and management; analysis, sharing and use of data; and budgets concerned.

IV. Develop means to enhance access to quality social services on outer islands

7.15. One of the issues with selection of convergence areas is the practical aspects of on the one hand the need to reach substantial numbers of children and women and on the other hand the need for accessibility of areas by flight from the national capital. As argued in the report this has meant that isolated outer islands with relatively small populations have been left out. This while there are many such islands in the Pacific focus countries. There is a need to address the delivery of quality social services to children and women on outer islands in the region.

7.16. One of the ways in which to enhance access to services on outer islands would be to enhance ‘one stop’ support, in which service providers would be able to provide several services as individuals or in teams. This would require enhanced coordination amongst the various government agencies concerned.

7.17. In terms of UNICEF’s programmes there is an opportunity to make use of single sector programmes and the access to communities on outer islands that these provide to piggy back additional services onto single sector interventions in a strategic way. In particular the expansion of the WASH programme to cover substantial areas in Solomon Islands and Kiribati, including many outer islands, provides opportunities in this respect. UNICEF could moreover, advocate for an integrated child development approach in other single sector

---

61MoRES stands for Monitoring Results for Equity Systems which is a conceptual framework for effective planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and managing results in equity focused programming aimed at the improvement of outcome for the most disadvantaged children. The system focuses on the critical need for intermediate process and outcome measures, in between the monitoring of inputs/outputs and higher level outcome changes. UNICEF, MoRES, Monitoring Results for Equity systems. Access and Quality in early Learning. June 2012; UNICEF, UNICEF’s Refocus on Equity: Results Based Management through Monitoring for Equity. Presentation to the Equity Meeting in Oslo, 10 May 2012.
programmes in outer islands including government programmes, making use of the learnings in WASH.

V. Promote holistic child development in new fora that UNICEF has become part of and seek linkages with initiatives concerning holistic child development in the region

7.18. UNICEF’s positioning in Education SWAps in the three focus countries provides it with a voice and leverage in the education sector, which is an important achievement. Sector wide approaches are though not necessarily in line with UNICEF’s holistic vision of child development. UNICEF could, however, use its position within the SWAps to promote a more holistic development approach and include aspects of health, HIV/AIDS, and child protection in the education programming, making use of the SWAp coordination mechanisms that are put in place and that provide linkages with other Government Ministries and Departments, sub-national and local authorities and non-governmental organizations.

7.19. Support to provincial and local planning and budgeting for child development closely links with developing sub-national governance capacities. In this respect it is important for UNICEF to seek linkages with programmes that explicitly address these issues including the strengthening of Provincial Government in Solomon Islands (PGSP programme).
8. LESSONS LEARNED

8.1. Support to a holistic approach to child development, increasing access to a variety of social services of adequate quality for underserved and vulnerable children and women takes time. Such an objective takes a longer term process approach in which support is provided to the development of capacities at multiple levels: the level of the enabling environment, including legislation, policies and standards for service delivery; the organizational level, supporting the development of capacities of the various governmental and non-governmental agencies involved in service delivery; and the individual level, developing skills, knowledge and attitudes of the staff involved in service provision as well as of the vulnerable people concerned, building their capacities as individuals and groups to demand the services that they require. For such a process to succeed and for enhanced capacities on all these levels to come together a longer term commitment of the various parties concerned is needed.

8.2. The area based principle, which constitutes one of the ways in which a holistic approach to child development can be supported, is not necessarily applicable in all contexts. The area based principle more or less assumes that there would be a geographical or administrative (set of) underserved area(s) which if addressed would reduce poverty substantially. The poverty pattern in many of the Pacific countries though is more spread out, including a large number of outer islands with relatively small populations which are underserved and it is more difficult to justify long term focus on such areas as part of a convergence approach. Given the limitations of an area-based approach there is a need as well as an opportunity to shift the focus of convergence to other ways of realizing a holistic approach to child development, which is the underlying principle of the approach. This can be done through an integrated approach, piloting and replication as well as through systemic support to coordination of planning and delivery of social services on sub-national level.

8.3. For a strategic approach to produce the results expected it needs to be mainstreamed within an organization. This means that the approach first of all needs to be clear to all stakeholders concerned, so that there is a shared understanding of the approach, how it is to be implemented and what it is expected to achieve. Moreover, the approach needs to become a key guiding principle in programming, with key documents referring to the approach and indicating its importance as well as details of its implementation. Human resources, financial and administrative systems need to be able to support the implementation of the approach and brought in line so that they enable application of the approach. Monitoring and evaluation need to be adapted, on the level of the programme components as well as on the level of the approach itself, providing means to assess whether the strategy actually delivers upon its expectations, in terms of intermediate changes as well as in term of results for children and women. Only when an approach is mainstreamed in this way would one be able to link progress in terms of results with the strategy implemented.
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

UNICEF Pacific
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION

Requesting Section: Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation
Date/updated: June 2012

Programme Area and Specific Project involved: Evaluation of UNICEF’s Convergence Approach in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu

1. Purpose of Evaluation:

These Terms of Reference are to undertake an evaluation of UNICEF Pacific’s ‘convergence programming’ in three countries; Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

The independent evaluation of UNICEF Pacific’s ‘convergence programming’ will guide the implementation of UNICEF Pacific’s next Multi-Country Programme 2013-2017. Findings and recommendations will be applied to the management of existing convergent programming, design of new activities and work plans with governments, and strengthening of programme monitoring and partnerships.

The evaluation will cover the period of 2008-2012 and will assess the extent to which:

1) Results have been achieved at the sub-national level in convergence provinces/islands for the five programme areas, including Health, Education, Child Protection, HIV/AIDS and Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation;
2) The convergence approach has enhanced the achievement of results and contributed to impact at the sub-national level;
3) Approaches and lessons learned have been replicated and scaled-up from convergence areas to the national level.

The evaluation will also consider:

4) Equity - the extent to which the convergent approach has incorporated an equity approach and contributed to a reduction in national and sub-national disparities for children based on income, geography, gender and disability. Differences between countries will be an important dimension of the analysis.

2. Background

As part of the 2008-2012 Multi-country Programme, UNICEF supports the achievement of results at scale for children in three countries: Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. A distinguishing feature of UNICEF’s engagement in these countries is programming at the sub-national level. Disparities are addressed through ‘convergent programming’, which enables direct engagement and capacity building with local authorities and communities in provinces and islands.

‘Convergent programming’, originated as a way to integrate programmes to holistically address the development needs of children. Working from a community-based approach, solutions reach across programmes silos to enhance children and mothers well-being throughout the lifecycle. In the Pacific, the approach has evolved beyond this initial purpose, to serve a range of programming priorities. Most notably, sub-national convergence areas provide a base in which to demonstrate approaches before scaling-up nationally.
Sub-national focus also facilitates a focus on achieving the Millennium Development Goals with equity. By concentrating resources on the lowest performing Provinces/Islands, which face the greatest disparities and are home to the most vulnerable populations, UNICEF can accelerate progress for children.

The use of sub-national areas also facilitates effective and efficient programme implementation. By centering UNICEF’s work in discrete areas, operational support and programme oversight and monitoring can be provided with greater efficiency. Baseline data has been established across programmes to support measurable impact for convergence areas and annual joint monitoring has been carried out with national counterparts. Early-warning sentinel monitoring, to monitor the impact of external shocks, is conducted in convergence areas and complements programme monitoring. Humanitarian assessments carried out in some of the convergence areas also provide monitoring data.

Implementing the Convergence Approach
Sub-national convergence sites were selected in the three countries based on several criteria including: status of key child rights indicators (with an emphasis on areas facing greatest disparities), pre-existing UNICEF programmes, comparative need for strengthening capacity of local government administration and services, and current and proposed programmes for women and children supported by other UN agencies and NGOs.

Convergent sites include the following:
- Kiribati: Abemama Island, South Tarawa
- Solomon Islands: Choiseul and Western Provinces
- Vanuatu: Tafea Province

To implement the approach, Children’s Development Plans were elaborated with each Provincial Government or Island Council, outlining locally-identified priorities and UNICEF’s commitments in the areas of Health and WASH, Child Protection, Education, HIV/AIDS, Social Policy and PME. Operationalization of sub-national programming has been carried out in general through regular Annual Work Plans and in partnership with local administrations. Monitoring of implementation has been done through regular field visits by programmes staff, the use of qualitative monitoring techniques and annual joint monitoring missions with line ministries. However, it should be noted that implementation and monitoring vary by country, convergence province/island and programmes, and full operationalization remains to be determined.

Evolutions in the Convergence Approach
It is assumed that activities in each site have evolved as programmes finish piloting phases or complete implementation of agreed workplans. In addition, convergence sites have also received emergency support from UNICEF and partners (Tafea in Vanuatu) highlighting the need to include emergency preparedness as part of convergence activities. In addition, the aid environment in three countries has shifted since 2008, with Sector Wide Approaches and Joint Partnership Arrangements evolving in Health and Education, with implications for locally-focused convergence programming.

3. Evaluation Scope
The evaluation will cover the period of 2008-2012 and the three countries in which the ‘convergence approach’ is being implemented: Kiribati, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. It will assess the extent to which:

- Results have been achieved at the ‘convergence level’ across five focus areas, including Health, Education, Child Protection, HIV/AIDS and Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation;
- The convergence approach has enhanced the achievement of results and contributed to impact at the sub-national level;
- Approaches and lessons learned have been replicated and scaled-up from convergence areas to the national level.

The evaluation will also consider:

- Equity - the extent to which the convergent approach has incorporated an equity approach and contributed to a reduction in national and sub-national disparities for children based on income, geography, gender and disability. Differences between countries in integrating an equity perspective will be an important dimension of the analysis.
• Relationships and coordination with national and sub-national stakeholders, decentralized structures and systems, and identify opportunities for improved collaboration and coordination.

• Relevance, efficiency, and sustainability of the convergence approach in line with the OECD-DAC criteria for evaluation, together with integration of human rights, gender equality and environmental sustainability in line with UNICEF’s evaluation criteria.

Evaluation questions and sub-questions based on these criteria will be developed and presented in the Inception Report.

Stakeholders at national and sub national levels will be involved in the evaluation process, including national and provincial governments, service-providers for health, education and protection, NGOs and CSOs, children families and community leaders, stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The evaluation will present findings based on the objective use of evidence and addressing the stated criteria and questions. The report will also provide clear, relevant and realistic recommendations together with appropriate lessons learned.

4. Evaluation Methodology

The methodology will entail a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. In addition, an equity focused approach to data collection and analysis, highlighting disparities based on geography, income, gender and other key variables, will be central to the methodology. Triangulation of data through different methods and tools (desk review, interviews, focus groups discussions) and sources (government representatives at the national and sub national levels, beneficiaries) is fundamental.

Stakeholders at national and sub national levels will be involved in the evaluation process, and this should be one of the main principles underlying the methodological proposal. Views of the various stakeholders should be reflected in the evaluation report to the extent of possible.

In undertaking the review, the independent evaluator will:

• Review available and relevant documentation including UNICEF’s convergence planning and monitoring reports, UNICEF Pacific studies and evaluations and relevant national and sub-national planning documents (a list of core documents is provided below).

• Conduct interviews at the national and sub national levels, with UNICEF staff and partners, in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Focus group discussions with be held with beneficiaries and stakeholders including national and provincial governments, service-providers for health, education and protection, NGOs and CSOs, children families and community leaders. stakeholders and beneficiaries are to be identified with UNICEF Pacific).

• To ensure that an equity focused approach to data collection and analysis will be effectively undertaken, the evaluation will be informed by key child statistics available through UNICEF Pacific studies and publications, national surveys (MICS, DHS, Census, HIES) and administrative data from Health, Education and other relevant sectors.

Core guidance and documents (additional documents expected):

i. UNEG (2005) “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”
   http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

ii. UNEG (2005) “Norms for Evaluation in the UN System”
   http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21

    http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=102

iv. UNICEF Reporting Standards
v. UNICEF (2011) “How to design and manage Equity-focused evaluations”
5. Evaluation Management

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. **Independent Evaluator(s):** An independent consultant(s) who will conduct the inception, data collection, analysis and reporting phases of the evaluation. Expected products are inception report, draft and final reports.

2. **Evaluation Manager:** Chief, Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation who will oversee the overall evaluation process, will ensure that the evaluations product are of quality and that the evaluation will be disseminated and used. The evaluation manager will also facilitate the connection between the consultant and the stakeholders.

3. **Evaluation Support:** The M&E Specialist will provide day-to-day support for the logistics of the evaluation – supported by Field Office staff in the three countries.

4. **Evaluation Reference Group:** UNICEF Pacific and Regional Office senior staff who will help to ensure quality, relevance and independence of the evaluation.

The Independent Evaluator will report to the Evaluation Manager, who will provide direct supervision of deliverables.

The Manager will coordinate the participation of the Evaluation Reference Group on inputting the ToR, selection of Independent Evaluator, inception report, and draft evaluation report.

The Evaluation Manager will coordinate with UNICEF senior management on the drafting of a management response to the evaluation findings and recommendations.

4. Work Schedule:

The contract will start in August and end in October 2012. Effective work period will be 8 weeks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and preparatory interviews with Evaluation Manager. Preparation and submission of Inception Report.</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>Home based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Fiji for consultations. Finalize inception report based on feedback from Evaluation Reference Group. Undertake consultations with UNICEF Pacific staff and stakeholders in Suva. Finalize data collection tools.</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>Suva, Fiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country visits (to three countries) undertaking key informant interviews, focus group discussions etc at national and sub-national levels.</td>
<td>1 week per country plus travel time = 4 weeks</td>
<td>Kiribati: South Tarawa, Abemama Solomon Islands: Western, Choiseul Vanuatu, Port Vila, Tanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write up of findings for evaluation and presentation of draft report</td>
<td>1.5 weeks</td>
<td>Home based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation review and redraft of evaluation report based on feedback from Evaluation Reference Group.</td>
<td>0.5 weeks</td>
<td>Home based (discussion via telecom)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total effective work period of contract** 8 weeks (2 months)
5. Deliverables/End Product(s):

The following reports are to be provided:

a. Draft Inception Report: Provided to UNICEF Pacific prior consultations and travel to Fiji for comments and feedback from Evaluation Reference Group. The inception report will outline:
   1) The object of the evaluation including context and theory of change
   2) The evaluation purpose, objective and scope
   3) Evaluation questions and sub-questions against criteria stated in the evaluation scope
   4) Full methodological proposal including evaluation questions and sub-questions, data collection tools, sampling and analysis methods;
   5) Stakeholders participation and ethical considerations
   6) Reporting structure
   7) Timeline

b. Final Inception Report: To be presented to UNICEF Pacific prior to travel to Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

c. Draft Independent Evaluation Report: Provided to UNICEF Pacific following field travel and home-based work for comments and feedback from the Evaluation Reference Group. The report should adhere to UNICEF’s Evaluation Reporting Standards and should address, among other things, full purpose, scope and methodology including:
   1) Object and context, theory of change, identification of stakeholders and implementation status of the programme
   2) Purpose, objective and scope including the evaluation framework and criteria
   3) Methodology including data collection methods, data sources, ethical issues and safeguards, use of M&E framework
   4) Incorporation of equity, human rights, gender equality.
   5) Findings and conclusions, including distinct lessons learned and recommendations

d. Final Independent Evaluation Report: To be presented to UNICEF Pacific at the end of the evaluation.

6. Payment Schedule: The “percentage” of total remuneration for each deliverable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signing of contract and scheduling of field visits.</td>
<td>Outset of contract</td>
<td>Travel and DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalized Inception Report</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>20% of payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalized Evaluation Report</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>80% of payment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total effective work period of contract 8 weeks (2 months)

7. Type of Supervision that will be provided:

The Consultant will be supervised by the Chief of Policy, Advocacy, Planning and Evaluation Programme, UNICEF Pacific

8. Consultant’s work plan and Official Travel Involved:

The consultant is expected to undertake travel to Fiji, Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.
9. Consultant’s Work Place: Consultant will be based within UNICEF Pacific offices while in the Pacific region. The rest of the assignment will be home-based. Consultant is expected provide their own laptop.

10. Qualifications or Specialized Knowledge/Experience Required:

**Academic qualifications:**
- Advanced University degree in Social Sciences or related technical field such as development, children or social research.

**Knowledge, skills and experience:**
- A minimum of eight to ten years progressively responsible experience in programme design and management, research, monitoring and evaluation for international development;
- Excellent qualitative and quantitative research skills;
- Previous experience conducting evaluations for UNICEF, United Nations and/or international non-governmental organizations.
- Knowledge of UNICEF’s work and programmes and experience in decentralized programmes.
- Proficient in Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, PowerPoint) and relevant internet and email software.
- Previous experience in the Pacific is an asset.

**Competencies required:**
- Highly organized; able to plan, implement and monitor work with good attention to detail.
- Highly motivated; able to motivate and build the capacity of others and to drive initiatives forward with minimal day-to-day supervision.
- Ability to take the initiative within clearly defined parameters.
- Analytical and conceptual ability; excellent communication skills.
- Ability to make timely and quality judgments and decisions.
- Proven ability to keep to deadlines.
- Ability and willingness to work as part of a team; demonstrated ability to work with people of all ages and from various organizations, including Government partners and with children and young people.
- High tolerance for operating in an environment characterized by uncertainty and ambiguity.
- Commitment to continuous learning for professional development.
ANNEX 2: CONTEXT OF THE THREE FOCUS COUNTRIES

KIRIBATI

Kiribati is a country of 33 atolls and low lying reef islands scattered along the equator in the Central part of the Pacific. In terms of land area and population, Kiribati is one of the smallest nations in the world, but in geographic spread it is one of the largest. The distance from the capital Tarawa in the west to Kirimiti in the east is about 3,500 km. Kiribati’s many small islands make transport and communications difficult and expensive. Its location in the centre of the Pacific Ocean puts it far away from the world’s main markets and transport routes. Given its geographical condition, the country is faced with significant challenges of communication.

The eastern Line and Phoenix Islands are sparsely populated. Most people live in the western Gilbert Group, and over 40 per cent of the national population is concentrated on the southern end of one atoll, Tarawa. The economy of South Tarawa is much more monetised than those of the other islands. On the outer islands the economy operates mostly at subsistence level, there is almost no cash employment other than with the government or councils, and access to services is quite restricted.

The population amounted to about 93,000 in 2005 and with an annual growth rate of around 2.3% - the population could easily double by 2030, presenting major social and economic implications. The level of development in Kiribati is one of the lowest in the region.

Two issues are identified as of particular concern. First, the breakdown of the family support structure is having an impact on Kiribati society, particularly on young people in South Tarawa. Tensions between traditional values and modern or western ways are causing social problems such as increase in crime, drug abuse, violence, suicide and incidence of diseases like HIV/AIDS and Sexually transmitted infections (STI). There is high unemployment rate due to high school drop out rate and the limited employment opportunities available. This further aggravates the situation of youths in Kiribati. Second, while men dominate most of the cash work, the involvement of women in paid employment is growing. However, there is still need for more investment in facilities and infrastructure that will help women generate the cash they require to meet family and social needs.

The national economy depends primarily on remittances from Kiribati people working abroad (mainly merchant seamen and fishermen on foreign-owned ships), fishing licence fees, exports of copra and sea products (including seaweed, beche-de-mer and aquarium fish), and foreign aid.

Traditional Kiribati culture incorporated a thorough understanding of the environment of the islands, and natural resources were sustained through social controls such as fishing regulations, clan taboos, and population controls that limited demand upon resources. But with social and economic change, many of these mechanisms have broken down. As the world climate changes, Kiribati may also be badly affected by more frequent, powerful storms and the rising sea level.

People under the age of 18 years made up just less than half (47 per cent) of Kiribati’s population in 2005. The upbringing of children generally involves the extended family rather than simply the biological parents, although this is slowly changing, more so on South Tarawa. Although the status of women in Kiribati is changing, they are generally treated as subordinate to men. Women can inherit or own land in Kiribati tradition, but they usually
still have less access to modern types of resources. There are nevertheless a growing number of women working in skilled and professional jobs, including at the highest levels of government.

The churches are a strong institution in Kiribati and an important source of both social change and stability. Almost all of the population are Christian. The Catholic Church and the Kiribati Protestant Church (KPC) account for one half and one-third of the population respectively. The churches provide spiritual direction and are also involved in social and community development.

SOLOMON ISLANDS

The Solomon Islands is one of four Melanesian countries located north-east of Australia in the Pacific Ocean. It comprises an estimated 1,000 islands spread over a large area of ocean. The country has six mayor islands and is administratively divided into 9 provinces. The national capital Honiara has the status of administrative area. Average population density is 17 people per square kilometre. While Honiara is most densely populated, Choiseul province is least populated with only 5 people per km². Total population amounted to 516,000 in 2009 with a large amount of youth with half the population under 20. While population growth remained low till the 1960s, it has grown since from 1 in 1959 to 2.3 % annual growth rate in 2009. The number of households has grown over time with the average number of household members declining from 6.5 in 1986 to 5.7 in 2009. Average life expectancy has increased over time from 50 years in 1976 to 68 in 2009.

The socio-cultural diversity of Solomon Islands is high and the country has 63 distinct languages and numerous local dialects. While English is the official language, Solomon Pijin is the Lingua Franca for most people.

While 20% of the population lives in urban centres, 80 % lives in the country side, making a living from a subsistence lifestyle, including fishing and gardening primarily for own consumption. The formal economy is relatively small and major exports of Solomon Islands include gold, forestry products, fish, copra, cocoa, coconut oil and palm oil. Largest employment sectors include manufacturing (22%), agriculture (20%), public administration (15%), educational services (12%) and wholesale and retail (10%). Children aged 12-19 years represent 18% of the total national employment figures with considerable disparities amongst province, with highest percentage in Malaita province.

According to the 2005/6 household Income and Expenditure Survey 23% of the population lived below the basic needs poverty line, with higher levels of poverty in Honiara (32%) and lower rates in other urban centres (14%) and rural areas (19%). Urban children were found to experience proportionally higher rates of poverty.

Solomon Islands remains a male dominated society with a lack of female representation in the national parliament. Women are bound by bride price and its associated social obligations. Employment is heavily skewed towards men, with males making up around 67 % of total people employed. Gender violence appears widespread with both women and children at risk of physical, emotional and sexual violence. The high prevalence of violence against women has serious repercussions for children.

Over recent years there have been gradual improvements in primary school enrolment and literacy rates. Better access to education has been a driver of increased gender equality and poverty reduction. Progress, however, needs to accelerate if the Solomon Islands is to meet the MDG targets for education. Addressing the wide geographic dispersion and disparities in access to education remains an on-going challenge. In early childhood education, primary and junior secondary education girls have slightly higher enrolment rates, which shifts at the senior secondary level, with boys’ enrolment higher than that of girls at 24 versus 21% respectively.

The health care system has seen some improvement and this is evident in lower infant and child mortality rates and in the Expanded Programme on Immunization, but population growth and financial constraints have impeded further progress. There has been a shift in
focus to preventative health care rather than a purely curative approach in response to the increasing incidence of non-communicable ‘lifestyle’ diseases such as diabetes and high blood pressure.

One third of children under 5 years of age suffer from stunting (low height for age). Micronutrient deficiencies are a serious public health problem and result from diets that lack vitamins and minerals. There is low uptake of vitamin and iron supplementation and almost half of all children under five years are affected by iron deficiency. Lack of sanitation is most prevalent in rural areas where 74% of households lack toilet facilities compared to 5% of urban households.

In 2009, UNICEF and the Government of Solomon Islands completed the first-ever Baseline Report on abuse and exploitation of children in the country. The Baseline Report confirmed that abuse and exploitation of children in the Solomon Islands is widespread and common and that it cuts across boundaries of culture, faith, race and provincial borders.


Map of the Solomon Islands with indication of Western and Choiseul
VANUATU

The Republic of Vanuatu is one of four Melanesian countries located to the north east of Australia in the South West Pacific. It comprises 88 islands – 65 of them inhabited – spread over a large area of ocean. The distances between islands create major obstacles in the delivery of communication, transport and essential services. Vanuatu has seven active volcanoes and two subterranean vents that cause frequent earth tremors.

In 2009 Vanuatu had a population of 234,000 people with a high ration of children with under 19 year olds representing 47% of the population, with an additional 11% for 19 – 24 year olds. The population is spread over six provinces which have two urban centres, Port Villa and Luganville. Average population density amounts to 19 persons per km² with most people living in the coastal areas, away from the rugged volcanic plateaus. Bislama is the national language while both English and French have official language status. Most Ni-Vanuatu also speak a local dialect.

Subsistence agriculture is the main source of livelihood along with fishing, small-scale farming of copra, cocoa, kava, vanilla and other cash crops and cattle and small livestock grazing. Land is held under customary tenure with 75-year leases being issued for urban, commercial, residential and tourism developments.

Since 2000 the Gross National Product has increased largely due to increased activity in retail and wholesale trading, manufacturing, utilities, tourism and construction. The population relies heavily on imported products such as rice, wheat flour, frozen chicken wings and canned foods as well as fuels and manufactured goods. The most striking income disparities exist between those living in remote rural areas with poor access to services, employment and markets and those living in urban areas. Shefa and Tafea provinces have the highest number of unemployed people.

About 9% of the population in Vanuatu lives below the international poverty line while 16% lives below the Vanuatu National Poverty Line. While there is income poverty, poverty of opportunity is the main issue in particular for rural children who face access barriers due to geography and lack of infrastructure. Rural children experience three times more deprivations compared to children in urban areas, with deprivation concentrated in the lowest income quintile.

People living in rural areas, remote villages and outer islands have limited access to basic infrastructure such as electricity and running water. Fifteen per cent of the population have access to only unimproved drinking water sources such as unprotected wells, rivers and springs and this has serious implications for child health in terms of diarrheal diseases.

There has been minimal progress in women’s participation in politics and in the last 30 years only five women have been successful in gaining seats in parliament. Many women are dependent on their partners for income and basic necessities as men have much greater representation in the labour force. Women are more likely to be involved in subsistence activities.

Vanuatu literacy rate is quite low at an estimated 85% and is even lower in rural areas at 80.5%. There are high rates of student drop-outs, withdrawals and absenteeism. These rates could be attributed to geographical constraints, parents’ inability to cover school and transport costs and children’s involvement in subsistence agriculture. While Vanuatu is progressing towards meeting MDG2 indicator of 100% primary school enrolment, it has not
achieved the second indicator concerning completion of year six. There seems little prospect of Vanuatu achieving MDG 2, ‘Universal Education’, by the 2015 deadline.

Communicable and non-communicable diseases are causing significant health problems in Vanuatu and the country currently faces a “double disease burden” putting severe stress on the health budget and system. The prevalent health problems are malaria, tuberculosis, STIs, acute upper-respiratory tract infection, diarrhoea and viral hepatitis. A lack of human resources both in numbers and skills constrains the delivery of basic health services particularly in the rural areas. With 16% of children moderately or severely underweight malnutrition is a significant public health concern.

Baseline data from 2009 indicate significant child abuse issues which require further data and verification. Many cases go unreported or would be dealt with by village chiefs and village meetings.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Kiribati</th>
<th>Solomon Islands</th>
<th>Vanuatu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IECD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U5MR (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMR (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of improved drinking water sources (%)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of improved sanitation facilities (%)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School enrolment (%)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school children reaching grade 5 (%)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMMUNIZATION PLUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year olds immunized against DPT3 (%)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year olds immunized against measles (%)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>&gt; 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIV and AIDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult HIV prevalence rate (%, 15-49 years)</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV prevalence rate (%, 15-24 years)</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative HIV cases</td>
<td>46 (460)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemic line (1% of population in numbers)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>4,601</td>
<td>2,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHILD PROTECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth registration rates (%)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum age for labour (years)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal age of responsibility (years)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of sexual consent (years)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal age of marriage (years)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 (with father’s consent)</td>
<td>16 (girls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual population</td>
<td>93,096</td>
<td>460,104</td>
<td>215,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child population (actual, under 18 years)</td>
<td>45,717</td>
<td>236,051</td>
<td>113,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNI per capita (US$)</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MDG Status of UNICEF Focus Countries at a Glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDG Goal</th>
<th>Solomon Islands</th>
<th>Vanuatu</th>
<th>Kiribati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 1: Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger</strong>&lt;br&gt;Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger. (Incidence of Food Poverty in national poverty data)</td>
<td>Low level of food poverty but off track to reduce basic needs poverty</td>
<td>Low level of food poverty but off track to reduce basic needs poverty</td>
<td>Low level of food poverty but off track to reduce basic needs poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 2: Achieve Universal Primary Education</strong>&lt;br&gt;Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere boys and girls alike will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.</td>
<td>Slightly off track</td>
<td>Slightly off track</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 3: Promote Gender Equality and Empower Women</strong>&lt;br&gt;Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and to all levels of education no later than 2015</td>
<td>Improving but off track overall</td>
<td>Slightly off track</td>
<td>On track with education equality but off track with empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 4: Reduce Child Mortality</strong>&lt;br&gt;Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.</td>
<td>Slightly off track</td>
<td>Slightly off track</td>
<td>Slightly off track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 5: Improve Maternal Health</strong>&lt;br&gt;Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality rate.</td>
<td>On track</td>
<td>Slightly off track</td>
<td>Off track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 6: Combat HIV/AIDS and other diseases</strong>&lt;br&gt;Halt and reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria and other major diseases.</td>
<td>Some data gaps and slightly off track</td>
<td>Some data gaps and slightly off track</td>
<td>Off track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 7: Ensure Environmental Sustainability</strong>&lt;br&gt;Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.</td>
<td>Some data gaps and slightly off track</td>
<td>Some data gaps and slightly off track</td>
<td>Some data gaps and slightly off track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDG 8: Develop a Global Partnership for Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;Develop further and open, rules-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading &amp; financial system, including a commitment to good governance, development &amp; poverty reduction.</td>
<td>Data gaps slightly off track</td>
<td>Data gaps and slightly off track</td>
<td>Data gaps and slightly off track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Annex 3: Methodologies for data gathering and key characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Study and review of selected documents relevant to the present evaluation</td>
<td>To get informed on the background and context as well as documented details of the UNICEF programme through secondary resources</td>
<td>Main learning from the desk review will be used to develop the inception report, which includes details on the methodology applied in the remainder of the evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interviews</td>
<td>Face-to-face interviews with key stakeholders making use of a set of topics for discussion</td>
<td>To gather qualitative data from a variety of stakeholders</td>
<td>Informed by the desk review and evaluation objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of secondary data on site</td>
<td>Review of quantitative and qualitative data from programme monitoring and data from quantitative surveys conducted</td>
<td>To review monitoring data gathered and to triangulate these data with the primary data gathered, to obtain information from quantitative surveys conducted</td>
<td>This will build on review of secondary data in the desk review and will be an on-going process throughout the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
<td>Discussion at the local level with programme beneficiaries, in particular members of worst-off groups making use of a set of topics for discussion</td>
<td>To assess aspects of programme results at the local level, to obtain feedback from beneficiaries and to triangulate with project reporting and monitoring data on results</td>
<td>Informed by the desk review and evaluation objectives and discussions on regional and national level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4: Evaluation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Description / Deliverables</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review and preparatory interview with Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Review of relevant documentation and preparatory discussion with Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions at Sub-regional level in Fiji</td>
<td>Consultations with UNICEF and other stakeholders in Suva, Fiji and finalization of the inception report</td>
<td>1 week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliverable: Final Inception Report</td>
<td>24 Sept 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Country visits to Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Kiribati (chronological order)</td>
<td>Data gathering at national and sub-national level in each of the countries and one selected convergence area per country</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanuatu: Tafea Province</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon Islands: Western Province</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kiribati: South Tarawa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Analysis of findings of the evaluation and preparation of the draft evaluation report</td>
<td>1.5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Final Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Preparation of the final evaluation report based on feedback received from the Evaluation reference Group</td>
<td>0.5 week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**ANNEX 5: Data on Key Result Indicators for UNICEF Programmes in the period 2008-2012**

**HEALTH and SANITATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Result Indicators</th>
<th>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR 1: At all times, children survive, grow and develop to their full potential, especially those from most vulnerable islands and communities in PICTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>K: 46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: no data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI: 53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 Mortality Rate</td>
<td>K: 63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI: 70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 2: By 2012 more mothers and new-borns have increased and equitable access to evidenced-based packages of essential services and interventions in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Mortality Rate</td>
<td>K: 56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 250</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI: 220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo Natal Mortality Rate</td>
<td>K: 23 (2000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI: 16 (2000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 12 (2000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 3: By 2012, more schools and communities have improved health, economic and human development outcomes related to water, sanitation, hygiene and climate change in selected PICTs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population using an improved drinking water source in each country (disaggregated by residence and wealth quintile)</td>
<td>K: 65% (2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 91% (20??)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI: 70% (2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 70% (20??)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 60% (2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 83% (20??)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of the population using an improved sanitation facility in each country (disaggregated by residence and wealth quintile)</td>
<td>K: 40% (2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 31% (20??)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI: 31% (2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 32% (20??)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 50% (2005)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 52% (20??)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicated as 'Latest Values' but year of data not further specified

---

### EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 1:</strong> By 2012, children aged 3 to 5, especially those most disadvantaged, benefit from improved access to quality early learning opportunities in 5 Pacific Island Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% new entrants into primary education who have attended ECE, pre-school or formal early learning opportunity</td>
<td>K: -</td>
<td>K: 55 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 54 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Si: -</td>
<td>Si: 35 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Si: 45 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 96 %</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education Net Enrolment Rate</td>
<td>K: -</td>
<td>K: 34 % (gross)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 27 % (gross)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Si: 40 %</td>
<td>Si: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Si: 40 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 2:</strong> By 2012, primary school aged children have access to schools which uphold minimum national quality standards, and which support student enrolment and retention to the end of the primary cycle in 4 Pacific Island Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net enrolment rate for primary education (disaggregated by gender)</td>
<td>K: -</td>
<td>K: 93 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 85 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Si: 93 %</td>
<td>Si: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Si: 95 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 87 %</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Intake rates into Year One</td>
<td>K: -</td>
<td>K: 74 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 67 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Si: 50 %</td>
<td>Si: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Si: 48 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 44 %</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention / Survival rates (cohort flow) to end of primary or non-formal equivalents (disaggregated by gender)</td>
<td>K: -</td>
<td>K: 90 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 89 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Si: 63 %</td>
<td>Si: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Si: 67 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: 79 %</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of corporal punishment in Schools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 40 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Si: 70 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 36 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Pacific Island Countries adopting minimum quality standards for primary education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 3:</strong> By 2012, primary school aged children attain national numeracy, literacy and life-skills learning outcomes by the end of the primary education cycle in 4 Pacific Island Countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of learners attaining national standards in numeracy and literacy in basic education cycle</td>
<td>K: Literacy 57%</td>
<td>K: Numeracy 47%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: -</td>
<td>K: Literacy 53%</td>
<td>K: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K: Numeracy 54%</td>
<td>K: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Si: Literacy 53%</td>
<td>Si: Numeracy 46%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: Literacy 39%</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: Numeracy 54%</td>
<td>V: -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Evaluation Report / Frank Noij / December 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR 4: By 2012, Ministries of Education in 5 disaster prone PICs equip children and schools with the knowledge and skills to cope when disasters strike and lead the provision of education services in post disaster settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of children reached in declared emergencies with education interventions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of PICs with operational MoE led education cluster coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of school children and teachers with increased knowledge and skills of emergency response procedures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 countries
**HIV/AIDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR 1: By 2012, Governments of in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Vanuatu and Tuvalu have and use sound strategic information for effective HIV programming, to reduce vulnerability to and impact of HIV and AIDS among the most at risk population and most vulnerable populations, (with a special focus on children and women)</td>
<td>Percentage of women aged 15–49 who received an HIV test in the last 12 months and who know their results</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 3 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 5 %</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 2 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 2 %</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 0 %</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 3 %</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 2: By 2012, most at risk and most vulnerable men, women and children in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Vanuatu and Tuvalu have access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support services</td>
<td>Percentage of HIV-positive pregnant women who received antiretroviral drugs to reduce the risk of mother-to-child transmission</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 3: By 2012, most at risk and most vulnerable boys and girls, men, women and their partners in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Kiribati, Vanuatu and Tuvalu engage in HIV-risk reduction behaviours at all times (including during emergencies)</td>
<td>Percentage of most-at-risk populations in 5 target countries that have received an HIV test in the last 12 months and who know their results</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 27 % 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 32 % 20-24 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 5 % 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 7 % 20-24 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 8 % 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 13 % 20-24 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of most-at-risk populations in the 5 target countries who both correctly identify ways of preventing the sexual transmission of HIV and who reject major misconceptions about HIV transmission</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 12 % 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 13 % 20-24 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 25 % 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 35 % 20-24 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 26 % 15-19 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 24 % 20-24 yrs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of young women and men aged 15–24 in the 5 target countries who have had sexual intercourse before the age of 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 23 % males</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 8 % females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 13 % males</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SI: 16 % females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 14 % males</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>V: 9 % females</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CHILD PROTECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR 1: Children are increasingly protected by legislation and are better served by justice systems that protect them as victims, offenders and witnesses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 18% fully 22% partial 61% non-compliant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of alignment between national law/s and relevant child protection CRC/Optional Protocols provisions, based on indicators used in the 2008 baseline research</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 18% fully 22% partial 61% non-compliant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice system’s relative ability to protect children as victims, offenders and witnesses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 0% compliant 45% partial compl. 55% non-compliant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR 2: Children are better served by well informed and coordinated child protection social services which ensure greater protection against and respond to violence, abuse and exploitation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 10% fully 37% partial 53% non-compliant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare systems relative strengths to prevent, protect and respond to child protection concerns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 10% fully 37% partial 53% non-compliant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR 3: Children in selected geographical areas grow up in home and community environments that are increasingly free from violence, abuse and exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on most significant change in relation to child protection issues (as a result of child protection communication for social change initiatives)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No MSC stories collected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of adults who accept corporal punishment as means of discipline/means of education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 81 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St: 72 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V: 78 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of teachers who accept corporal punishment as means of discipline/means of education</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>K: 40 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St: 70 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V: 36 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No MSC stories collected

Numerous MSC stories from focus countries demonstrate qualitative changes in relation to positive, non-violent parenting, care and protection.
## POLICY, ADVOCACY, PLANNING AND EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PCR 1: By 2012, social and economic policies are evidence-based and progressively address the rights of children, youth and women, particularly those most vulnerable and at-risk in Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Tonga, Tuvalu, Samoa and Fiji</td>
<td>Kiribati – No Child Policy (0), Youth Policy reviewed and mainstreamed, coordinated implementation; Solomon Islands - Child Policy (1), Youth Policy reviewed, mainstreamed and coordinated implementation; Vanuatu - Child Policy (1), Youth Policy (1) coordinated implementation, evidence base developed using census data; Regional – Youth Strategy reviewed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-, youth-, women-focused policies and legislation developed with evidence, mainstreamed with sufficient resource allocation and implementation monitored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional mechanisms for local/subnational/national levels for sustained community engagement in policy development</td>
<td>CRC Reporting: 5/14 PICs overdue with Initial CRC report. 6/14 PICs overdue with Periodic CRC report. 3/14 PICs on target.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRC Reporting: 2/14 PICs overdue with Initial CRC report. 4/14 PICs overdue with Periodic CRC report. 6/14 PICs on target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>2007 (or earlier as indicated)</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 2:</strong> By 2012, quality disaggregated children’s, young people’s and women’s social data are available and integrated into monitoring and evaluation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of updated Situation Analysis reports on children, women and young people</td>
<td>14 Sitans, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Tonga, Tokelau, Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Niue, Fiji, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Palau and Nauru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of national M&amp;E systems with segregated data on children, women and young people</td>
<td>No systematic data collection, storage, analysis, dissemination, and use; only some data are linked to CRC, CEDAW, WFFC goals, and child-related MDG targets and indicators exist (Kiribati, Solomon Islands, and Vanuatu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of qualitative and participatory community monitoring and evaluation activities</td>
<td>Joint monitoring of UNICEF programmes and Most Significant Change participatory monitoring conducted annually since 2009 in Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCR 3:</strong> By 2012, government and communities engage in long-term integrated, strategic communication fostering and sustaining behaviour and social changes to address the survival, development and rights of children, youth and women especially in Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Tonga, Tuvalu, Samoa and Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of implemented communication processes and activities that are evidence based, strategically planned and integrated into selected programmes of governments and communities in selected areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of advocacy and external relations activities that are strategically linked to the achievement of programme results and related strategic communication processes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of evaluations documenting social change linked to actual implementation of strategic communication</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K: In process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI: In process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V: Child-related MDG targets reported annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 6: Documentation Reviewed

UNICEF documents

UNICEF Pacific, Convergence Paper for Mid-Term Review, 2010
Exit Note UNICEF Pacific Mid-Term Review. Suva, June 2010
UNICEF Pacific Annual Management Plan 2012
UNICEF Pacific, Looking Back Moving Forward 2011/2012 A Review and Update on UNICEF’s Work for Pacific Island Children
UNICEF Pacific, I No Bin Gat Protection. Understanding HIV and AIDS Risk and Vulnerability among Vanuatu Youth
UNICEF Pacific, Bad sickness, Rubbish sicki. Understanding HIV and AIDS Risk and Vulnerability among Solomon Islands Youth
UNICEF Pacific, I feel I can never get infected! Understanding HIV and AIDS Risk and Vulnerability among Kiribati Youth
UNICEF Pacific, Proposal for advocacy strategy to protect the vulnerable children, women and youth in the Pacific
UNICEF Pacific Island Countries, Supplementary Note / Annex to the Multi-country programme Document 2013-2017
The UNICEF Medium-Term Strategic Plan, 2006-2013
UNICEF Pacific, Sentinel Monitoring, Monitoring Resilience in Kiribati, May 2011
UNICEF Pacific, Sentinel Monitoring, Monitoring Resilience in Vanuatu, July 2011
UNICEF Pacific, Situation Monitoring: Food Price Increases in the Pacific Islands. April 2011
UNICEF Pacific, Monitoring the early response to a humanitarian crisis: the use of an Omnibus Survey in the Solomon Islands
UNICEF Pacific, Situation reporting: Food Price Increases/Nutrition Security in the Pacific Islands

UNICEF Pacific, Protecting Pacific Island Children and Women during Economic and Food Crisis

UNICEF Pacific, Urbanization and Children in the Pacific

UNICEF Pacific, Climate change impacts on children in the Pacific: Kiribati and Vanuatu

UNICEF Pacific, State of the Pacific Youth 2011, Opportunities and Obstacles

UNICEF Pacific, Urban Youth in the Pacific, Increasing resilience and reducing risk for involvement in crime and violence

UNICEF Pacific, Monitoring the early response to a humanitarian crisis: the use of an Omnibus Survey in the Solomon Islands


UNICEF Pacific, Essentials for Excellence. Researching, Monitoring and Evaluating Strategic Communication for Behaviour and Social Change, with Special Reference to the Prevention and Control of Avian Influenza / Pandemic Influenza. 2008

UNICEF, MoRES, Monitoring Results for Equity systems. Access and Quality in early Learning. June 2012

UNICEF, UNICEF’s Refocus on Equity: Results Based Management through Monitoring for Equity. Presentation to the Equity Meeting in Oslo, 10 May 2012

UNICEF, Evaluation of the Vanuatu Child Friendly Schools Project in Tafea Province

UNICEF Pacific, Kiribati Joint Monitoring Trip Reports of UNICEF staff members, October 2010


**Government / UNICEF**

Government of Kiribati, UNICEF Pacific, A Situation Analysis of Children, Women and Youth. Fiji, 2005


South Tarawa Rolling Development Plan for Children, 2010-2012. May 2010
Western Province Development Plan for Children 2010-2012, for Inclusion to the Western Province Development Plan. TAFEA Provincial Council, TAFEA Provincial Development Plan for Children, 2010-2012

Pacific Fora

CLGF Pacific, Port Vila Declaration on Building Vibrant & Resilient Local Economies & Communities in the Pacific. Outcomes of the Pacific Local Government Symposium and Annual general Meeting of the CLGF Pacific Technical Advisory Panel held in Port Vila, Vanuatu from 11-14 October 2010

Fortieth Pacific Islands Forum, Cairns Compact on Strengthening Development Coordination in the Pacific, August 2009

Pacific Island Forum Secretariat, 2011 Pacific Regional MDGs Tracking Report, August 2011

Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, Pacific Aid Effectiveness Principles, Palau, July 2007


Port Vila Declaration on Accelerating Progress on the Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. August 2010

UN


UN Evaluation Group, Norms for Evaluation in the UN System. April 2005 and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, April 2005

Other References

Accra Agenda for Action. Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Accra Ghana, September 2008

Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation. Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, Busan, Republic of Korea, November/December 2011

Kirkpatrick, Donald L. Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels, 2006

Kirkpatrick, Donald L. and James D., Implementing the Four Levels. A Practical Guide for Effective Evaluation of Training Programs, 2007

OECD DAC, Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management. Paris, 2002

Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Ownership, Harmonisation, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability. High Level Forum, Paris February/March 2005