

Terms of Reference for Interim Evaluation of the Solomon Islands Knowledge-Action-Sustainability for Resilient Villages (SOLKAS) Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	0
1. Project Summary.....	1
2. Background and Context.....	2
3. Scope of Evaluation.....	5
3.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope.....	5
3.2 Intended Audience and Use of the Study.....	6
3.3 Key Study Questions.....	7
4. Study Methodology.....	9
4.1 Study Design.....	9
4.2 Tentative Sampling Approach.....	10
4.3 Ethical Considerations.....	11
5. Expected Outputs & Deliverables.....	12
6. Reporting and Governance.....	14
7. Study Team and Selection Criteria.....	15
8. Schedule of Payment.....	16
9. How to Apply.....	16

1. PROJECT SUMMARY

Type of study	Mid Term Evaluation of SOLKAS project
Name of the project	Solomon Islands Knowledge-Action-Sustainability for Resilient Villages (SOLKAS) Project
Project Start and End dates	February 2024 – February 2030
Project duration	Six years
Project locations:	6 Provinces in Solomon Islands
Thematic areas	Child Poverty, Climate Change, Education
Donor	Green Climate Fund (GCF), Solomon Islands Government (SIG), Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)- ANCP & AHP, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)
Estimated beneficiaries	Community Members, Teachers, Students, Public Officials. SOLKAS will directly benefit 185,000 children, youth, women and men in 170 rural and remote communities across 6 provinces. Total indirect beneficiaries 277,797. Total beneficiaries 462,899.
Overall objective of the project	The project's objective is to strengthen the resilience of target communities and beneficiaries to climate change impacts and associated natural hazards by strengthening the capacities of national, subnational, and local governments, communities, and schools to understand, adapt, plan and implement responses to climate crises.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Solomon Islands Knowledge–Action–Sustainability for Resilient Villages (SOLKAS) Project is a nationally scoped climate change adaptation initiative designed to strengthen the resilience of climate-vulnerable rural and remote communities across the Solomon Islands. The project responds to the country’s extreme exposure to climate-related hazards, including cyclones, flooding, droughts, sea-level rise and heatwaves, combined with structural challenges such as geographic dispersion, limited services delivery capacity and high dependence on climate-sensitive livelihoods.

SOLKAS is financed by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) under the Simplified Approval Process and is implemented over a six-year period from 2024 - 2030. The project is designed not only to deliver short - to medium-term adaptation actions, but also to catalyse sustained institutional, behavioural and livelihood changes beyond the implementation period. The midterm evaluation takes place at a critical point in the project lifecycle, allowing assessment of progress, implementation quality and the likelihood of achieving sustained resilience outcomes.

The project is built on the premise that resilience in the Solomon Islands requires simultaneous investments in knowledge and skills, locally led planning and action, resilient livelihoods and infrastructure, and institutional systems capable of supporting adaptation at scale. To this end, SOLKAS works across community, school and governance entry points, with a particular focus on children, youth, women and marginalised groups as key agents of change.

Across its implementation, SOLKAS seeks to strengthen adaptive capacity by increasing climate change knowledge and access to climate information; enabling communities and schools to undertake inclusive, locally relevant climate and disaster risk assessments and translate these into actionable adaptation plans; supporting the implementation of priority adaptation actions that improve food, water and nutrition security and protect critical social infrastructure; promoting diversification into climate-resilient livelihoods, especially for rural youth; and embedding data-driven and gender-responsive adaptation planning within ward, provincial and national institutions. Together, these elements are intended to address both immediate climate risks and the underlying social, financial, informational and governance barriers that constrain long-term resilience.

SOLKAS aims to build climate resilience of children, youth & communities in climate vulnerable rural areas through 3 interlinked pathways:

1. **Knowledge:** The first component focuses on strengthening climate knowledge, adaptive skills and access to climate information among communities, schools and youth, including participatory planning processes.
2. **Action:** The second component supports the implementation of priority adaptation actions identified through these plans, including climate-resilient school infrastructure, climate-resilient agriculture and fisheries practices, improved water management and nutrition outcomes, and support for youth-led livelihood innovation.
3. **Sustainability:** The third component strengthens institutional systems and governance by deploying digital tools for climate risk management, enhancing ward- and provincial-level planning and budgeting, and fostering partnerships that link youth livelihoods initiatives with markets and the private sector.

Implementation arrangements are designed to promote national ownership and long-term sustainability. Save the Children Australia (SCA) serves as the GCF Accredited Entity, holding overall accountability for fiduciary management, compliance and reporting to the Fund.

Delivery is undertaken by two Executing Entities: The Government of Solomon Islands, primarily through the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology (MECDM), and Save the Children Solomon Islands (SCSI). Project activities are implemented in partnership with multiple line ministries, including those responsible for education, agriculture, fisheries, rural development and women and youth, through formal memoranda of agreement.

A dedicated Project Management Unit (PMU) is responsible for day-to-day coordination, financial management, procurement, monitoring and reporting. Strategic oversight is provided by a National Steering Committee, supported by a National Technical Working Group, while Provincial Technical Working Groups coordinate implementation at sub-national level and link community-level activities with provincial planning and governance processes. These arrangements are intended to embed SOLKAS within national and sub-national systems, strengthen institutional capacity to support ongoing adaptation, and enable scaling of effective approaches beyond the project period.

Intended Results

Goal: *To increase the climate resilience of the livelihoods, food and nutrition security of target climate-vulnerable communities.*

- **Outcome 1:** Community, school and youth stakeholders have increased understanding of climate change and the ability to develop and implement locally-relevant adaptation plans.
 - **Output 1.1:** Children, youth, and communities have access to (and can utilise) climate change materials, climate information services and early warning systems
 - **Activity 1.1.1:** *Increase school children's understanding of current climate change impacts and future risks.*
 - **Activity 1.1.2:** *Increase children and community members' capacity to understand and identify climate change and disaster risks at the local level (including to food security and nutrition).*
 - **Activity 1.1.3:** *Increase access to and use of climate information and early warning systems at the local level.*
 - **Activity 1.1.4:** *Train DRCs in gender equality and disability inclusion as it relates to climate change adaptation and project implementation e.g., data collection, analysis, mainstreaming and inclusion.*
 - **Output 1.2:** Inclusive local adaptation action plans are developed by schools and communities
 - **Activity 1.2.1:** *Increase school and community understanding of immediate locally relevant climate and disaster risks via school and community climate and disaster risk assessments.*
 - **Activity 1.2.2:** *Support inclusive adaptation planning processes in schools and communities.*
 - **Output 1.3:** Youth have increased skills for resilient livelihoods
 - **Activity 1.3.1:** *Support youth to effectively engage with local level adaptation planning processes.*
 - **Activity 1.3.2:** *Support youth to develop skills for resilient livelihoods in a changing climate.*
 - **Activity 1.3.3:** *Support children and youth to develop knowledge and skills for household, school and community resilience in a changing climate.*
- **Outcome 2:** Communities and schools increase climate resilience via upgraded infrastructure, increased knowledge, enhanced food and water security, and sustainable livelihoods.
 - **Output 2.1:** School buildings are retrofitted to address identified climate risks

- **Activity 2.1.1:** Support the implementation of School Climate, Disaster and Resilience Plans (SCDRPs).
 - **Activity 2.1.2:** Support schools to increase physical resilience to the impacts of extreme weather and climate change (retrofitting and additions).
 - **Output 2.2:** School children have access to climate change curriculum materials
 - **Activity 2.2.1:** Support use of climate change curriculum materials in targeted schools.
 - **Activity 2.2.2:** Provide Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion capacity strengthening support to MEHRD and NDMO.
 - **Output 2.3:** Community food and water security and nutrition outcomes are enhanced through climate-resilient agriculture and fisheries techniques and application of nutrition education and water management
 - **Activity 2.3.1:** Support application of locally led climate resilient agriculture innovations.
 - **Activity 2.3.2:** Establish/scale-up community-, school- and home-based kitchen gardens for enhanced nutrition utilising climate-resilient crops.
 - **Activity 2.3.3:** Support climate-resilient adaptations to local fisheries for food security.
 - **Activity 2.3.4:** Support application of village climate resilient water resource management techniques and technologies.
 - **Activity 2.3.5:** Strengthen extension worker service to support women's roles in agriculture.
 - **Output 2.4:** Targeted youth develop sustainable livelihood opportunities
 - **Activity 2.4.1:** Establish and scale Youth Climate Resilient Livelihoods Incubator.
 - **Activity 2.4.2:** Support youth to access new/emerging resilient livelihoods opportunities within and beyond communities.
- **Outcome 3:** Communities and schools are making data-driven adaptation decisions, are supported by sub-national government with enhanced capacity, and have more climate resilient livelihoods.
 - **Output 3.1:** Climate Resilience Information Management System (CRIMS) is used by schools and communities to make climate-informed decisions
 - **Activity 3.1.1:** Co-develop (by MECDM, MEHRD and SCSI) and deploy CRIMS digital toolset suite for data-driven community climate adaptation planning and decision-making.
 - **Activity 3.1.2:** Co-develop (by SCSI and MEHRD) and deploy CRIMS Climate Resilience Information Management digital toolsets for data-driven school-based climate adaptation planning and decision-making.
 - **Activity 3.1.3:** Utilize project experience developing/deploying digital toolsets to inform future locally-led adaptation.
 - **Output 3.2:** Ward institutions have knowledge and skills to support to community adaptation
 - **Activity 3.2.1:** Support targeted Wards to adopt adaptive governance systems.
 - **Activity 3.2.2:** Ongoing stakeholder engagement.
 - **Activity 3.2.3:** Capture lessons learned, emerging themes and best practices at the community level to ensure sub-national and national planning processes are informed by local needs and that local actions support national objectives.
 - **Output 3.3:** Youth launch climate resilient livelihood options
 - **Activity 3.3.1:** Youth-private sector matchmaking.
 - **Activity 3.3.2:** Seeding support to scale up incubated ideas.

3. SCOPE OF EVALUATION

3.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope

The project is seeking to procure the services of an independent evaluation team to design, plan and conduct an interim evaluation of the SOLKAS Project. The evaluator will provide an independent and rigorous evaluation function, designing and implementing a framework applying the GCF Evaluation Criteria as set out in the GCF Evaluation Policy and further defined in the [GCF Evaluation Guidelines](#) and aligned with the Integrated Results Management Framework (IRMF). The Mid-Term Evaluation aims to assess the programme's progress toward achieving intended climate adaptation results, evaluate its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, paradigm shift potential, and country ownership, and generate evidence-based recommendations to strengthen adaptive management and enhance programme performance during the remaining implementation period.

More specifically, the interim evaluation seeks to:

- To examine the extent to which the programme incorporates locally led adaptation principles, strengthens community ownership, and supports meaningful participation of local actors, women, youth, and marginalized groups in decision-making and implementation.
- To evaluate progress toward achieving the programme's intended outputs, outcomes, and impacts as defined in the approved Funding Proposal, Results Framework, Logical Framework, and Annual Performance Reports.
- To assess the effectiveness of implementation arrangements, delivery mechanisms, institutional coordination, partnerships, and adaptive management processes in achieving planned results.
- To assess the extent to which the programme is contributing to transformational change through:
 - *institutional strengthening,*
 - *policy influence,*
 - *innovation,*
 - *scaling potential,*
 - *replication potential, and*
 - *systemic climate resilience and/or low-emission development pathways.*
- To assess the effectiveness of integration and implementation of the Gender Action Plan
- To provide evidence-based recommendations to improve programme effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and achievement of intended climate outcomes during the remaining implementation period.

Scope: The interim evaluation will assess project implementation, its progress, overall management, and or contributions towards expected results, including behavioural changes necessary to achieve the expected results. Given this is a mid-term review and activities are designed sequentially, not all activities and outputs have begun implementation or are at a stage where they can be meaningfully examined. At the inception stage, the exact scope and focus of activities will therefore be further examined and discussed with the contracted consultant. Moreover, quantitative baseline data to compare midline values of key outcome indicators

against is not available. In target communities where project activities have not yet commenced, “baseline” comparison data should therefore be collected.

3.2 Intended Audience and Use of the Study

Primary intended audience of the study are:

Stakeholder	Further information
Project donors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Climate Fund (GCF), • Solomon Islands Government (SIG), • Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)- ANCP & AHP, • New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)
Primary implementing organisation	Save the Children and Government of Solomon Islands
Government stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology [MECDM] • Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs [MWYCFA] • Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock [MAL] • Ministry of Provincial Government and Institutional Strengthening [MPGIS] • Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development [MEHRD] • Ministry of Rural Development [MRD] • Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (FMR)
Community groups	WDCs, DRCs & SDMCs etc.
Beneficiaries	Children and adults involved in the program/project/s and the study, Schools and communities
International development/ humanitarian research community	Other organisations working in LLA and in the Pacific

The findings from the evaluation will primarily be used:

- by the project management team, delivery partners and other stakeholders to inform improvements in project implementation.
- by the project management team to strengthen the on-going development and implementation of the project and the sustainability of its intended outcomes.
- to demonstrate accountability for the funding received from the GCF.
- by partners, stakeholders, and the Government of the Solomon Islands to learn lessons from the project for the purpose of replicating what works elsewhere and/or taking up approaches and activities that have been proven to work to scale up the project.

Together with Save the Children, the study team will be required to identify how the primary audience will be involved throughout the evaluation process and how evaluation findings will be

shared with each of the different stakeholders in the table above. The proposal should include suggested methods to report findings back to communities, beneficiaries and children will be conducted in an accessible and child friendly manner.

3.3 Key Study Questions

The following evaluation questions will guide the scope and methodology of the evaluation. The evaluation will follow OECD DAC criteria adapted to Green Climate Fund requirements, including its scorecard approach to assess its Enabling Environment and Paradigm Shift dimensions.

The study team will be required to undertake consultation with the SOKLAS Project Management Unit Program Quality team and Save the Children Regional Office MEAL at the commencement of the project in order to further refine the study questions. A list of indicative questions by evaluation criterion are provided below:

Evaluation questions

RELEVANCE

- To what extent is the project aligned with national adaptation priorities and community needs?
- Is the project theory of change (TOC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the TOC and intervention logic hold, or does it need to be adjusted?
- Are the identified, planned inputs and strategies realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How effectively are Locally Led Adaptation principles embedded in design and implementation; especially on Devolving Decision-Making to the Lowest Appropriate Level, Addressing Structural Inequalities, Investing in Local Capabilities and Institutional Legacy, Flexible Programming and Learning?

EFFICIENCY

- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money, absorption rate, commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments, co-financing, etc.)?
- Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent was the M&E tools such as the TOC and logframe used in performance management and progress reporting?

EFFECTIVENESS

- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the TOC and pathways identified?

- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outcomes such as adaptation? How strong is the evidence base for the achievements of outcomes, and to what extent are they based on the application of a well-defined methodology?
- To what extent has the project contributed to an enabling environment? What is the strength of evidence for this finding based on the scorecard assessment?

COHERENCE IN CLIMATE FINANCE DELIVERY WITH OTHER MULTILATERAL ENTITIES

- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for other local climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local-level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation?

GENDER EQUITY

- How effectively is the Gender Action Plan implemented?
- Are benefits equitably reaching women, youth, and vulnerable groups?
- How has the project and its implementing partners considered gender sensitivity (or transformation) in the design and implementation of its activities and institutional processes?

COUNTRY OWNERSHIP OF PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES

- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country-level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/ necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the results achieved?

INNOVATION IN RESULTS AREAS

- Which role has the project played in the provision of 'thought leadership', 'innovation', or 'unlocked additional climate finance' for climate change adaptation/ mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

REPLICATION AND SCALABILITY

- What are the project's lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

IMPACT

- To which extent has the project contributed or will be contributing to the desired paradigm shift? What is the strength of evidence for this finding based on the scorecard assessment?

UNEXPECTED RESULTS

- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?

4. STUDY METHODOLOGY

4.1 Study Design

The interim evaluation should be rigorous allowing for verification and triangulation of findings. It will seek, to the extent possible, to be inclusive and participatory, involving principal stakeholders and beneficiaries in the analysis. The mid-term evaluation should use a mixed-method, non-experimental design combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to ensure triangulation and robustness. The design must respond to the key constraint that for some indicators baseline data may not be available and incorporate retrospective and concurrent baseline collection. Core Design Features should include:

- **Contribution analysis** to assess causal pathways (aligned with ToC)
- **Participatory and inclusive approach** (children, women, youth, vulnerable groups)

The methodology should at a minimum include:

1. *Desk review of relevant documents and monitoring data. A range of project documentation will be made available to the study team that provides information about the design, implementation and operation of the Program. Available data sets include, but are not limited to:*
 - a. *Baseline profile of Communities and School*
 - b. *Climate Smart Agriculture training dataset*
 - c. *Solar and internet installation database/records*
 - d. *Monthly Reports and Community Adaptation Plan database (for Sampling)*
2. *GCF scorecard for assessing paradigm shift*
3. *Qualitative methods, including key informant interviews and focus group discussions to explore and explain observed changes. The evaluation should ensure stakeholders across the Accredited and Implementing Entities, Implementing Partners, as well as key stakeholders at the community, national, and regional levels are consulted. Focus Group Discussions should include gender segregated discussions with men, women, youth, and children.*
4. *Quantitative methods, including a household level survey should be conducted. The sample should aim to be representative of the project total population. Moreover, as no baseline quantitative data is available as a comparison, the sampling design should aim to collect additional data in communities where project activities have not yet commenced, which can act as a baseline comparison benchmark.*
5. *Case studies of communities and schools receiving direct support through retrofitting*

6. A detailed sampling approach is to be developed by the consultant at the inception stage, in collaboration with Save the Children. All primary data collected during the study must facilitate disaggregation by gender, age, disability, location.

Bidders are required to submit a quality assurance plan that sets out the systems and processes for ensuring that the evaluation deliverables and all evaluation activities are of a high quality and meet ethical standards from inception to the end of the contract.

In addition, bidders will demonstrate understanding of the risks associated to the delivery of the evaluation with a contingency plan to mitigate the impacts of the risks on the evaluation outputs. The evaluation will require a phased and flexible data collection plan aligned with transport availability and weather conditions that allow for logistical adaptations for fieldwork given the context.

Example of Risk Mitigation in Methodology

Risk	Mitigation
Weather delays (cyclones, rough seas)	Flexible schedule + buffer time
Transport unreliability	Cluster sampling, local coordination
High costs	Reduced sample, local enumerators
Access to remote islands	Prioritise feasible clusters

4.2 Tentative Sampling Approach

Sampling Strategy Overview

A multi-stage clustered sampling approach may be used instead of wide geographic dispersion. This reduces high transport costs (boats, fuel, charter flights), accounts for weather disruptions and irregular schedules and enables efficient supervision and quality control. The consultant should ensure representativeness across the 6 provinces if logistically feasible. If not realistic, then at least 4 provinces including using the administrative/project data and validating it.

Quantitative Methods

The sample is expected to be representative at the Provincial level, focusing on the intervention status i.e., active communities. A list of 170 project communities and 100 Schools in 52 Wards will be provided.

Quantitative Sample Size (Household Survey):

- To ensure statistical confidence (approx. 95% confidence, $\pm 5\%$ margin of error at the project level). Total samples may be 450-600 households.
- Allocation can be based on the following or by convenience:
 - o 10-15 communities total sampled with 5-6 School
 - o 40-60 households per community

Quantitative Sampling Procedure:

- Stage 1: Province Selection, based on High and Low program intensity, Accessibility within evaluation timeframe.
- Stage 2: Select Communities Within Clusters, approx. 3-5 communities per province can be used for logistical constraints based on project beneficiary coverage.

- Stage 3: Within Community Sampling, use systematic random sampling or for remote villages, Apply random walk method with clear protocol. The last option will be convenience sampling.

Qualitative Methods

Tok Tori (TBD)

GCF Scorecards for assessing the Enabling Environment and Paradigm Shift dimensions

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

- 30–40 interviews total
- Increased reliance on provincial-level stakeholders and national actors

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

- Total 20-30 FGDs, 2-3 FGDs per community with women, men, and youth

Case Studies

- 5–6 purposively selected cases based on remoteness/high vulnerability, strong program performance, and innovation examples (e.g., youth livelihoods, climate-resilient agriculture)

4.3 Ethical Considerations

The study team is required to adhere to the [Save the Children Child Safeguarding: Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse; Anti-Harassment, Intimidation and Bullying](#); and Data Protection and Privacy policies throughout all project activities. The evaluation approach will need to receive ethics review and approval, the preparation of which will be the responsibility of the consultant, with the support of the Save the Children team.

It is expected that this study will be:

- **Child participatory.** Where appropriate and safe, children should be supported to participate in the evaluation process beyond simply being respondents. Opportunities for collaborative participation could include involving children in determining success criteria against which the project could be evaluated, supporting children to collect some of the data required for the evaluation themselves, or involving children in the validation of findings. Any child participation, whether consultative, collaborative or child-led, must abide by the [9 Basic Requirements for meaningful and ethical child participation](#).
- **Inclusive.** Ensure that children from different ethnic, social and religious backgrounds have the chance to participate, as well as children with disabilities and children who may be excluded or discriminated against in their community.
- **Ethical:** The study must be guided by the following ethical considerations:
 - Safeguarding – demonstrating the highest standards of behaviour towards children and adults.
 - Sensitive – to child rights, gender, inclusion and cultural contexts.
 - Openness - of information given, to the highest possible degree to all involved parties.

- Confidentiality and data protection - measures will be put in place to protect the identity of all participants and any other information that may put them or others at risk.¹
- Public access - to the results when there are not special considerations against this
- Broad participation - the relevant parties should be involved where possible.
- Reliability and independence - the study should be conducted so that findings and conclusions are correct and trustworthy.

It is expected that:

- Data collection methods will be age and gender appropriate.
- Study activities will provide a safe, creative space where children feel that their thoughts and ideas are important.
- A risk assessment will be conducted that includes any risks related to children, young people's, or adult's participation.
- A referral mechanism will be in place in case any child safeguarding or protection issues arise.
- Informed consent will be used where possible.

It is the responsibility of the consultant to obtain relevant approvals if required. Save the Children will provide assistance with this process only in exceptional cases.

5. EXPECTED OUTPUTS & DELIVERABLES

The study deliverables and tentative timeline (subject to the commencement date of the study) are outlined below. The study team lead and Save the Children team will agree on final milestones and deadlines at the inception phase.

Deliverables and Tentative Timeline

Deliverable / Milestones	Tentative Timeline
The study Team will facilitate a workshop with the relevant stakeholders at the commencement of the project to develop the inception report.	21 Aug 2026
The study Team will submit an inception report * in line with the provided template , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Study objectives, scope and key study questions ▪ description of the methodology, including design, data collection methods, sampling strategy, data sources, and evaluation matrix against the key study questions ▪ data analysis and reporting plan ▪ caveats and limitations of study 	04 Sep 2026

¹ If any Consultancy Service Provider, Freelancer or Contingent worker will have direct contact with children and/or vulnerable adults and/or beneficiaries and/or have access to any sensitive data on safeguarding and/or children and/or beneficiaries, it is the responsibility of the person receiving the consulting service to contact the local HR team and child safeguarding focal point to ensure vetting checks and on-boarding are conducted in line with statutory requirements, local policies and best practices guidance.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ risks and mitigation plan ▪ ethical considerations including details on consent ▪ stakeholder and children communication and engagement plan ▪ key deliverables, responsibilities, and timelines ▪ resource requirements ▪ data collection tools (in line with the evaluation matrix) <p>Once the report is finalised and accepted, the evaluator/researcher study team must submit a request for any change in strategy or approach to the study manager or the steering committee.</p>	
<p>Final data collection tools (in the report language):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Survey instrument ▪ Data collection mechanism 	25 Sep 2026
Ethics Approval	Sep 2026
Training of Enumerators and Data collection	Oct-Nov 2026
<p>A Draft Evaluation Report including below elements: All reports are to use the Save the Children Final Study Report template</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive summary ▪ A summary table on: criteria/KEQ (each question), MoV (e.g., scorecard, survey, interviews, etc), Main findings (top headlines), Assessment (e.g., progressing as planned, better than expected, requires attention, lagging?), Recommendations (what, where, when, how?) ▪ Background description of the Program and context relevant to the Study ▪ Scope and focus of the study ▪ Overview of the study methodology and data collection methods, including a Study matrix ▪ Findings aligned to each of the key Study questions ▪ Specific caveats or methodological limitations of the evaluation ▪ Conclusions outlining implications of the findings or learnings ▪ Recommendations ▪ Annexes (Project logframe, study ToR, Inception Report, Study schedule, List of people involved) ▪ Annex: Table of Management Response Plan with suggestive action, based on the Evaluation Recommendation (Template will be provided by SOLKAS Team) 	04 Dec 2026
Review and feedback on the Draft Report	11 Dec 2026
Submission of revised 2 nd draft evaluation report	18 Dec 2026
Comments for 2 nd revision	15 Jan 2027

<p>An Interim Findings Presentation with Power Point Presentation including a summary of formative findings from the study. The focus will be on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Summary of interim findings ▪ Any emerging program issues or risks (if applicable) ▪ Any changes that have had to be made to the study design (if applicable) ▪ Key tasks for the next stage of the study and any proposed refinements or changes to methodology (if applicable) 	20 Jan 2027
Data and analyses including all encrypted raw data, databases and analysis outputs	12 Feb 2027
Final Study Report* incorporating feedback from consultation on the Draft Study Report	12 Feb 2027
<p>Knowledge translation materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PowerPoint presentation of Study findings ▪ Evaluation Brief 	12 Feb 2027

*All reports are to use the Save the Children [Final Study Report template](#)

** The Evaluation Brief is a 2-4 pages summary of the full report and will be created using the Save the Children [template](#).

All documents are to be produced in MS Word format and provided electronically by email to the Save the Children. Copies of all PowerPoint presentations used to facilitate briefings for the project should also be provided to Save the Children in editable digital format.

6. REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

During the implementation of the contract, the evaluator will report to the Evaluation Manager, who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of interim evaluation deliverables. There will be coordination with the project team who will assist in connecting the evaluator with senior management, government and development partners, beneficiaries, and other relevant key stakeholders. In addition, the project team will provide key project documentation prior to fieldwork and assist in developing a detailed programme to facilitate consultations as necessary. Save the Children will not provide enumerators to assist with primary data collection. Save coordination and introduction to communities, consultants will be expected to manage all data collection logistics independently.

The study team lead is to provide reporting against the project plan. Additionally, weekly and/or ad hoc meetings and/or written updates to the evaluation manager outlining progress and flagging any risks or challenges for mitigation. This will be required during the field work preparation and data collection phases. A written Progress Report (1-page) by email to the Save the Children Evaluation Manager every month, documenting progress, any emerging issues to be resolved and planned activities for the next month.

7. STUDY TEAM AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Bidders are required to clearly identify and provide CVs for all those proposed for the evaluation team, clearly stating their roles and responsibilities for this evaluation. The proposed evaluators should include the technical expertise and practical experience required to deliver the scope of work and evaluation outputs. Bidders should provide evidence of previous project experience for the provision of similar evaluation services and the design and implementation of similar evaluation activities as required by this TOR.

Understanding of Requirements and Experience

To be considered, the study team members together must have demonstrated skills, expertise and experience in:

- Designing and conducting outcome evaluations for climate change and locally led adaptation programs, particularly in relation to Green Climate Fund supported programs
- Leading socio-economic research, evaluations or consultancy work in the Pacific context (Solomon Islands is preferred) that is sensitive to the local context and culture.
- Conducting ethical and inclusive studies involving children and children's participatory techniques
- Conducting ethical and inclusive studies involving marginalised, deprived and/or vulnerable groups in culturally appropriate and sensitive ways
- Managing and coordinating a range of government, non-government, community groups and academic stakeholders
- Sound and proven experience in conducting evaluations based on OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, particularly utilisation and learning focused evaluations
- Strong written and verbal skills in communicating technical and/ or complex findings to non-specialist audiences (especially report writing and presentation skills)
- A track record of open, collaborative working with clients

There is a high expectation that:

- Members (or a proportion) of the study team have a track record of previously working together.
- A team leader will be appointed who has the seniority and experience in leading complex study projects, and who has the ability and standing to lead a team toward a common goal.
- The team has the ability to commit to the terms of the project and have adequate and available skilled resources to dedicate to this study over the period.
- The team has a strong track record of working flexibly to accommodate changes as the project is implemented.

Financial Proposal

Save the Children seeks value for money in its work. This does not necessarily mean "lowest cost", but quality of the service and reasonableness of the proposed costs. Proposals shall include personnel allocation (role / number of days / daily rates / taxes), as well as any other applicable costs.

8. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT

The following payments will be made to the consultant using an agreed mode of payment.

- Upon approval of inception report and tools: 20%
- Upon submission of First Draft study Report: 30%
- Upon approval of final study report: 50%

9. HOW TO APPLY

Qualified consultants or consultancy teams, with required relevant experience in similar evaluations, are invited to submit a package of documentation including a Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal, as per the requirements below and in relation to the consultancy described in this ToR, including:

- **Technical Proposal** (not longer than 15 pages), outlining:
 - The understanding of the task in relation to the consultancy.
 - Summary of the approaches and methods proposed with sampling methodology/ sample size and table on how each evaluation/research question and logframe indicator will be measured/ evaluated (linking with the methodology and tools):
 - *The proposal clearly articulates the objective(s) of the study.*
 - *The proposed approach and methodology should be robust, appropriate (actionable, sensitive, responsible) and indicates that it will achieve the requirements of the study. Explain the methodology you will adopt based on the intervention description and key questions from the ToR.*
 - Brief analysis of risks and mitigation measures for the proposed evaluation approach.
 - Names, roles, responsibilities, and key relevant experience of the team members including experience in evaluation, in field work in Solomon Islands and experience in climate change adaptation or related fields relevant for SOLKAS activities.
 - Tentative Work plan with key activities, timeline and LoE/ days needed to carry out activities.
- **Financial proposal / proposed budget**, up to 3 pages, in USD with all costs envisaged including:
 - Consultancy fees clearly separate from all other technical, logistics and admin costs.
 - Payment breakdown structure.
- **CVs of the proposed team members**
- **Three sample assignments** completed in whole or in large part by the lead consultant – samples of baseline reports, process evaluation reports, and outcome evaluation reports are preferred.
- **Contact details of three reference** clients/supervisors for whom you have provided services similar to the deliverables requested here. References will only be contacted for shortlisted applicants.

SCI Evaluation Scoring for prospective consultants

Category	Evaluation Quality Criteria (used for internal scoring after completion)
Purpose, Design and Methods	1. Does the evaluation report clearly identify the evaluation's purpose (including its key objectives, questions and criteria) as set out in the evaluation's Terms of Reference (ToR)?
	2. Are the data collection and analysis methods a clearly justified approach to addressing the evaluation's purpose and questions? (Do they provide valid, reliable and ethical data?)
	3. Is the methodology suitably tailored to the context and population groups to which the evaluation questions relate (e.g. re gender, disability, socio-economic status, geographic location, cultural context, ethnicity)?
	4. Is the size and composition of the sample in proportion to the conclusions sought by the evaluation?
	5. Does the evaluation build on what is already known, for example existing tried and tested frameworks and tools, existing data/evidence, and previous lessons learned?
	6. Are the methods used to collect and analyse data and any limitations of the quality of the data and collection methodology explained and justified?
	7. Has any personal and professional influence or potential bias among those collecting or analysing data been recorded and addressed or mitigated ethically?
Analysis and Findings	8. If evaluating impact, is a point of comparison used to show that change has happened (e.g. a baseline, a counterfactual, comparison with a similar group)?
	9. Is the explanation of how (e.g. theory of change, logframe, activities) the intervention contributes to change explored?
	10. Is the data well triangulated, such as by using different data collection methods, types of data and stakeholder perspectives?
	11. Are alternative factors (e.g. the contribution of other actors) considered to explain the observed result alongside an intervention's contribution?
	12. Are unintended and unexpected changes (positive or negative) identified and explained?
	13. Are the perspectives of children & communities included in the evidence, including the most deprived and marginalised? Note: For evaluations focused on young children, caregiver perspectives are adequate instead.
	14. Are the findings disaggregated according to sex, disability and other relevant social differences?
	15. Is there a clear logical link between the data that was collected and analysed, and the conclusions and recommendations presented?
	16. Are conflicting findings and divergent perspectives presented and explained in the analysis and conclusions?
	17. Are the findings and conclusions of the assessment shared with and validated by a range of key stakeholders (e.g. communities, partners, Save the Children staff)?
Communication and Use	18. Is the analysis and interpretation of the data well communicated through accessible language and helpful visuals (diagrams, graphs, tables as needed)?
	19. Are references, annexes and links included that provide additional relevant data, analysis or references (including key documents and which individuals/stakeholders were involved)?
	20. Is there a clear plan for how to use the results, including recommendations that are 'SMART' (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timebound) and directed toward the appropriate 'end users', a dissemination plan, and specific actions for implementing these recommendations?

ToR prepared by:	Louisa Carpenter and Shahzada Sayeed
ToR approved by:	
Date of sign off:	