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1 Background to Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development

Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development (Pacific Women) is a $320 million, 10-year program (2012–2022) focused on enabling women and men across the 14 Pacific Island Forum countries to improve the political, social and economic opportunities for women. It reflects the Government of Australia’s commitment to work for improved equality and empowerment of women.

The outcomes sought by Pacific Women include:

- Women, and women’s interests, are increasingly and effectively represented and visible through leadership at all levels of decision-making (leadership and decision making)
- Women have expanded economic opportunities to earn an income and accumulate economic assets (women’s economic empowerment)
- Violence against women is reduced and survivors of violence have access to support services and to justice (ending violence against women)
- Women in the Pacific will have a stronger sense of their own agency, supported by a changing legal and social environment and through increased access to the services they need (enhancing agency)

In addition to the above outcomes, Pacific Women has two objectives. These include:

- By the end of the first three years of the program, the capacity, resources and relationships are established and action in key result areas is evident across the country and regional program activities.
- By the end of Year Six, joined up services and action, independent of but informed by Pacific Women will be evident in all 14 countries.

Pacific Women is implemented through work at the country and regional level. Country plans have been developed to represent locally relevant responses and starting points for change towards the key intended outcomes. Regional and multi-country activities have been designed to address common issues across the region or sub-region and to complement and build on country specific activities.

To support program management, a Pacific Women Support Unit has been established in Fiji, with a national sub-office in PNG. The Support Unit's role is to provide technical, administrative and logistical support to the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade's (DFAT) bilateral and regional Pacific Women teams and to Pacific Women's implementing partners.

2 Background to the Pacific Women M&E System

The Support Unit holds the responsibility for the design, implementation and review of Pacific Women’s M&E system. Pacific Women’s M&E system operates at a number of different levels. This includes the program level; the country level and the activity level. Each separate level has its own cycle of planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting. These cycles together combine to form the Pacific Women M&E system.

As at May 2017, the M&E system was made up of the following components:

- A Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MELF), including a program MELF; country plan MELFs and implementing partner M&E Plans
- A Knowledge Management System (KMS) Database
- Pacific Women Program Reporting, which includes a Pacific Women Six-Monthly Program Progress Report and an Annual Pacific Women Progress Report
Pacific Women Country Program Progress Reports
Implementing partner project reporting
A Pacific Women Value for Money Rubric
Country Reflection Workshop Methodology
A Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection

The Support Unit also manages an M&E Panel, made up of M&E Specialists and M&E Practitioners. The M&E panel provides additional technical support to the Support Unit, DFAT and/or implementing partners when needed.

From the 10-12 May 2017, the Support Unit convened a workshop to review components of the M&E system, and consider how 18 months of program implementation could provide recommendations to streamline and increase useability. The workshop brought together 35 participants with representation from DFAT, implementing partners for Samoa, Tonga, Fiji and Solomon Islands, members from Pacific Women’s M&E panel and Support Unit staff. All participants invited to the workshop had either direct experience with aspects of the Pacific Women M&E system or were selected M&E technical specialists.

3 Background to the Pacific Women Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework

Pacific Women’s MELF provides advice and a suggested plan for how routine monitoring and periodic evaluation should be carried out for the program. For the purpose of this MELF, the following definitions are provided:

Monitoring is the continuous and systematic collection and analysis of data in relation to a project. Monitoring usually focuses on activities and outputs, and is usually done internally by an organisation.

Evaluation is the periodic assessment of progress towards a project’s outcomes or goal. Pacific Women understands that there are two ‘types’ of evaluation. This includes: 1) big ‘E’ evaluation, which consists of independent evaluation activities carried out by external evaluators; and 2) small ‘e’ evaluation, a process that attempts to introduce leaning and ongoing analysis and evaluative thinking into an organisation. Through this MELF, Pacific Women aims to encourage implementing partners to invest in and prioritise small ‘e’ evaluation.

Learning is a developmental process that integrates thinking and doing. It provides a link between the past and the future, requiring us to look for meaning in our actions and give purpose to our future actions. Pacific Women aims to take a ‘learning by doing’ approach, in acknowledgement of the complex change that the program aims to support.

---

1 PNG has an Annual Program Progress report. Fiji, Vanuatu and Tonga will begin producing a country level progress report from financial year 2017-2018.
2 six-monthly or annual, dependant on partner and project size
3 The panel was reviewed in June 2017 and an additional four M&E practitioners were added to the panel.
4 Purpose of the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework

The primary purpose of the Pacific Women MELF is to support the program, countries and implementing partners to carry out regular and systematic assessment of progress towards outcomes, inform program decision making and ensure learning leads to program improvement.

The program MELF is the overarching document that provides guidance to support the development of Pacific Women country plan MELFs. These country plan MELFs are then intended to provide guidance to Pacific Women implementing partners to develop their project M&E plans. This process is meant to be mutually reinforcing, with M&E plans expected to inform the refinement of country level MELFs, which in turn inform the refinement of the Program MELF. In some cases, additional support will be required to translate and adapt concepts and inquiry questions. It is the Support Unit’s role to ensure this technical advice is provided to both DFAT and implementing partners.

5 Theory Driven Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation

The program MELF is structured around two diagrams, 1) a Program Theory, which is a visual representation of the Pacific Women design, including the program’s principles and ways of working; and 2) a Program Logic, which is more operational in nature, and sets out the short, intermediate and long term outcomes for each of Pacific Women’s intended outcomes. Both diagrams identify the assumptions that could affect progress or success, which will be tracked by Pacific Women’s M&E system.

A Theory of Change for the Pacific Women program was developed during the program design (2012-2013).\(^5\) The underlying conceptual framework used by the Theory of Change is based on the Rao and Kelleher framework\(^6\) (see figure 1 below). This framework identifies four quadrants where change is needed to achieve increased gender equality and empowerment of women in the Pacific. These quadrants relate to the interconnected areas of individual, family and community change; changes in informal and formal systems; and changes to organisational and societal systems. The figure suggests that strategies are needed across these different dimensions for long term, sustainable change to occur.

In mid-2015, a Program Theory and Program Logic for Pacific Women was developed, extending the Theory of Change in the design document. This Program Theory and Program Logic was trialled by the program from Jan 2016 – April 2017 and reviewed at a partner workshop in May 2017 culminating in the Program Theory and Program Logic presented in this MELF. As a living document, the Pacific Women MELF is revised on a yearly basis to ensure that the program is adapting to context and considering program learning.

For other important approaches and principles of the Pacific Women MELF, refer to Annex 9.

---

\(^5\) Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development design document April 2014 (p.33)

Figure 2  Pacific Women Program Theory

**GOAL**  Women in the Pacific (regardless of income, ethnicity, disability, age or geography) participate fully, freely and safely in political, economic and social life.

**OUTCOME 1**  Women and women’s interests are increasingly and effectively represented and visible at all levels of decision-making.

**OUTCOME 2**  Women have expanded economic opportunities to earn an income and accumulate economic assets.

**OUTCOME 3**  Violence against women is reduced. Survivors of violence have access to support services and to justice.

**OUTCOME 4**  Women in the Pacific have a stronger sense of their own agency, supported by a changing legal and social environment and through increased access to the services they need.

**PROGRAM STRATEGIES**

**01**  Pacific Women takes a gender transformational approach to increase likelihood of sustainable gender equality outcomes.

**02**  Pacific Women implements the program through a complexity lens (i.e. uses high socio-political analysis, M&E, Learning and Research) which informs program decision making.

**03**  Pacific Women supports national governments to meet obligations under the Pacific Leaders Gender Equality Declaration (PLGED).

**04**  Pacific Women promotes Pacific ownership and leadership, and supports work through coalitions for change.

**05**  Pacific Women provides funding to a wide range of women’s organisations, governments, regional organisations, civil society and research institutions.

**06**  Pacific Women, as a donor led program works with and through a diverse range of partners and stakeholders to drive gender equality outcomes.

**07**  Pacific Women works to increase coordination within DFAT to mainstream gender and leverage DFAT sector programs.

**STRATEGY ASSUMPTIONS**

Pacific Women is able to support partners who take a transformative approach.

Implementing through a complexity lens (i.e. focus on local context and socio-political analysis) improves program outcomes and will lead to more effective outcomes for gender equality.

National governments request, want and need support to meet PLGED obligations.

Pacific ownership and leadership of Pacific Women will lead to more effective outcomes.

Pacific Women is able to support the range of organisations needed to bring about sustainable changes in gender inequality.

The government of Australia as a donor is able to facilitate and contribute to gender equality.

Pacific Women has the ability and influence to leverage DFAT sector programs in order to contribute to greater gender equality outcomes.
### Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework (MELF)

#### Pacific Women Program logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEARS 1 - 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>YEARS 4 - 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>YEARS 8 - 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are increasing enabling spaces for women and girls to participate and practice decision-making skills (1)</td>
<td>More women and girls are visible and influence decision making at community, local and national levels (2) (6) More women stand for or apply for leadership positions (4) (6) Public and private institutions have developed policies, practices and programs that support and enable women to move into leadership roles (5)</td>
<td>Community, local and national decision making reflects the needs and interests of women and girls Women elected to local and national level governments have the skills to fulfill their roles Women hold senior positions in the public and private sector and have the skills to fulfill their roles Community and public and private sector attitudes and perceptions support women and girls’ inclusion in leadership and decision making processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and public and private sector knowledge about gender equality has increased (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDENTITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADVOCACY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACCOUNTABILITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, community, public and private sector knowledge about the benefits of women’s economic empowerment has increased (7)</td>
<td>Family, community, public and private sector attitudes and perceptions support women’s economic empowerment (8) Women have developed increased knowledge, skills and confidence to successfully undertake formal and informal economic activities (10) Private and public sector have developed policies, practices and programs that support and enable women’s economic empowerment (12)</td>
<td>Family and community members share the burden of work to enable women’s participation in economic activities Women have increased decision making in relation to their income and assets More women are employed in the public and private sectors and running small businesses National policies and regulations for safe working conditions for women are operating effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women are provided with opportunities to participate in formal and informal economic activities or business entrepreneurship opportunities (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and private sector identify the need for policies and legislation that mandates safe working conditions for women (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION</strong></td>
<td><strong>RESPOND</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREVENTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific women, their partners, families and communities understand the causes of violence against women (13)</td>
<td>Pacific women, their partners, families and communities mobilize and take action to address violence against women (14)</td>
<td>Family and community tolerance for violence against women is reduced Legislative reforms that protect women and children’s human rights are operating effectively and duty bearers are upholding the responsibilities Contextually relevant prevention services are more widely available across the region, and women and children are accessing and reporting violence when it occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative reforms that protect women and children human rights have been enacted and have commenced implementation (15)</td>
<td>Duty bearers support and implement legislative reforms that protect women and children’s human rights (16) Contextually relevant prevention and justice services continue to expand and result in more women and children reporting violence and accessing services (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and children can access contextually relevant support and justice services to address them to respond to and deal with violence (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADVANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREVENTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and private institutions have increased knowledge and capacity to develop gender equality policies, practices and programs (19)</td>
<td>Public and private institutions are implementing policies, practices and programs that support gender equality (21) Collective action (at the community, local and national level) is strengthened to advocate for gender equality (21)</td>
<td>Public and private institutions are upholding the rights of women and girls Collective action (at the community, local and national level) has resulted in social and legislative change in relation to gender equality Women and girls are utilizing their strengthened agency for positive change in gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective action (at the community, local and national level) is strengthened to advocate for gender equality (21)</td>
<td>Women and girls have more knowledge, skills and confidence to claim their rights and access resources (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Women and girls have access to information about their rights and responsibilities (23) | | *The numbers in the boxes represent the program logic outcome indicators*
## Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework

### ENABLERS
- National, regional and global policies and commitments
- Relationships with Pacific governments, women’s organisations, NGOs, regional agencies, other donors
- Women’s movements and coalitions
- Churches and Pacific gatekeepers
- Strong individual women who want change
- DFAT commitment to gender equality and the Pacific region
- Male advocates

### INPUTS
- Technical, administrative and logistical support provided by the Support Unit
- Country plans developed, resourced and implemented
- Grant agreements finalised with partners
- Activities implemented
- Research commissioned and finalised
- Monitoring and Evaluation processes implemented

### CONSTRAINTS
- Limited capacity and resourcing for governments to address gender equality
- Limited capacity and resources of implementing partners
- Entrenched social attitudes and norms about the roles of women and men
- Religious norms, values and beliefs that are not supportive of gender equality
- Normalisation of violence against women
- Geographical spread and isolation of many Pacific communities
- Limited pool of gender expertise
- Lack of stakeholder coordination

---

### PROGRAM LOGIC OUTCOME ASSUMPTIONS

*The numbers in the below table correspond to the numbers outlined in brackets [1] in the above Program Logic.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENABLERS</th>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>CONSTRAINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Leadership and Decision Making</td>
<td>Women’s Economic Empowerment</td>
<td>Ending Violence Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gaining and practicing leadership skills will lead to more women and girls influencing decision making</td>
<td>7. Family, community, public and private sector attitudes and perceptions can be changed to support women’s economic empowerment</td>
<td>13. Social norms, attitudes and behaviours can be changed in order to prevent violence against women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. More women and girls in decision making will result in decisions that reflect women and girls’ interests</td>
<td>8. Family and community members are willing to share the burden of domestic work with women and girls</td>
<td>14. Violence against women and children can be reduced through a range of prevention activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Community and public and private sector attitudes and perceptions in relation to leadership and decision making can be changed</td>
<td>9. Training and increased skills will result in more jobs and economic opportunities available to women</td>
<td>15. Legislation can be effectively implemented in a coordinated way across the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Women want to stand for elected positions</td>
<td>10. Women who have increased access to resources, markets and jobs will have increased life choices</td>
<td>16. Duty bearers can be motivated to uphold their responsibilities and implement legislation that protects the rights of women and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public and private sector institutions are motivated to implement policies, practices and programs that support women moving into leadership and decision making roles</td>
<td>11. Public and private sector management see and value the importance of safe working conditions for women</td>
<td>17. There are enough organisations that have the capacity to provide contractually relevant crisis support and justice services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Once women have skills, knowledge and confidence, they are able to influence decision making processes</td>
<td>12. Public and private sector demonstrate willingness to implement policies and regulations that mandate safe working conditions for women</td>
<td>18. Women and children understand their rights and actively seek out support and justice services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Inquiry Questions

The MELF has used the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Criteria (DAC) to identify and group questions. The criteria and their related questions for Pacific Women are as follows:

- **Relevance**: Has Pacific Women met the needs of its beneficiaries? Is the design of Pacific Women suitable, given the context?
- **Effectiveness**: Has Pacific Women met its objectives, i.e. is Pacific Women progressing towards its intended outcomes?
- **Efficiency**: Has Pacific Women operated in an efficient way, considering principles of value for money?
- **Impact**: Has Pacific Women contributed to longer term change for women?
- **Sustainability**: Has Pacific Women built the potential or capacity for ongoing results?

The Pacific Women MELF takes a question led approach, to give prominence to learning, reflection and improvement. Structuring monitoring and evaluation processes around questions enables a broader analysis of a project’s progress and achievements. It supports project staff to think critically on a regular basis, not just about progress to outcomes (effectiveness), but to consider issues of design (relevance) value for money (efficiency) and impact and sustainability. Using questions encourages a project not to leave this broader analysis to external evaluation (which might only happen once over the life of a project), and instead integrate this thinking into the routine practice of program implementation.

To take a question led approach, projects first need to select the questions that are of highest priority to them. Using these questions to lead the development of an M&E plan, projects would then think about what forms of monitoring data and what forms of evaluation data would help them answer these questions. By doing this, projects can carry out regular internal reflections, on a 6-monthly or yearly basis depending on the size of the project. Projects don’t need to consider all questions all the time. Often relevance, effectiveness and efficiency are considered more often, with impact and sustainability being considered less often, and usually towards the latter half of the project’s life.

The following inquiry questions are divided into sections.

- The first section includes questions that are relevant at the Program and country level.
- The second section includes inquiry questions and guidance that is relevant to projects and implementing partners.

Please refer to the section which is most relevant to you.

**Guidance**: All questions set out in this MELF should be considered guiding questions. It is expected that DFAT, the Support Unit and implementing partners will refine and adapt these questions, based on the activities being implemented. What is important for countries and implementing partners to consider is for inquiry questions to be spread across all the domains of relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; impact and sustainability.
Program and Country Level MELF Inquiry Questions
7 Program and Country Level MELF Inquiry Questions

The below questions (section 7) are only relevant to the program and country level. If you are an implementing partner, you do not need to respond to these questions. Please refer to the implementing partner inquiry questions (section 8).

7.1 Relevance inquiry questions

Relevance inquiry questions come directly from the assumptions in the Program Theory. It is not necessary to turn every assumption into a relevance question; it is acceptable for you to choose 3-5 of your most critical assumptions. For the purposes of this MELF, the following relevance questions have been selected as the focus for the period 2017-2019.

1. To what extent has Pacific Women worked with partners who take a gender transformational approach? (strategy assumption 1)
2. To what extent has Pacific Women been implemented through processes that address complexity, learning and adaptation and has this led to more effective outcomes for gender equality? (strategy assumption 2)
3. To what extent has Pacific Women built Pacific ownership and leadership, and has this led to more effective gender equality outcomes? (strategy assumption 4)
4. To what extent has Pacific Women influenced and leveraged DFAT sector programs to contribute to greater gender equality outcomes? (strategy assumption 7)

Guidance for country programs: Pacific Women countries that are developing their country plan MELF should first design their Program Theory, and identify their most critical assumptions. Once this has been done, you should turn a selection of your assumptions (3-5) into relevance inquiry questions. The above relevance questions can act as a guide, with country MELFs adapting to reflect their context.

7.2 Program level inquiry questions for Pacific Women objectives

The below two inquiry questions relate to Pacific Women’s two program objectives and do not need to be considered by country programs or implementing partners. The first question was the focus of the 2016 Year Three Evaluation of Pacific Women. The second will be the focus of the Year Six Evaluation.

1. At the end of three years: To what extent has the program been able to increase the capacity, resources, relationships and understandings for action across country and regional program activities?
2. At the end of six years: To what extent are joined up services and action evident in all 14 countries? If so how and to what extent?

7.3 Effectiveness inquiry questions

Effectiveness inquiry questions come from the Program Logic, and are an assessment of progress to outcomes. Country MELFs are encouraged to use the below four effectiveness questions.

1. To what extent have core programming strategies contributed to the effectiveness of country programs?
**Guidance:** DFAT with technical assistance from the Support Unit are required to develop effectiveness question number one further, depending on the programming strategies that they use. For example, the Samoa Pacific Women program strategy is to implement through the Government of Samoa. Therefore, the question may read, ‘To what extent did implementation through government contribute to the effectiveness of the Samoa country plan?’ In Fiji for instance, where there is a strong focus on working through women’s organisations and coalitions, the question may read, ‘To what extent did working through coalitions and women’s organisations contribute to the effectiveness of the Fiji country plan?’

2. To what extent has Pacific Women [or the X country plan] achieved its stated objectives? If not, why not?

3. To what extent, and in what ways has Pacific Women [or the X country plan] achieved progress towards outcomes in:
   - Leadership and decision-making
   - Women’s economic empowerment
   - Ending violence against women
   - Enhancing agency

4. To what degree and how did change in one outcome contribute to or work against change in another outcome?

**Guidance:** In addition to the above effectiveness questions, country plan MELFs should include the list of outcome effectiveness questions in their country plan MELFs (refer to page 13 and 14). These questions are related to the Pacific Women assumptions in the Program Logic (refer to page 6). Country programs may be interested in tracking a selection of these outcome questions, and implementing partners will be asked to nominate one to two questions to investigate through their M&E processes.

### 7.4 Efficiency

Efficiency inquiry questions focus on the use of resources and the efficient delivery of outputs. The below inquiry questions are suggestions for country programs to consider. Country programs don’t have to ask all five efficiency questions, but a suggested number is between three to five.

1. To what extent has Pacific Women delivered value for money for DFAT, partner governments and organisations in the Pacific and for Pacific Women and their communities?

2. To what extent and how did the program implement program communication, reporting and accountability mechanisms?

3. Were required levels of personnel and skills in place to support program delivery?

4. To what extent did Pacific Women contribute to improved co-ordination of country and regional gender equality initiatives within its remit? If so, how?

5. Have activities been implemented on time and on budget?

### 7.5 Impact

It may take some time for a program to see evidence of impact, but it is useful to undertake some reflection on a yearly basis to track progress. Answers to the below questions will provide critical information to enable Pacific Women to report on its impact. It is suggested that country programs include all three impact inquiry questions in their MELF.

---

7 See Appendix 4
1. To what extent was the program able to reach and benefit the most vulnerable women?
2. To what extent were greater numbers of women in the Pacific able to participate fully, freely and safely in political, economic and social life?
3. What results, expected and unexpected, direct and indirect, were produced by the program?

### 7.6 Sustainability

Like impact questions, sustainability questions are best assessed after a certain period of implementation. Sustainability inquiry questions focus on the degree to which benefits produced by the program will be maintained or ongoing. It is suggested that countries include all three impact inquiry questions in their MELF.

1. To what extent did Pacific Island governments demonstrate increased commitment to effective resourcing and implementation of gender equality policies and legislation?
2. To what extent did Pacific Women contribute to increased resourcing for gender equality programming?
3. To what extent was sufficient capacity built in the Pacific to sustain gender equality?
4. To what degree was there an indication of ongoing benefits attributable to the program and what factors contributed to or prevented the achievement of on-going benefits?
Implementing Partner Inquiry Questions
8 Implementing Partner Inquiry Questions

Implementing partners should take guidance from their *Pacific Women* country plan MELF, if one exists. If there is not a country plan MELF in place, implementing partners should use the below questions as a guide to support the development of their M&E plans. The Support Unit is available to provide additional support and guidance (refer to Annex 7 for Support Unit contact details).

8.1 Relevance inquiry questions

Implementing partners are asked to answer the following two relevance inquiry questions. If there are additional relevance questions associated with your program theory that you wish answer, this is fine. The below two are the minimum that we ask partners to consider.

1. To what extent did your project meet the needs of its beneficiaries?
2. To what extent was your project suitable for the local context?

8.2 Effectiveness inquiry questions

Effectiveness inquiry questions come from the Program Logic, and are an assessment of progress from short to intermediate outcomes. The number of effectiveness questions that you nominate will depend on the size of your project, and the number of outcomes you are working towards. At a minimum, we ask that all projects track and respond to the following question:

1. To what extent and in what ways did your project progress towards its intended outcome(s)?

**Guidance:** implementing partners should adapt this question to be specific about the outcome(s) they are working on. For example, if your project’s outcome is: women in leadership positions have the skills to fulfil their roles; your question would become: ‘To what extent and in what ways do women in leadership positions have the skills to fulfil their roles?’ For each of your program outcomes, create a corresponding effectiveness question.

8.3 Outcome specific effectiveness inquiry questions

If possible, we would like you to consider incorporating into your M&E plan relevant questions from the below list. This will help us to test some of the key assumptions associated with progress to intended outcomes for *Pacific Women*. If you nominate to do this, please refer to the outcome that applies to your project, and select the questions that are most relevant.

**Leadership and decision making**

1. To what extent did gaining, practicing and applying leadership skills lead to more women and girls influencing decision making?
2. To what extent did more women and girls in decision making result in decisions reflecting women and girls’ interests?
3. To what extent were there improved community, public and private sector attitudes and perceptions in relation to women in leadership and decision making?
4. To what extent did men’s support for women in leadership roles contribute to change (positive or negative)?
5. To what extent was there an increase in women wanting to stand for elected positions?
6. To what extent were public and private sector institutions motivated to implement policies, practices and programs that support women’s move into leadership and decision making?
7. To what extent were women or girls able to influence decision making processes?
Women’s economic empowerment

1. To what extent were family, community and/or public and private sector attitudes and perceptions changed to support women’s economic empowerment? What were the most effective strategies?
2. To what extent and in what ways have family and community members started to share the burden of domestic work with women and girls?
3. To what extent did training or other opportunities and increased skills result in more jobs and economic opportunities for women?
4. To what extent did increased access to resources, markets and jobs lead to increased incomes, assets and life choices for women?
5. To what extent did public and private sector identify and improve safe working conditions for women?
6. To what extent did the private and public sector demonstrate development and implementation of policies and practices that support safe working conditions for women?

Ending violence against women

1. To what extent did families and communities demonstrate a change in social norms, attitudes and behaviours to violence against women and girls? What were the most effective strategies?
2. To what extent did prevention activities lead to a reduction in violence against women? What were the most effective prevention strategies?
3. To what extent was legislation effectively implemented in a coordinated way?
4. To what extent were duty bearers motivated to uphold their responsibilities and implement legislation that protects women and girls’ human rights? What were effective strategies?
5. To what extent were contextually relevant support services delivered?
6. To what extent do women and girls understand their rights and actively seek out support and justice services?

Enhancing agency

1. To what extent was the capacity of public and private sector institutions to develop gender equality policies, practices and programs increased? What were effective strategies?
2. To what extent and in what ways were public and private sector institutions enabled to support gender equality?
3. To what extent did coalitions or individuals working collectively need support to advance their advocacy efforts? What capacity was needed most?
4. To what extent has collective action resulted in more sustainable change to gender equality outcomes?
5. To what extent has access to information about rights led to more women and girls gaining skills and confidence?
6. To what extent has knowledge, skills and confidence about rights led to more women and girls utilising agency for positive change in gender equality?

8.4 Efficiency inquiry questions

Efficiency inquiry questions focus on the use of resources and the efficient delivery of outputs. The below inquiry questions are suggestions for implementing partners to consider. It is suggested that implementing partners select a minimum of two efficiency questions.

1. To what extent and how did the program implement program communication, reporting and accountability mechanisms?
2. Were required levels of personnel and skills in place to support program delivery?
3. Have activities been implemented on time and on budget?
4. Have activities and processes resulted in improved coordination amongst project stakeholders?

8.5 Impact inquiry questions

It may take some time for a project to see evidence of impact, but it is useful to undertake some reflection on a yearly basis to track progress. Answers to the below questions will provide critical information to enable implementing partners to report on their impact. It is suggested that implementing partners include two-four impact inquiry questions in their M&E plans.

1. To what extent was your project able to reach and benefit the most vulnerable women?
2. To what extent were the planned results produced by the project?
3. Were there any unintended results (both positive and/or negative) produced by your project?
4. To what extent did your project or program contribute to change in gender equality?

8.6 Sustainability inquiry questions

Like impact questions, sustainability questions are best assessed at certain points in time. Sustainability inquiry questions focus on the degree to which benefits produced by the program will be maintained or ongoing. It is suggested that implementing partners answer two-three sustainability inquiry questions in their M&E plan.

1. To what extent did your project or program build sufficient capacity to sustain gender equality outcomes?
2. To what extent is there an indication of ongoing benefits attributable to your project or program?
3. What factors contributed to or prevented the achievement of on-going benefits?

9 Pacific Women’s Knowledge Management System Database

The Support Unit maintains a KMS database, which stores the following program information:

- Project level information – i.e. name of project, outcome focus, funding amount, reporting cycle information and key outputs as per the project implementation plan
- Activity level data – i.e. total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability and location), total number of activities delivered, types of activities delivered (i.e. training, mentoring, counselling) and qualitative data including evidence of progress to outcomes, reflections and lessons learnt

The KMS database can run program and country level reports, which can provide the following data:

- Program and country level reports: capture the total number of projects and the total amount of funding in each outcome area for each country; the number of projects that are completed and underway; and projects weighted by investment size and by country
- Activity level reports: capture the total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability and location) per country and data on types and numbers of activities delivered in each country, per outcome area.

The Support Unit has developed a data entry template for partners to use to collect and report on standard monitoring data. While this template is not mandatory, it is encouraged, with the aim of trying
to improve reliable data collection across the program. The data entry template can be accessed by contacting the Support Unit (refer to Annex 7 for contact details).

10 Indicators

The indicators included in the Pacific Women MELF either highlight an activity that facilitates the empowerment of women and girls – such as access to crisis support services – or they point to gaps in equality of outcomes – such as levels of political participation or portion of time spent on unpaid work. At the population level, where possible, these indicators are aligned with regional and international indicators (i.e. the Pacific Leaders Gender Equality Declaration (PLGED) indicators, DFAT Aggregate Development Indicators and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) indicators).

The indicators included in this MELF have been organised into four categories:

1. **Implementation indicators that guide data collection for entry into the KMS database:** implementing partners are required to report on these indicators, but should only collect data on the outcome(s) that are relevant for their project.

2. **Indicators taken from the DFAT Aggregate Development Results:** where applicable, implementing partners are required to report on these indicators. If your project is not addressing these indicators, collection of this data is not required.

3. **Headline indicators:** indicators that Pacific Women reports on within its Annual Progress Report. These indicators provide stakeholders with a quick overview of program achievement. These indicators will be tracked by the Support Unit over the life of Pacific Women.

4. **Longer term population level indicators:** which are aligned, where possible with the PLGED and SDGs indicators. These indicators also highlight change and trends over time against Pacific Women’s objectives and goal. Country level data against these indicators will also be tracked by the Support Unit and utilised by the program at set periods of time (yearly, if possible). This may include points of program or country plan evaluation and during country reflection workshops. These indicators will be reviewed as part of the yearly MELF review process. Where applicable, implementing partners are asked to include indicators in their M&E plans and collect and report against them.
## Table 1  Pacific Women Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pacific Women</th>
<th>Implementation Indicators</th>
<th>DFAT Aggregate Development Indicators</th>
<th>Headline Indicators</th>
<th>Population level Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leadership and Decision Making | ▪ % of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)  
▪ Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability and location)  
▪ Types and number of activities delivered (i.e. candidate training, mentoring, political party training etc.)  
▪ Participant satisfaction with activities  
▪ Evidence of attitude or behaviour change | ▪ Numbers and percentage of management committees in which women are equally represented  
▪ Number of women supported to take on leadership roles at the community, provincial and national level  
▪ Number of people to access civic and voter education | | ▪ Proportion of seats held by women in national and local government (SDG indicator 5.5.1.b and PLGED indicator 1& 2)  
▪ Proportion of women in managerial positions in the public sector (SDG indicator 5.5.2 and PLGED 3) | |
| Ending Violence Against Women | ▪ % of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)  
▪ Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability)  
▪ Types and number of activities delivered (i.e. EVAW awareness training, crisis services delivered, male advocacy training etc.)  
▪ Participant satisfaction with activities  
▪ Evidence of attitude or behaviour change | | ▪ Number of police and justice officials trained.  
▪ Number of women and children who have accessed crisis support services (includes counselling, health and justice services)  
▪ Number of people participating in community awareness about ending violence against women | ▪ Number of incident police reports on domestic violence (PLGED indicator 9)  
▪ Percentage of domestic violence cases disposed of by courts. |
| Women’s Economic Empowerment | ▪ % of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)  
▪ Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability)  
▪ Types and number of activities delivered (i.e. financial literacy training)  
▪ Participant satisfaction with activities  
▪ Evidence of attitude or behaviour change | ▪ Numbers of poor women who increase their access to financial services  
▪ Numbers of poor women with increased incomes | ▪ Number of women who have accessed financial information and services (includes financial literacy training and financial services)  
▪ Number of women who have gained formal qualifications  
▪ Number of women who have gained formal qualifications | | |
| Enhancing Agency | ▪ % of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)  
▪ Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability)  
▪ Types and number of activities delivered (i.e. training, policy reform)  
▪ Evidence of attitude or behaviour change | | ▪ Number of men who undertake male advocacy training | ▪ Number of women trained in small business and financial literacy.  
▪ Labour force participation rate – ration women to men (PLGED indicator 5)  
▪ Proportion of time spent on unpaid domestic and care work (SDG 5.4.1) | |

Pacific Women Shaping Pacific Development
11 Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection

The Support Unit has produced a Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection. This toolkit aims to support implementing partners to identify what data to collect to inform project learning and improvement. The Toolkit provides a range of guidance, templates and resources that can be adapted to collect both routine monitoring data and periodic internal evaluation. The toolkit has been updated based on recommendations provided at the May 2017 M&E system review workshop.

The Toolkit is available online at: www.pacificwomen.org

12 Project Reporting

The Pacific Women Support Unit has the responsibility for compiling the following program reports:

- **Six-Monthly Program Progress Report**: This report aims to provide DFAT with an assessment of progress towards Pacific Women outcomes and a consolidated activity update on regional and bilateral investments on a six-monthly basis. The report is based on activity reports that have been submitted by partners to DFAT and/or the Support Unit. The Six-Monthly Progress Report is submitted to DFAT in February and September each year.

- **Pacific Women Annual Progress Report**: This report features case studies that highlight the voices of Pacific women and men and the key achievements across the 14 countries supported by Pacific Women. The report also reflects on lessons learned, key forums and events and considers priorities for the up-coming financial year. The Annual Progress Report is published in November each year.

- **Annual Pacific Women Country Progress Reports**: There are several Pacific Women countries that produce an Annual Program Progress report. PNG has produced one for 2016 and 2017 and Fiji, Vanuatu and Tonga will begin producing a country level progress report from financial year 2017–2018.

While there are no compulsory reporting templates for Pacific Women projects, a sample narrative reporting template is available for projects if they wish to use it. This reporting template can be obtained from the Support Unit (refer to Annex 7 for contact details) or it is included in the Pacific Women Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection, which can be found on the Pacific Women website (www.pacificwomen.org).

Projects are also asked to report on quantitative monitoring data in an accessible way. This can be done either through using the KMS data entry template, or through presenting quantitative data in clearly identifiable tables in project narrative reporting. Refer to Table 1 on Page 17 to confirm quantitative data requirements for Pacific Women projects.

13 Country Reflection Workshop Methodology

13.1 Purpose and rationale

Country reflection workshops are an important part of the Pacific Women MELF. These workshops provide a critical space to reflect on work, get exposure to new ideas and test out new thinking with others. They are also essential for testing the program’s relevance in diverse contexts, tracking and testing innovation and synthesising evidence of contribution to longer-term outcomes.

In 2016, a methodology for the country reflection workshop was trialled in Vanuatu. This workshop was facilitated by an external partner and included a review of literature relating to Pacific Women’s intended outcomes, with the aim of establishing a baseline for Vanuatu prior to program
commencement. Three annual country reflection workshops have also been held in PNG. The PNG workshops focussed less on program design and context, and more on creating opportunities for partners to network and share programming experiences. Smaller workshops have also been held in Cook Islands and Solomon Islands as part of a country plan review. Due to the degree of variation amongst Pacific Women countries, the MELF suggests a differentiated approach to enable countries to tailor reflection workshops to their specific context.

The rationale for country reflection workshops links to the outcome-focused nature of the Pacific Women program design and its underlying emphasis on testing assumptions, tracking progress along a causal pathway and enabling evaluative thinking and learning at all implementation levels (program, country and activity).

13.2 Country reflection objectives

Country reflection workshops can be designed to suit one or more of the following objectives.

‘Lifting the Gaze’: which aims to provide partners and stakeholders with a space to discuss and debate external issues, such as country context; gender policy related developments; development aid achievements or gaps. Some amount of ‘lifting the gaze’ is valuable in all country reflection workshops.

Enabling program synthesis: which provides a forum for program implementers to share project and activity level data, validate lessons learnt through discussion and use the space as a basis for planning and reporting.

Encouraging mainstreaming: which includes strategically involving non-program players who can inform and contribute to validating program reflections. This objective is particularly useful in countries where policy dialogue (state/non-state actors, academic/NGO) is improving or there have been recent positive developments in gender policy work and mainstreaming. The intent is for program approaches and learnings to be adopted by others.

Capacity building: which provides opportunities for training and skills building workshops for program implementers and stakeholders. This approach is recommended for country programs where partners have not benefitted from M&E capacity building opportunities.

Building momentum for change: This objective is particularly useful in countries where there is networking and coalition building between women’s organisations and within civil society, or where the program is trying to support of strengthen coalitions. This objective may not be a priority in countries where Pacific Women resourcing is relatively small or where there are limited women’s organisations.

13.3 Recommended strategies

The below table provides some recommended strategies for the content, design and facilitation of country reflection workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Optional strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifting the gaze</td>
<td>Keynote paper and presentation on gender equality or a Pacific Women outcome area (women’s economic empowerment, leadership, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation by DFAT on country program and/or presentations by other development partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel discussion on a chosen topic with diverse representation (donor, academic, NGO, government, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional/country level research study (existing) utilised as input document with facilitated plenary session on lessons and implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling program synthesis</td>
<td>Presentation by DFAT on country program or a Pacific Women outcome area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective | Optional strategies
--- | ---
Partner presentations on project achievements and challenges (optional focus on one or more Pacific Women outcome) | Facilitated discussion on major impacts, outcomes and lesson learnt
Small group activities – poster workshop, peer review of project reports, world café style discussions

**Encouraging mainstreaming**
- Attendance/presentation by regional organisations
- Attendance/presentation from government agencies
- Presentation by program implementing partners on achievements, outcomes and lessons learnt
- Policy advocacy skills building session and/or workshop

**Capacity building**
- Presentation by DFAT or Support Unit on Pacific Women MELF
- Basic M&E training and/or M&E skills building workshops – e.g. interview skills, reporting skills, innovative data collection tools
- Partner forum with a technical or outcome focus to exchange practical strategies

**Building momentum for change**
- Presentation by one or several networks or women’s organisations
- Attendance/presentation by key stakeholders from government and academia
- Policy forum and panel discussion
- Attendance/presentation by other non-program Non-Government Organisations and Civil Society Organisations

For further guidance, including a sample agenda for a country reflection workshop, please refer to Annex 4 or the Pacific Women Toolkit for Monitoring and Evaluation Data Collection.

## 14 Value for Money Rubric

The purpose of designing a value for money (VfM) rubric is not to ensure that we always do the cheapest thing, but to develop a better understanding of costs and results so that Pacific Women can make more informed, evidence-based program decisions. Including a VfM rubric in the Pacific Women MELF increases transparency about what the program considers ‘good’ VfM and can be used to guide the design of VfM evaluations. Value for Money evaluations are different to tracking project efficiency. All projects will track efficiency, through collection of output indicators and through considering the efficiency inquiry questions. A VfM evaluation is a more rigorous inquiry into costs and results of a project.

Value for Money evaluations can be undertaken for the program, for country programs and for projects. Before undertaking a VfM assessment, it is important to consider where, when and how they are best carried out. Pacific Women suggests the following considerations:

- **Outcomes stage**: Has the program or project been running for long enough? Can an assessment of costs against outcomes be undertaken?
- **Budget size**: Does the investment warrant a VfM assessment?
- **Risk profile**: All projects involve some risk, but has the project been identified as high risk, with an associated high cost?
- **Technical expertise**: Are additional technical skills needed to carry out a VfM assessment? If yes, is the cost of this technical assistance reasonable against the cost of the program or project?
14.1 Value for money for *Pacific Women*

In 2015, the Support Unit developed a draft VfM rubric for *Pacific Women*. This rubric used the DFAT VfM criteria of economy, efficiency, effectiveness, ethics and equity. The rubric was then tested and piloted as part of the *Pacific Women* Year Three Evaluation (carried out at the end of 2016). The *Pacific Women* VfM rubric has been updated based on findings and recommendations from the evaluation and is presented in Annex 5. The primary purpose of this rubric is for it to be used when designing or planning a VfM evaluation at the program or country level.

14.2 Value for money for implementing partners

In addition to program or country VfM assessments, DFAT is interested in identifying projects that would benefit from a VfM assessment. The above *where*, *when* and *how* considerations will inform project selection.

DFAT acknowledges that some implementing partners may have some fears or concerns about a VfM assessment. For this reason, when approaching VfM with partners, *Pacific Women* prioritises a participatory planning and data collection process, where the implementing partner and DFAT work together to refine the criteria and standards to be used as part of the assessment.

An example of this process was undertaken in 2016 with a *Pacific Women* partner in PNG. Through a collaboration between the implementing partner, DFAT and the Support Unit PNG sub-office, a VfM rubric, along with a rating scale was developed. This process involved discussions about what would demonstrate VfM for the project and the context within which it operates, and strategies for assessing each component. This rubric aligned with DFATs VfM principles and built on the *Pacific Women* VfM rubric.

15 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

The M&E plan presented in Annex 1 provides a template that countries and implementing partners can use to track progress of their program or project. The example provided in Annex 1 demonstrates how an implementing partner could map data sources for both monitoring and evaluation against possible inquiry questions. Two implementing partner inquiry questions for each domain of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability have been used as an example. Countries and implementing partners should use this as a guide only and adapt to their selected inquiry questions. The Support Unit can provide additional advice and guidance on this process upon request.
Annex 1 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for Pacific Women

Guidance: The below M&E plan is a suggested format for countries and implementing partners. To demonstrate how the template is used, the below table provides an example of how implementing partners may complete their M&E plan. An example of two inquiry questions for each domain of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability is presented below. This is to be used as a guide only, and implementing partners need to revise and populate the M&E plan dependent on their specific inquiry questions, indicators and data sources. The data sources included in this plan are only examples, there are many more data collection tools that implementing partners can use to collect both monitoring and evaluation data. Partners are encouraged to use a variety of methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry Question</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Monitoring Data Sources</th>
<th>Focus of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance Inquiry Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent did your project meet the needs of its beneficiaries?</td>
<td>• % of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)&lt;br&gt;• Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability)&lt;br&gt;• Types and number of activities delivered&lt;br&gt;• Participant satisfaction with activities</td>
<td>• Project reporting&lt;br&gt;• Project implementation plan&lt;br&gt;• Activity tracking templates (participant registration forms)&lt;br&gt;• Participant satisfaction questionnaires&lt;br&gt;• Pre/post questionnaires</td>
<td>• Perspectives from beneficiaries regarding the extent that the project met their needs.&lt;br&gt;• Perspectives of project stakeholders regarding the extent that the project met beneficiary needs&lt;br&gt;• Evidence of positive change to target group as a result of project activities</td>
<td>• Focus Group Discussions (with target group and project stakeholders)&lt;br&gt;• Face-face interviews&lt;br&gt;• Case Studies or Stories of Change&lt;br&gt;• Project internal reflections (small e-evaluation)&lt;br&gt;• Project reports&lt;br&gt;• Midterm or end of project evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent was your project suitable for the local context?</td>
<td>• Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability)&lt;br&gt;• Types and number of activities delivered&lt;br&gt;• Participant satisfaction with activities</td>
<td>• Project implementation plan&lt;br&gt;• Activity tracking templates (participant registration forms)&lt;br&gt;• Participant satisfaction questionnaires&lt;br&gt;• Pre/post questionnaires</td>
<td>• Perspectives from project stakeholders on the suitability of project activities.&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders could include: Beneficiaries&lt;br&gt;• Government stakeholders&lt;br&gt;• Non-Government partners&lt;br&gt;• Donors&lt;br&gt;• Other groups that the project directly works with&lt;br&gt;• Evidence of innovation in relation to project implementation</td>
<td>• Project internal reflections (small e-evaluation)&lt;br&gt;• Focus Group Discussions&lt;br&gt;• Case Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness Inquiry Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry Question</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Monitoring Data Sources</th>
<th>Focus of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent and in what ways did your</td>
<td>• % of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)&lt;br&gt;• Project reporting&lt;br&gt;• Activity tracking templates</td>
<td>• Evidence of progress to outcomes</td>
<td>• Project internal reflections (small e-evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | | |
### Inquiry Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project progress to its intended outcome(s)?</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Monitoring Data Sources</th>
<th>Focus of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability)</td>
<td>Perspectives from project stakeholders on project progress to outcomes</td>
<td>Case studies or stories of change from beneficiaries, Interviews with project stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types and number of activities delivered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity tracking templates (participant registration forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant satisfaction questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Efficiency Inquiry Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Were required levels of personnel and skills in place to support project delivery?</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Monitoring Data Sources</th>
<th>Focus of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)</td>
<td>Perspectives of project management and project staff on level of personnel and skills to support project implementation.</td>
<td>Interviews with project staff, donors and other stakeholders (as appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation plan</td>
<td>Perspectives of stakeholders, such as donors.</td>
<td>Desk review of monitoring data sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity tracking templates (participant registration forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant satisfaction questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Have activities been implemented on time and on budget?</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Monitoring Data Sources</th>
<th>Focus of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)</td>
<td>Perspectives of staff, management, program stakeholders and donors on if activities were delivered on time and on budget (and reasons why/why not).</td>
<td>Interviews with project management and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget utilisation rate (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with donors and other relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project reporting (narrative and financial)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact Inquiry Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. To what extent was the project able to reach the most vulnerable women?</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Monitoring Data Sources</th>
<th>Focus of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of intended outputs delivered (target 75%)</td>
<td>Perspectives from project stakeholders on if the project reached the most vulnerable women.</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of people reached (disaggregated by sex, age, disability)</td>
<td>Stakeholders could include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types and number of activities delivered</td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation plan</td>
<td>Government stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity tracking templates (participant registration forms)</td>
<td>Non-Government partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant satisfaction questionnaires</td>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post questionnaires</td>
<td>Other groups that the project directly works with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of project reaching vulnerable women</td>
<td>Evidence of project reaching vulnerable women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Case studies or stories of change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project internal reflections (small e-evaluation)</td>
<td>External evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Question</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Monitoring Data Sources</td>
<td>Focus of Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation Data Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were there any unintended results (both positive and/or negative) produced by the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of any unintended (positive or negative) consequences</td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>Stories of change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>External evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Evidence of gender responsive laws and policies</td>
<td>Perspectives of project stakeholders on the projects contribution to increased capacity for sustained gender equality outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent did the project build sufficient capacity in order to sustain gender equality outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perspectives of project stakeholders on the projects contribution to increased capacity for sustained gender equality outcomes</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Project internal reflections (small e-evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>External evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent is there an indication of ongoing benefits attributable to the project and what strategies contributed to or prevented the achievement of on-going benefits?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perspectives of stakeholders of ongoing benefit attributable to the program.</td>
<td>Stakeholder interviews or focus group discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perspectives of stakeholders on what were effective strategies to support sustainability</td>
<td>Project internal reflections (small e-evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of ongoing benefits that have been brought about by the project.</td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of ongoing benefits that have been brought about by the project.</td>
<td>Case study or Story of Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of ongoing benefits that have been brought about by the project.</td>
<td>External evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2    Steps to Develop a *Pacific Women* Country Plan Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework

1. **DFAT contacts Support Unit to discuss Country Plan MELF process**
2. **DFAT consults with all *Pacific Women country* partners about timing of MELF workshop**
3. **Support Unit reviews all country level project information (proposal, activity reporting and M&E information)**
4. **Support Unit provides technical assistance to finalise country plan MELF**
5. **In-country workshop with implementing partners to nuance a final draft country plan MELF**
6. **A draft MELF, based on project portfolio is drafted by the Support Unit or M&E panel member**
7. **Support Unit (or M&E panel member) provides assistance to implementing partners to finalise M&E plans**
8. **Capacity development support provided to implementing partners to enable implementation and reporting on M&E plans**
Annex 3  Steps for Implementing Partners to Develop an M&E Plan

The below steps are presented as indicative steps that implementing partners can take to produce an M&E plan and commence M&E data collection, analysis and synthesis. The Support Unit and/or M&E panel members are available to provide implementing partners with additional technical assistance if required.

1. **Implementing partners develop a Program Theory and Program Logic for their project**
2. **Implementing partners refer to their country plan MELF or Program MELF to select and finalise inquiry questions**
3. **Implementing partners identify monitoring indicators and data sources against each inquiry question**
4. **Implementing partners then map the focus of evaluation and data sources against each inquiry question**
5. **Implementing partners establish an organisational process to store all monitoring data**
6. **Implementing partners select data collection tools, and nominate M&E roles and responsibilities for staff members**
7. **Implementing partners establish processes to collect small e-evaluation data. This may mean collecting data on a six-monthly basis to enable internal program reflection**
8. **Implementing partners finalise an organisational process for internal reflection (this may be a six-monthly or yearly project reflection day)**
9. **Implementing partners consider monitoring and small-e evaluation data during an internal reflection day to consider project progress and lessons learnt**
10. **Implementing partners make adjustments to project implementation based on lessons learnt**
11. **Implementing partners use internal reflection lessons to complete project reporting**
12. **At internal reflection day, implementing partners may wish to also reflect on a selection of inquiry questions from their M&E plan.**

**M&E cycle continues, starting with data collection for the next reporting cycle**
Annex 4  Country Reflection Workshop Guidance

Introduction
This short guide outlines the key considerations and steps to conduct a country reflection workshop.

What is a country reflection workshop?
A country reflection workshop is a collaborative discussion space for program implementers to engage with DFAT, the Support Unit, implementing partners and other important stakeholders to determine the program’s contribution to gender equality and women’s empowerment at the country level. This knowledge and information will inform the overall Pacific Women Theory of Change and reporting, and country and partner learning and program improvement.

Organising principles
The following guiding principles, informed by the Pacific Women MELF underpin the preparation, facilitation and reporting of country reflection workshops.

5. **Do no harm:** to put ethical and safety consideration above all else
6. **Acknowledge complexity:** and the need to understand the nature and interactions taking place between contextual variables and different actors
7. **Be flexible:** involving ongoing consultation with partners and adaptation of reflection and reporting processes to suit local contexts and needs
8. **Encourage multiple voices:** including the collection and presentation of both women and men’s voices and the voice of local (women’s) organisations
9. **Utilise national expertise:** where this is possible, and with the aim of building the capacity of national practitioners and support for partner-led analysis at the country level.

Why conduct a country reflection workshop?
The starting point for preparing for a country reflection workshop is to determine the ways in which the collaboration and discussion will benefit key stakeholders, particularly program implementers and DFAT. The way to do this is to select from the proposed ‘objectives’ and ‘strategies’ (section 13) and balance these against the available resources at the country program level.

Most workshops will start with some amount of external reflection – i.e. reflection on the country context. However, the extent to which this involves independent research and analysis will vary across the Pacific Women country programs.

Below are some examples for one, two or three day workshops that will be trailed over 2017/2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One day workshop</th>
<th>Two-day workshop</th>
<th>Three-day workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on Pacific Women country plan</td>
<td>Keynote paper and presentation on gender equality. This could be country specific, or include regional, other donor programs.</td>
<td>Country level research studies utilised as input document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner presentations on project achievements and challenges</td>
<td>Presentation by DFAT and other donors on programs implemented outside of Pacific Women but which have an intention to achieve better outcomes for women.</td>
<td>Panel discussion on a chosen topic with diverse representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated discussion on major impacts, outcomes and lesson learnt (reflection on program or country MELF inquiry questions; with a focus on relevance, effectiveness, impact and/or sustainability)</td>
<td>Attendance/presentation by key stakeholders from government and academia. Presentations can be determined in consultation with key stakeholders. It may be a presentation on a program or a piece of research, or</td>
<td>Group discussion on context, implications for country plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One day workshop</th>
<th>Two-day workshop</th>
<th>Three-day workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>it could be a session aimed at building knowledge about gender equality drivers or response strategies.</td>
<td>Policy forum and panel discussion</td>
<td>Presentation by gender experts on best practice relating to any of Pacific Women’s intended outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group activities based on themes emerging from the facilitated discussions or on major impacts.</td>
<td>Presentation by Pacific Women program staff on overall program</td>
<td>Partner presentations on project achievements and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy forum and panel discussion</td>
<td>Partner presentations on achievements and challenges</td>
<td>Outcome area focussed partner forum/skills exchange (reflection on program or country MELF inquiry questions; with a focus on relevance, effectiveness, impact and/or sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated discussion on major impacts and outcomes (reflection on program or country MELF inquiry questions; with a focus on relevance, effectiveness, impact and/or sustainability)</td>
<td>M&amp;E workshop and skills building Small group activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic M&amp;E workshop (training on data collection tools or other implementing partner priorities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When to conduct a country reflection workshop?

Country reflection workshop can be held at multiple points throughout the design and implementation of country programs. At least one year of country plan program implementation is required before a country workshop is held. In some cases, a reflection workshop may be held as part of a country plan review, to contribute to analysis of progress. The frequency will depend on a number of factors, such as the size of Pacific Women’s investment and partner availability. Pacific Women would like to encourage countries to consider a country reflection workshop once a year, or once every two years (for smaller countries with fewer activities). When countries decide to carry out a country reflection workshop may also be influenced by the following:

10. Workshops held in advance of a new budget cycle may contribute to refining budget allocations and programming strategies.
11. Workshops held midway through a budget and implementation cycle may have a formative evaluation function or be used to strengthen M&E systems, indicators and evaluation questions at the country program level.
12. Workshops with an outcome focus might contribute to refining programming strategies and/or an evaluative focus of a Pacific Women outcome.

What does organisation of a country reflection workshop involve?

The following are some considerations for countries when preparing for a country reflection workshop:

13. **Facilitation:** discussions on program achievements, gaps or contributions to gender equality and women’s empowerment are best facilitated by an external facilitator. The Pacific Women Support Unit M&E Manager or M&E panel members should be considered as potential facilitators. Depending on the scope and objectives of the workshop, this may mean that the facilitator facilitates the entire workshop, or that the facilitator is part of a team (alongside workshop organisers) for the duration of the workshop. Careful consideration should be given to who this facilitator is as a nuanced understanding of the country context is required.
14. **Preparatory work and documentation:** as some level of scene setting or ‘lifting the gaze’ is required for all workshops, DFAT need to think through the content and format of this presentation,
paying attention to language and other requirements. It is useful to provide information or keynote addresses to participants before the workshop. This session could potentially be facilitated by a national consultant who has experience and a reputation within the gender equality space, an implementing partner or even a stakeholder from a Pacific University is appropriate.

15. **Hosting:** this involves selecting a date, venue, inviting participants and giving them sufficient time to respond to the invitation. An explanation of the objectives of the workshop is important to ensure that the right staff members from implementing organisations attend. Skills building sessions can be an incentive for implementing organisations to send staff to country reflection workshops.

16. **Feedback:** it is important to provide feedback to participants after the workshop through sharing either a workshop report or a one-page summary of the key lessons. These lessons can be shared beyond the program implementers by making them available publicly through the *Pacific Women* website. Organisers may also consider providing feedback before finalising the report as a means of reflecting on initial findings.

17. **Reporting:** Consider appointing a rapporteur as part of planning for the country reflection workshop. The purpose of the country reflection report is to provide information back into *Pacific Women*’s M&E system, including on the *Pacific Women* Theory of Change and the specific achievements, gaps and lessons learnt at the country program level as well as country level impact of *Pacific Women*. 
## Annex 5  Pacific Women Value for Money Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 E’s</th>
<th>Principles and Standards</th>
<th>High Level (A) Very strong performance without gaps or weaknesses</th>
<th>Adequate (B) Acceptable performance with no significant gaps or weaknesses</th>
<th>Poor (C) Performance is unacceptably weak with significant gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency and relevance</td>
<td>Appropriate selection of strategies, activities and outputs to be delivered</td>
<td>Evidence-based decision making</td>
<td>More than 75% of the countries demonstrate that contextual analysis feeds into interventions and strategies</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the countries demonstrate that contextual analysis feeds into interventions and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportionality</td>
<td></td>
<td>The extent of adherence to the country plans for delivering interventions</td>
<td>More than 75% of the countries adhere to the country plan for delivering interventions</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the countries adhere to the country plan for delivering interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability</td>
<td>Effectiveness in how good outputs are converted to outcomes and impacts</td>
<td>Results focused</td>
<td>More than 75% of the countries are delivering interventions in accordance with the country plan, and achieving the intended outcomes</td>
<td>More than 75% of the countries are delivering interventions in accordance with the country plan, but not achieving the intended outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and risk management</td>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which there are performance and risk management processes in place</td>
<td>More than 75% of the country plans have comprehensive performance and risk management processes in places, with evidence of their use</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the country plans have comprehensive performance and risk management processes in places, with evidence of their use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimentation and innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which there is experimentation and innovation. See annex six for definition of experimentation and innovation</td>
<td>More than 75% of the countries can demonstrate at least one innovation</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the countries can demonstrate at least one innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 E’s</td>
<td>Principles and Standards</td>
<td>High Level (A) Very strong performance without gaps or weaknesses</td>
<td>Adequate (B) Acceptable performance with no significant gaps or weaknesses</td>
<td>Poor (C) Performance is unacceptably weak with significant gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy</strong></td>
<td>Efficiency in managing costs</td>
<td>Cost consciousness: The extent to which cost consciousness principles are applied in <em>Pacific Women</em> program management. See annex six for definition of cost consciousness.</td>
<td>More than 75% of the countries have cost consciousness principles embedded in all aspects of program management</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the countries have cost consciousness principles embedded in all aspects of program management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encouraging competition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 75% of the country plans show evidence that competition is practiced in procurement</td>
<td>More than 75% of the country plans show evidence that competition is practiced in procurement</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the country plans show evidence that competition is practiced in procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethics</strong></td>
<td>Ethical and Equitable practices</td>
<td>Transparency Accountability: The extent to which accountability mechanisms (e.g. country plan reviews, country reflection workshops, reporting to <em>Pacific Women</em>) are in place</td>
<td>More than 75% of the countries meet these criteria</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the countries meet these criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which there is country ownership and relevance</td>
<td>More than 75% of the country plans demonstrate cultural and beneficiary relevance</td>
<td>Between 50 – 75% of the country plans demonstrate cultural and beneficiary relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The extent to which marginalised groups (poor, socially excluded, persons with disabilities) are reached by program interventions</td>
<td>Majority of the countries (75%) can show evidence that they reach at least 2 of the groups</td>
<td>Majority of the countries (75%) can show evidence that they reach at least 1 of the groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 6  DFAT Value for Money Principles

**Principle 1: Cost Consciousness**

Cost-consciousness is central to value for money and requires DFAT to seek reasonable opportunities to reduce costs at every level of operations. Decision makers should scrutinise programming costs throughout the investment lifecycle to ensure the most cost-effective options are pursued. However, economy should not be pursued without consideration of the impact on effectiveness or efficiency. Cost is one critical aspect of the value for money equation, but value for money does not always mean choosing the lowest cost option. It requires consideration of the priority of the task, alternative ways of achieving it and the costs and benefits of different approaches.

**Principle 2: Encouraging Competition**

Competition is central to value for money and requires DFAT to consider and compare competing methods and partners and to select the option that offers the optimal mix of costs and benefits. This means that decision makers must encourage a culture of contestability and the competition of ideas and alternative solutions when making investment decisions. It also requires decision makers to encourage and use competitive selection processes when selecting partners and contractors.

**Principle 3: Evidence Based Decision Making**

Evidence based decision making at all levels is crucial to ensuring value for money. Informed decisions build on and contribute to organisational learning, continuous improvement and overall effectiveness. Evidence based decision making requires systematic, structured and rational approaches to decision making, framed around logical arguments informed by accurate analysis. It requires DFAT to focus on learning from past experience to avoid adopting methods and approaches that have not been successful in the past. At a strategic level, it requires that efficient systems are established to gather, collate and succinctly present empirical and qualitative evidence so that it can be utilised to inform contract and program management and as well as future management options. Closer relationships with partners and contractors are also crucial to ensure we are able to learn from and leverage their experience to deliver outcomes across the full set of DFAT’s strategic objectives.

**Principle 4: Proportionality**

Value for money requires that organisational systems are proportional to the capacity and need to manage results and/or deliver better outcomes and be calibrated to maximise efficiency. An ongoing commitment to business process reforms to eliminate inefficiencies and duplication will help achieve this. Business processes, policies and systems should be designed with a clear understanding of transaction costs, measured against the potential benefits. The means of assessing value for money also need to be proportional to the scope and complexity of the investment being evaluated.

**Principle 5: Performance and Risk Management**

Performance and risk management are integral to value for money and to maximising the effectiveness of investments. Contracts, other investments and programs must be continuously reviewed for quality to ensure that they are meeting their objectives and delivering maximum impact. Robust approaches to risk management are also critical as they maximise the likelihood of achieving objectives and thereby contribute to overall effectiveness. Comprehensive integrity risk systems are particularly important to prevent fraud and corruption and ensure resource allocations reach the intended targets. Consideration of risk must also be coupled with risk appetite, recognising that effective investments require decision makers to engage with risk in order to maximise results.
Principle 6: Results Focus
DFAT must focus on results and impact. Effective contract, investment and program design, and robust implementation, are essential to ensure DFAT’s objectives are met in a timely and cost-effective manner. Clearly identified objectives and performance targets are crucial to facilitating a strong results orientation. Innovation and adaptability, based on clear and logical evidence, is also central to achieving results. Decision makers need to balance anticipated outcomes and benefits with the potential for increased risk and manage these accordingly. Flexibility is necessary to ensure approaches can be adapted to achieve results in volatile environments with changing priorities.

Principle 7: Experimentation and Innovation
Many of DFAT’s investments are delivered in inherently risky environments. To maximise impact, creative and flexible approaches to the design and delivery of contracts, investments and programs are required. This can be fostered through the trialling of experimental and innovative mechanisms where there are reasonable grounds to expect better overall outcomes. This will require an appetite to trial new ways of delivery and a recalibration of risk tolerance.

Principle 8: Accountability and Transparency
Accountability and transparency are central to value for money as they strengthen responsibility for results and can contribute to the continuous improvement of organisational processes. Effectiveness requires that DFAT is held accountable both by taxpayers and by intended targets and beneficiaries for delivering results. This helps to create appropriate incentives for optimal performance. DFAT must hold partners accountable and demand transparency at all levels to facilitate honest dialogue about the overall impact of investments.
Annex 7  Roles, Responsibilities and Time Lines for Implementing the MELF in 2017/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Time Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approval of revised MELF document</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of the <em>Pacific Women</em> Toolkit for M&amp;E Data Collection</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orient Support Unit staff, M&amp;E panel and GFPs to revised MELF document</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager</td>
<td>December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll out and support of the KMS data collection template</td>
<td>Knowledge Management and Research Officer</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support countries and implementing partners to finalise and implement MELFs and M&amp;E plans</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager and M&amp;E Panel as needed</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and refinement of the KMS Database</td>
<td>Knowledge Management and Research Officer</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight and/or conduct of evaluations and reviews of selected programs</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager and M&amp;E Panel Members</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications of results and learnings</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager, Team Leader, Senior Program Manager, Communications Coordinator, M&amp;E Panel Members</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Program MELF</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review M&amp;E Panel</td>
<td>M&amp;E Manager</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support Unit Contact Details
Suva: +679 331 4098
PNG: +675 320 1377
ingformation@pacificwomen.org.fj
Annex 8  Guiding Principles and Approach for the *Pacific Women* Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework

The following guiding principles and approaches underpin the MELF for *Pacific Women*.

**‘Do No Harm’**

An overarching guiding principle for the *Pacific Women* MELF is to ‘do no harm’. It is essential to put ethical and safety considerations above all else. The ‘do no harm’ approach needs to guide all monitoring and evaluation activities and the safety of everyone must be ensured.8

**Integration and Alignment**

The *Pacific Women* MELF will assist to meet accountability requirements; support reflection and learning for program improvement; support evidence informed planning, policy development and program delivery; and support exchange of knowledge and information amongst all stakeholders.

The *Pacific Women* MELF has been developed to align with two significant documents that frame the principles and approach to be adopted, these being:

- The DFAT Aid Program Monitoring and Evaluation Standards (June 2014)9

**Participatory Approach**

The *Pacific Women* MELF acknowledges the complex and complicated nature of the Pacific and the need to understand the interactions taking place between various variables and how these relate to the achievement of different outcomes, or conversely limitations to what can be achieved. Monitoring and evaluation approaches will be designed to be appropriate for the various Pacific country contexts in which data is being collected. Monitoring and evaluation processes will be participatory in both design and implementation and include the collection and presentation of both ‘women’s and men’s voices’ and local organisations. Where ever possible, M&E processes will use local expertise, including women with disabilities and aim to build the capacity of local practitioners. Capacity building for M&E at all levels will underpin the development and implementation of country MELFs and implementing partner M&E plans.

**Mixed Methods Data Collection**

As gender equality is complex, diverse qualitative and quantitative data sources will be used to assess outcomes. The approach to data collection will be systematic, aimed at testing the program theory and program logic and guided by evaluation questions. Data collection for monitoring and evaluation will follow ethical principles that will ensure credible, consistent and reliable data is collected and analysed. Wherever possible sex, age and vulnerable / marginalised group disaggregated data will be collected so that data analysis can be structured around what is happening and changing for relevant vulnerable / marginalised groups. Data collection will aim to capture both the success stories and the less successful activities that together can generate different kinds of lessons learned. Promising

---

8 DFAT Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation Good Practice Note, ‘Preparing Aid Program Performance Reports and Aid Program Management Reviews’.
approaches that can act as exemplars of good practice will be encouraged to document their activities through formal evaluation processes.

The Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework as a Living Document
The MELF will remain a living document and thus will need to adapt and adjust its focus and content according to country and activity level experiences. The Program MELF will be updated annually to ensure its adaptation to the changing needs of Pacific Women.

Multiple Purposes for Monitoring and Evaluation
The MELF will be developed and implemented to support a range of complementary purposes including:

- **Accountability** to donors, Pacific governments and program partners (including communities) for funding provided, outputs delivered and progress to intended outcomes.
- **Learning** through reflection and sharing that identifies what works, what does not, for whom and under what circumstances.
- **Program improvement** informed through the identification of progress in program implementation and successes achieved and challenges encountered during implementation.
- **Evidence informed** planning, policies and programs that use monitoring and evaluation findings and research knowledge to guide decision-making and resource-allocation processes.

Evaluation Led Focus for Monitoring and Evaluation
The approach used in the *Pacific Women* MELF recognises that evaluation represents a deeper and richer form of inquiry. Monitoring represents a sub-set of evaluation and focuses on the continuous collection of activity data to inform program implementation. Evaluation questions are developed and used to guide both monitoring and evaluation activities and their organisation within evaluation domains provides a focus for areas of investigation.
### Annex 9  Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Activity</strong></th>
<th>Actions taken or work performed during a reporting period. Activities define ‘what we do’ in our everyday work within a project or program. Common activities include things such as: deliver training; conduct awareness session; provide counselling etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution</strong></td>
<td>Where a result has occurred wholly due to a particular activity or program as opposed to contribution where the result has occurred partly due to a particular activity or program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td>Hypotheses about factors or risks which could affect the progress or success of an intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Collection Tools</strong></td>
<td>Methodologies used to collect information during monitoring and evaluation. Examples are informal and formal surveys, key stakeholder and community interviews, focus groups, expert opinion, and case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which the intervention’s objectives and outcomes were achieved, or are expected to be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>A measure of how economically resources and inputs (funds, staff, time, etc.) are converted to outputs and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>The periodic assessment of progress towards a projects outcomes or goal. This includes: 1) big ‘E’ evaluation, which consists of independent evaluation activities carried out by external evaluators; and 2) small ‘e’ evaluation, a process that attempts to introduce leaning and ongoing analysis and evaluative thinking into an organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation-Led M&amp;E</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation questions are developed and used to guide both monitoring and evaluation activities. Evaluation (‘Big E’) represents the broader, over-arching form of enquiry undertaken, usually undertaken externally. ‘Small e’ evaluation is undertaken internally and aims to build internal reflection and evaluative thinking to increase use of lessons learnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation intended to improve performance, most often conducted during the implementation phase of projects or programs e.g. a mid-term evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td>The higher-order objective to which an intervention is intended to contribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>A developmental process that integrates thinking and doing. It provides a link between the past and the future, requiring us to look for meaning in our actions and giving purpose to our future actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Intermediate to longer term changes related to program activities and outputs, and in fulfilment of the program purpose. Impact can be both positive and negative, intended and unintended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inputs</strong></td>
<td>The financial, human, and material resources used for the intervention including money, materials, equipment, staff, technical assistance and other resources that are required for the program to happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>The continuous and systematic collection and analysis of data in relation to a project. Monitoring usually focuses on activities and outputs, and is usually done internally by an organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Framework</strong></td>
<td>An over-arching plan for supporting monitoring, evaluation and learning functions for the life of a program. It includes a step by step guide to its operationalisation and application over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>Intended result contributing to physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other benefits to a society, community, or group of people via one or more interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td>Outcomes are the second level of results that are associated with a project or program. They usually refer to the medium-term results. Outcomes could include things such as: women have the knowledge and skills to start their own business; decreased community tolerance for violence against women; women are provided with psychological support to address violence. It includes the identification of unintended or unwanted outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outputs</strong></td>
<td>The first level of results associated with a project or program. They are the most immediate term results. Common outputs could include things such as: 10 training sessions conducted; 5 awareness sessions delivered; 35 counselling sessions provided etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory monitoring and evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Method in which representatives of agencies and stakeholders work together in designing, carrying out and interpreting a monitoring and evaluation system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Logic</strong></td>
<td>Diagrammatic representation of how a program or activity intends to achieve its results over time. In its basic form, it includes mapping inputs, outputs, short-term outcomes, medium-term outcomes and impact over agreed time-frames</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Theory</strong></td>
<td>Model of how a program is intended to work, and the if-then associations inherent in the design, including identification of the assumptions which underlie the anticipated changes to be brought about by the program design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>A measure of whether an intervention is suitable in terms of achieving its desired effect and working in its given context. Suitability may apply, for example, to whether the intervention is of an appropriate type or style to meet the needs of major stakeholder groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
<td>Refers to outputs, outcomes and impact together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Agencies, organisations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the intervention or its evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summative Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>An evaluation conducted at the end of an intervention (or a phase of that intervention) to determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>The continuation of benefits from an intervention after assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory-Based Approach</strong></td>
<td>Foundation that establishes the anticipated causal pathways from outputs (what we deliver) to the results (the difference it makes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theory of Change</strong></td>
<td>Umbrella term for both Program Theory and Program Logic that together identify the central mechanisms by which change is expected to occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value For Money</strong></td>
<td>The optimum combination of whole-life cost and quality to meet the user’s requirement. It can be assessed using the criteria of economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>