

Solomon Islands Policing Support Programme

Mid-Term Review

October 2019

Written by:

Meenakshi Sankar, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
Nicola Johnson, New Zealand Police

Table of contents

Table of contents.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Abbreviations.....	4
Programme context.....	5
Purpose of the Review.....	6
Review Objectives.....	6
Methodology/Approach.....	9
Key Findings.....	11
Relevance.....	11
Effectiveness.....	13
Gaps and opportunities.....	20
Sustainability.....	27
Future Support.....	28

Acknowledgements

This mid-term review was undertaken collaboratively by evaluators from the Insights, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and International Services Group, New Zealand Police. The review team was accompanied by Peter Marshall from New Zealand Police and his timely and fit-for-purpose contribution is very much valued. The review team would like to first and foremost thank the Royal Solomon Islands Police Force for their willingness to participate in the review and their strong support. We would also like to thank the New Zealand Police Advisors based in Solomon Islands for their assistance with the consultations schedule and all other arrangements associated with the review.

The review team is grateful to the many interviewees who took the time to meet with the team and contributed to the review findings. Without their engagement and participation the review would have been incomplete. The clarity, openness and constructive approach with which all stakeholders engaged in the review are very much appreciated, and it is hoped that the report accurately reflects their insights and views.

Abbreviations

AFP	Australian Federal Police
CGGM	Community Governance and Grievance Mechanism
CO	Community Officers
CPC	Crime Prevention Committees
CPS	Crime Prevention Strategy
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
FBL	Field-Based Learning
IME	Insights, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
ISG	International Services Group
MFAT	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
NGE	National General Elections
NCPD	National Crime Prevention Department
NZP	New Zealand Police
PIF	Pacific Islands Forum
RSIPF	Royal Solomon Islands Police Force
RAMSI	Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands
SARA	Scanning, Analysis, Response an Assessment model
SIG	Solomon Islands Government
SIPSP	Solomon Islands Police Support Programme
SIPDP	Solomon Islands Police Development Programme
WB	World Bank

Programme context

In April 2019, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and New Zealand Police (NZP) undertook a joint review of the Solomon Islands Policing Support Programme (SIPSP). New Zealand has been assisting Solomon Islands with policing support since the late 1990s. The Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI) was established at the request of the Solomon Islands Government (SIG) following five years of ethnic tensions and conflict, known as 'the Tensions' (1998-2003). Endorsed by the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF), RAMSI was conceived as a comprehensive long term mission with a mandate to restore civil order, stabilise government finances, promote longer term economic recovery and rebuild the machinery of government. The 14 year RAMSI mission concluded on 30 June 2017. The Royal Solomon Islands Police Force (RSIPF) has benefitted from RAMSI's presence on the ground and from the associated capacity development.

Through SIPSP, New Zealand (through NZP) has continued to provide advisory assistance to the RSIPF to further the gains made under RAMSI, and to support NZ's ongoing security and economic interests in the region. Solomon Islands see New Zealand as a leader in community policing to protect domestic and regional security interests. It requested that New Zealand assist with the implementation of the RSIPF's Crime Prevention Strategy (CPS). Under SIPSP, eight long-term NZP advisors are working with the RSIPF to implement the CPS which draws on the NZP's own Prevention First Strategy.

New Zealand's involvement was to assist RSIPF to more effectively engage with communities, and to support early identification of issues and problems, including criminal activities to reduce the risk of local events escalating to wider disruption. The programme also supported continued improvements in RSIPF by working to strengthen internal processes and delivering ongoing training.

Targeted support for RSIPF for the implementation of the CPS lies at the heart of MFAT's four-year [2017-2021] programme of assistance through SIPSP. In addition to rebuilding trust in RSIPF, SIPSP also contributes to two strategic pillars as outlined in MFAT's country strategy for Solomon Islands around social cohesion and building state capability.

Purpose of the Review

The Review fulfils three distinct purposes:

- *Accountability*: gathering information about implementation to date to get early indication of how well outputs and outcomes are being achieved.
- *Improvement*: gathering information about implementation to date to identify improvements to allow for adaptive learning/programme adjustments in any future support.
- *Promoting collaboration and partnership in action*: undertaking the Review in collaboration with New Zealand Police to strengthen institutional knowledge about what works as well as strengthening partnership arrangements for the future.

Review Objectives

This section outlines the Review objectives and key questions. These questions guided the review and were amended following feedback from members of the Evaluation Steering Group.

Objective 1 (Relevance): Examine the ongoing relevance of Solomon Islands Policing Support Programme for SIG, RSIPF, NZP and MFAT and the communities of Solomon Islands.

- 1.1 To what extent does NZ's overall support to RSIPF remain a priority for SIG, RSIPF and New Zealand's Solomon Islands bilateral aid programme?
- 1.2 How relevant are the mechanisms or modalities of support offered within the SIPSP? How has the implementation of in-country advisors contributed to the effectiveness of the programme? Are there other modalities of support that could be considered?
- 1.3 To what extent are the relevant areas of focus (focus on SARA, a prevention-based problem-solving approach; creation of the 'Niu Future' youth development framework; the focus on drivers of crime as set out in the CPS; or a focus on operationalising CPS approach) well aligned to the strategy and priorities of RSIPF and the cultural context of the Solomon Islands?
- 1.4 How well does SIPSP align with and contribute to New Zealand's strategic pillars as articulated in the Solomon Islands country strategy (i.e. social cohesion and capability of the state).
- 1.5 Have the governance, planning and reporting arrangements contributed to maintaining relevance of SIPSP?

Objective 2 (Effectiveness): Examine the effectiveness of Solomon Islands Policing Support Programme both in terms of its implementation and key achievements.

- 2.1 How well has SIPSP been implemented? What have been the enablers and barriers to effective implementation and how can these be strengthened and/or addressed?
- 2.2 In what ways has the SIG accommodated and supported the implementation of SIPSP? What decisions have been made that demonstrate the SIG's commitment to support RSIPF and NZP to realise the benefits and value of SIPSP?
- 2.3 What progress has been made with respect to achieving short, medium and longer-term outcomes as stated in the Results framework? Has the Results Management Framework affected the effectiveness of SIPSP?
- 2.4 What improvements could be made to any future data collection and reporting which take into account capabilities and needs?
- 2.5 How have achievements of SIPSP outputs and outcomes been affected by coordination with other donor programmes? (notably Australia)
- 2.6 To what extent has the governance system guided delivery to ensure effectiveness?

Objective 3 (Efficiency): Understand the benefits vis-à-vis the costs of the Solomon Islands Policing Support Programme.

- 3.1 How efficiently has NZ's support been implemented? (through the MOU and use of advisors)
- 3.2 To what extent have activities and outputs been delivered to agreed quality standards, timeframes and budgets?
- 3.3 How well are the coordination arrangements between SIPSP and SIPDP (Australian programme) working to enhance efficiency?
- 3.4 To what extent do the management arrangements (MFAT Wellington, Honiara Post, NZP Wellington, NZP Honiara, RSIPF) support effective implementation?
- 3.5 To what extent does SIPSP represent value for money?

Objective 4 (Sustainability): The extent to which SIPSP is fulfilling the collective [MFAT, NZP and RSIPF's] aspirations for sustainability.

- 4.1 What progress has been made towards the sustainability goals of the SIPSP?
- 4.2 What efforts have been made to ensure sustainability, local ownership and a reduction in donor dependency, and how well are these working?
- 4.3 How have efforts for knowledge transfer and skills for prevention policing worked and where are the opportunities and challenges? How can MFAT-funded technical inputs be effectively delivered into RSIPF as to truly adopt a capability building approach?

Objective 5 (Looking Ahead): Consider the future prospects for SIPSP. Assess if and what amendments or other changes are needed if MFAT were to continue its future commitment to RSIPF and SIG.

- 6.1 What are the key lessons learned for the remaining phase of the SIPSP, if appropriate?
- 6.2 What amendments (if any) are recommended to improve the effectiveness of SIPSP in the remaining period?

Methodology/Approach

The scope of the Review covered the period from 2017-2019. Its geographic focus was the Solomon Islands. The Review was conducted jointly with evaluators from Insights, Monitoring and Evaluation (IME) division of MFAT and the International Service Group (ISG), NZP. The Review team had support from an independent, constabulary member from NZP whose role was to:

- provide subject matter expertise.
- clarify the operational policing context.
- contribute to testing the assumptions and implementation methods of the SIPSP.

In support of a consultative and participatory approach, the Review team engaged with a number of stakeholders, which included:

- MFAT stakeholders including respective Solomon Islands Programme and Activity Managers and other relevant MFAT staff in Wellington
- NZ Police stakeholders, including relevant ISG staff in Wellington and the Solomon Islands (i.e. current and previous SIPSP Advisors)
- Representatives from Solomon Islands Government including officials from relevant government agencies such as:
 - Ministry of Police, National Security and Correctional Services [MPNSCS] owing to its policy oversight and financial management role for RSIPF
 - Ministry of Justice and Legal Affairs [MJLA] owing to its broader engagement with the RSIPF
 - Ministry of Women, Youth, Children and Family Affairs [MWYCFA] as having key responsibilities for security
 - Ministry of Finance and Treasury [MoFT] as the lead agency for the preparation of the annual budget, which is tabled in Parliament each November.
 - Ministry of Development, Planning and Aid Coordination [MDPAC] as the agency responsible for the coordination of all development assistance.
 - Ministry of Public Service and the Public Service Commission owing its role in appointments and confirming promotions and recommendations.
 - Public Solicitors Office as a member of SAFNET and its role in getting cases to court.
- RSIPF including the Solomon Islands Police Commissioner; the RSIPF Senior Leadership team; RSIPF Provincial Commanders' RSIPF middle management officials [given their understanding of CPS was low in the AMAs]; RSIPF graduates
- Non-State actors such as World Vision; Oxfam; SAFNET; Church groups; YWCA; Save the Children etc.

- Development partners, such as the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and the Australian Federal Police (AFP), including the Solomon Islands Police Development Programme (SIPDP) Team Leader
- Other development agencies such as World Bank; the United National Development Programme (UNDP); the South Pacific Commission (SPC)
- Volunteer agencies such as the Australian Volunteers International (AVI) and the Volunteer Services Abroad (VSA).
- A community such as Burns Creek to provide a community perspective about SIPSP and its contribution to safety. Burns Creek offered SIPSP an opportunity to understand the complexities and the historic and societal issues to create social cohesion. It also highlighted the existing tensions between police and the community which remains an ongoing challenge.

Key Findings

Relevance

Examine the ongoing relevance for SIG, the RSIPF, communities, NZP and MFAT

SIPSP is described by all stakeholders as a programme with dual focus: capability building and community engagement. Its focus on working directly with RSIPF to lift its capability to operationalise the CPS, combined with a heightened focus on proactive engagement with the wider community means it occupies a unique position within RSIPF.

The SIPSP programme was designed as a follow-up to the withdrawal of RAMSI and intended to offer ongoing advisory support to RSIPF. RAMSI while successful in maintaining law and order and building infrastructure for effective policing operations did not invest sufficiently in human capital development. As a result, the Solomon Islands government requested ongoing support from both Australia and New Zealand to work with RSIPF and embed new processes and ways of working. This led to the creation of the two support programmes: the Solomon Islands Police Development Programme [SIPDP] implemented by Australian Federal Police, and the SIPSP implemented by New Zealand Police. The Australian SIPDP and NZ's SIPSP are seen to fill the gaps left by RAMSI and provide invaluable support to the RSIPF to strengthen their capacity and capability and empowering them to lead their own future. While the former focuses on institutional capacity building and response, the latter focuses on capability building in prevention policing and community engagement. This difference in approach of the two programmes is subtle and not easy to grasp – ongoing efforts are required to clarify the nature and approach deployed by the two programmes and cement their respective relevance and value. In the absence of this clarity, there is some risk that the two programmes progress on two parallel paths and the aspirations of the CPS, which ideally should sit across all areas of RSIPF's work, will not be achieved.

Both Programmes are endorsed by RSIPF leadership and management and interviewees readily acknowledge that without these programmes progress made within RSIPF would have been rather slow or even gone backwards. SIPSP in particular was regarded as having high relevance for all stakeholders for a variety of reasons including:

- *Its focus on capability development:* stakeholders noted that this aspect of policing did not receive much attention during the RAMSI period. Consequently SIPSP's explicit focus on capability development was seen as critical in building the confidence of RSIPF and motivating them to take the lead in many instances.
- *Its focus on prevention:* anchoring the capability and support offered by SIPSP in the operationalization of the CPS was seen as highly relevant. As a result, prevention as a strategy to shift community confidence and trust is gaining some momentum within RSIPF. The community engagement approach aligns with traditional structures.

- *Its focus on support vis-à-vis operational policing:* during the RAMSI period, NZP's involvement was more hands-on whereas its role in SIPSP is focused on capability development. Embedding this shift in role in the minds of RSIPF has taken time. RSIPF executive and leadership have embraced this shift and understand the role of SIPSP in post-RAMSI environment having seen the support in action.
- *Its focus on youth and community engagements:* SIPSP engagement in the community during the National General Elections (NGE) and their efforts to engage with youth in Honiara are well regarded and seen as expanding reach of RSIPF into vulnerable and marginalised groups in society. Issues affecting youth has been identified as one of the four drivers of crime in the CPS: high birth rates combined with limited educational opportunities; high unemployment; urban drift, causing a loss of cultural identity; high consumption of tobacco, alcohol, betel nut and Kwaso have a negative impact on young peoples.

Perhaps most importantly, SIPSP was seen as relevant to the Government of Solomon Islands: re-establishing community trust in RSIPF post ethnic tensions and enhancing the reputation of government are key goals for the SIG. There is also strong alignment between SIPSP/RSIPF and SIG's aspirations for improved governance, national unity, public order and safety as noted in the National Development Strategy.

The RSIPF has national responsibility for a wide range of activities: maintenance and enforcement of law and order; the preservation of peace; the protection of life and property; prevention and detection of crime; apprehension of offenders; upholding the laws of Solomon Islands; maintaining national security; assisting with the service and execution of court processes and orders; maintaining community safety, confidence and support; fire prevention and suppression; land and marine search and rescue; explosive ordinance disposal; assisting in dispute resolution; and providing assistance during emergencies. RSIPF's mandate and scope permeates all aspects of life in Solomon Islands. Therefore investing in building the capability of RSIPF reaps rich dividends to SIG and strengthens public perception relating to effectiveness of government institutions. Many stakeholders interviewed regarded RSIPF as a well performing institution and this in turn builds reputation of the government more generally.

For MFAT, SIPSP activities holds relevance as it aligns with MFAT's development priorities for Solomon Islands as outlined in 4YP [e.g. social cohesion; engagement of young people; community safety; improving employment opportunities for young people through the Burns Creek Social Enterprise project].

SIPSP also have high relevance for NZP given the impacts of regional security on national security. The flexibility of the SIPSP through the outputs approach allows the New Zealand advisors to build on their domestic strengths in order to work in a responsive and adaptive manner with the RSIPF. Historically the approach has been much more rigid and prescriptive, and moving away from the RAMSI approach has enabled donor dependency to reduce post intense support.

Effectiveness

Examine the effectiveness of SIPSP both in terms of its implementation and key achievements

Programme effectiveness can be assessed by a number of developments that has occurred since the implementation of SIPSP.

Evidence of improved visibility and profile for crime prevention

The creation of the National Crime Prevention Department (NCPD) and its subsequent formalization is perhaps the strongest evidence of programme success. The responsibility for the operationalization of the CPS lies with this department. Prior to SIPSP this department did not exist and there was no central coordination of the CPS. With the creation of NCPD, *'prevention now has a home'* and the department has since led the drafting of the revised CPS [at the time of the mid-term review, the document is awaiting sign off]. However as a host agency for crime prevention, NCPD faces a number of challenges:

- *Leadership*: the NCPD is a relatively new department and needs strong sustained leadership to ensure the prevention approach is fully integrated in all areas of policing. This underscores the need for SIPSP to actively support the NCPD leadership and staff to consolidate its work over the past two years and ensure ongoing sustainability of CPS implementation.
- *Resourcing*: stakeholders expressed some concerns regarding resourcing of the NCPD and its work. While the CPS is strongly endorsed by SIG and nominally 'owned' by all levels of RSIPF, it is not well supported financially. For instance, the Niu Futures Programme initiated within the auspices of youth engagement strand has one RSIPF person dedicated to oversee and drive the expansion of the programme. Lack of resourcing and capacity also means that SIPSP advisors step in to maintain momentum and this is not helpful.
- *Lack of an integrated approach to prevention*: RSIPF is a siloed organization and each department or unit appears to function quite separately from each other, with little cross departmental linkages. For instance National Intelligence Department (NID) focuses on serious crime and response; however there is little acknowledgement or understanding of how intelligence function of the Department can be enhanced through the community engagements undertaken by NCPD. Communities are a critical source of intelligence but their knowledge and observations are not harnessed in any systematic way. The mechanisms to enable these linkages are not in place. Ongoing efforts are needed to ensure the NCPD is better linked in with other departments to ensure crime prevention is threaded through the whole of RSIPF. Currently NCPD does not receive any information or updates from other departments and perhaps more importantly, much of the information appears to bypass the NCPD.

The experience of RSIPF during the national general elections with the community engagements using the prevention platform served as a clear signal about its importance and value.

Growing prevention mind set

The introduction of the CPS and the support offered for its implementation through SIPSP has contributed to shifting mind sets of the RSIPF and led to the recognition of crime prevention as an appropriate strategy and focus for achieving safety and stability in the Solomon Islands. The CPS provides a rationale for a crime prevention approach and explains that preventing crime is the responsibility of all employees of the RSIPF. Through the support offered by SIPSP, RSIPF leadership, the Minister and key government agencies have also come to understand the importance of the role and contribution of crime prevention through community engagement and also appreciate that crime prevention is not the domain of RSIPF alone. This growing understanding is well illustrated in the recent response from RSIPF to the border incursion problem. The first response consideration of the RSIPF Police Commissioner in relation to this incident was to task the development of a prevention plan, and for the Director of NCPD with SIPSP to lead this work. This is a clear acknowledgement of the value of mainstreaming of prevention across RSIPF. The advisors worked with local community groups to build their understanding and skills to set up a local intelligence gathering mechanism early, and track the situation closely.

There is also increased awareness of role of the community in prevention efforts across all stakeholders. Post ethnic tensions, there has been reduced community trust in police. Equally police too did not see any value in engaging with communities unless the interaction was related to crime. However with the work being done on community engagements in preparation for the NGE, RSIPF have begun to understand the role communities can play in prevention and access to local intelligence. RSIPF staff provided a number of examples of this growing understanding of prevention:

- After completing the education awareness workshops in Malaita, the Crime Prevention Committees (CPCs) came forward with information that led to the police apprehending key individuals.
- During the April tensions in Burns Creek, RSIPF with input from SIPSP advisors realized that going into the community in a convoy of police vehicles during a tense situation was not ideal. As a result, they left their police vehicles outside the community and walked into the community which immediately alleviated concerns and calmed everyone down.
- Following an information sharing workshop on illegal drugs, an operating unit in the community was identified by a family member. The information was passed onto NID and when the officers came to make arrests, the father of the young person provided all relevant information about his son.

There is also heightened awareness of the need to effectively link crime prevention and intelligence-led policing. Some progress has been made; however a whole of organization prevention strategy does not appear to be in place as yet. The current approach to prevention within RSIPF tends to treat prevention as a parallel approach to response policing with the two strategies working alongside each other as opposed to prevention being woven throughout. The siloing of prevention may be a result of the SIPSP and SIPDP not aligning their respective approach to a single overall combined vision, with each development partners working in a degree of isolation from each other.

Growing individual and institutional capability and confidence

The introduction of the CPS and the support offered for its implementation through SIPSP has contributed to shifting mind sets of the RSIPF and led to the recognition of crime prevention as an appropriate strategy and focus for achieving safety and stability in Solomon Islands. The capability building and support offered by SIPSP occurs mainly through mentoring and training workshops and SIPSP advisors '*sharing their experience and expertise*' with RSIPF. Staff who worked with SIPSP advisors commented that they watched how the advisors worked particularly their engagements with communities, and learnt by watching them. The growth in capability is well illustrated in two recent events: first, RSIPF leadership and management did not accept the first two iterations of the CPS as it did not meet their needs and expectations, and secondly RSIPF leadership initiated a review of the Learning and Development curriculum to better align it with the CPS. Mentoring efforts have targeted the Provincial Leadership Teams, to implement kwaso actions plans [activity involved support provinces to create their own provincial-level action plans]; provincial staff in the development and implementation of action plans for new and emerging issues and the NCPD and Provincial Youth/Community coordinator roles. These developments signal a growing understanding and confidence of RSIPF in their own judgment and capability to lead the implementation of the CPS.

RSIPF staff interviewed made specific mention of the value of new techniques and tools such as the training in Field-Based Learning programme that incorporates the SARA problem-solving model. The Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment steps outlined in the SARA model were well aligned with how communities have traditionally worked to resolve local issues. This work is led by SIPSP and is seen as providing tremendous value as it anchors the conversation in the communities.

Example: Applying the SARA model to real world situations¹

During the development of the field-based learning (FBL) approach, a topical issue arose for RSIPF which was a continuing, persistent kwaso/public issue occurring at Honiara central market. SIPSP took the opportunity to get involved and lead a prevention-based response using the SARA problem solving approach. It provided the opportunity to test the FBL in an operational setting and assess the level of frontline engagement and structure needed to support prevention policing. Results included:

- Development of a strong functional partnership between RSIPF and Honiara City Council Law Enforcement officers
- Increased timely enforcement activity which corresponded with improved policy visibility
- Improved intelligence gathering. SIPSP facilitated the placement of a fax machine at the Central Market Police Base to allow for submission of intelligence reports.
- Increased awareness raising of the issue and highlighted police and partner efforts by the RSIPF Media group
- Positive levels of cooperation.

¹ Activity Progress Report; Solomon Islands Police Support Programme, prepared by SIPSP Team Leader

Good media coverage of a number of community engagements occurred through national newspapers, radio and the RSIPF's Facebook site. The RSIPF Media Unit has proven to be a strong partner for the public-facing work being done by SIPSP and NCPD jointly. SIPSP has encouraged and advised NCPD staff on capturing their work, draft media reports and work with the media unit to prepare good context for the public. This served two purposes: first, it ensures recording of the prevention work as part of the NGE preparations and secondly, it provides assurances to the public about RSIPF's ability and willingness to reach out into the communities. Good relationships between the police and the community were critical to ensuring a trouble-free election and it enhances the ability of RSIPF to identify issues early. SIPSP has been instrumental in building the capability of NCPD staff to consider these angles and undertake these engagements.

However ongoing challenges remain with respect to ensuring sustainability of these capability gains.

- The Review found that while there were isolated examples of individual professional capability, there is no systematic assessment of capability development and/or skills transfer.
- Cumulative, tangible change desired at an organisational level is not stated and therefore not monitored systematically.
- The delays in drafting the revised CPS also illustrate specific areas where RSIPF still struggle: joined-up, multi-sectoral stakeholders engagements.
- The first two years of the SIPSP has focused on developing a wide range of action plans such as the Kwaso Action Plan and the Road Safety Action Plan. It may be timely to shift the focus towards supporting RSIPF with implementation of the Action Plans; and monitoring and tracking progress towards outcomes as state in the Action Plans.
- The community engagements initiated in preparation for the NGE have had a significant impact in building relationships between the police and the community. Sustaining these engagements and supporting RSIPF to lead these engagements will be critical to the ongoing success of these engagements.

Enhanced focus on youth and youth engagement

SIPSP initiated a range of Action Plans linked to the drivers of crime – Kwaso, Road Policing, and the ongoing development of a youth participation programme. The Review indicated that the RSIPF mind-set has been reframed from viewing youth as a driver of crime to recognising youth as an asset to the future of Solomon Islands. The Niu Futures youth development programme is an excellent illustration of this shift in mind set.

[NCPD support for the Niu Futures Youth Programme](#)

The Niu Futures youth development programme seeks to give young people opportunities to lead, and strengthen partnerships, trust and confidence between RSIPF and youth. An initial scan showed that RSIPF viewed youth primarily as a driver of crime. SIPSP advisors believed creating platforms for positive engagement between youth and RSIPF would help change current mind-sets of both groups. SIPSP facilitated and delivered two workshops to support the development of the content and direction of the Programme and to support youth leadership and facilitation capability with key RSIPF stakeholders. The Honiara Youth Hub, funded by the Honiara Council is a central point of coordination for this initiative. It was important to shift this mind-set and SIPSP worked with RSIPF to develop the 'Niu Future' youth development framework and focus RSIPF's attention on strengthening the links between the police and the Youth Hub. A NCPD youth development adviser oversees this initiative. A temperature check diagnostic tool used at the beginning of the initiative served as a good baseline for RSIPF to build on and track progress with youth. The initial temperature check (cold/warm/hot) taken during Phase 1 (Connect) saw 85% of youth describe their relationship with RSIPF as 'cold'. The recent survey of youth taken during Phase 3 (Empower) indicated a significant improvement in their relationship with the police, with 73% rating 'hot'. Other successful outcomes of youth participation in the Niu Futures programme include a participant receiving a short-term scholarship – the male youth has received Solomon Islands Government Arts and Culture Scholarship to Indonesia. He is one of a small number of Solomon Islanders chosen by the Government to receive this honour. A recent youth hub event had strong engagement from RSIPF officers, youth and staff, with the officers making an effort to speak with everyone present during the event. As a result of this engagement opportunity, NCPD officers have come to appreciate the value of building healthy relationships with youth and are modelling the behaviours that are required to achieve this.

The initiative has since been handed over to Child Fund NZ as SIPSP needed to reorient itself back to focus on building RSIPF capability.

[Burns Creek Social Enterprise Project](#)

SIPSP helped to drive the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between RSIPF and Solomon Islands Chamber of Commerce and Industry [SICCI]. This engagement with the private sector was driven by stakeholders' collective desire to identify employment opportunities in Burns Creek following the events post-election. While the project's origins are unclear, crime statistics show Burns Creek is a hot spot: manufacturing and consumption of kwaso is high; there is high level of unemployment with very limited employment opportunities; and high number of disengaged youth. At the same time, Burns Creek is also known for its agri-business entrepreneurs who thrive in the informal sector. This project aimed to build on the agri-business sector whilst also staying alert to other options. SIPSP facilitated a meeting of minds with RSIPF, SICCI and private sector partners to develop a social enterprise project. It was seen as a way of productively engaging young people in enterprise activities. In addition there is also a wellness programme with the Burns Creek football and basketball tournaments initiated by SIPSP

to build relationship with young people. Such efforts helped to build relationships with mainstream leadership in the community.

Success of the National General Elections

Support for the NGE policing operation became the primary focus for the SIPSP programme and all other activities of the Programme were put on hold to ensure successful elections. In the past, the NGE process has proven to be a high-risk period for the RSIPF and the Solomon Islands more generally as the complexities and uncertainty of the Solomon Islands political process has led to violence and destruction of property. Therefore success of the NGE became inextricably linked to the success of SIPSP and came to be seen as a testament to SIPSP's ability to build RSIPF capability. The RSIPF NGE operation provided a number of opportunities for the programme particularly relating to NGE community engagements. SIPSP advisors assisted AC Crime Prevention and the Director of NCPD to prepare a comprehensive community engagement plan for the provinces and key messages to be communicated to the public. SIPSP advisors then supported NCPD staff with logistics and on-the-ground to manage these engagements with communities thus raising RSIPF's profile in communities and building public trust and confidence at this critical time in Solomon Islands political history.

The success of the NGE was attributed by most RSIPF and other stakeholders to the proactive work initiated by SIPSP with the community engagement plan. The implementation of this plan placed NCPD, the Provincial Police Commanders and their provincial leadership team front and centre of the engagements thus lifting their visibility and profile. In focus was the strength and quality of RSIPF- community relationships providing the opportunity to identify any issues or risks that could be addressed as a preventative measure prior to the NGE. NGO's also readily acknowledged that the RSIPF played a critical role in ensuring peaceful elections.

SIPSP's adaptive and flexible approach and the quality of NZP advisors

From a programme delivery perspective SIPSP's adaptive and flexible approach is seen as critical to its success. The team on the ground were able to quickly adapt and create a fit-for-purpose programme to address the design gaps that became evident during implementation.

The cultural competence and relational skills of SIPSP advisors were also identified as critical ingredients in the achievements of SIPSP over the past two years. These qualities were seen a hallmark of Kiwis: 'they fit themselves with locals'; 'they go with RSIPF into tense situations without hesitation'; 'they are hands on' ; and their willingness to share their expertise and experience were seen as particularly unique.

They bring a Pacific approach to policing; they are hands-on and this appeals to the Solomon Islands way of doing things. Their going away party was well attended: because they build strong personal connections with the team here.

They work alongside us; they do not drive it. They are not in the front line.

They are able to provide logistical and financial support [e.g. megaphones; sporting equipment; costs of taking 30 young people on a retreat] when needed far more easily.

This suggests that the success of SIPSP does rest to a large extent on the skills, experience and personal attributes and leadership of the team members: they have breathed life into the programme and their approach, working style, work ethic and cultural competency has made a significant impact on RSIPF and all those involved in the different initiatives. The comment that SIPSP advisors '*have white skin but brown hearts*' is illustrative of their ability to fit into the local cultural context. SIPSP advisors' ability to engage constructively with youth [e.g. Niu Futures programme] and work in challenging areas such as Burns Creek seen to illustrate their strengths in this regard.

Maintaining the balance between being flexible to respond to emerging needs of RSIPF [a key feature and strengthen of SIPSP] and ensuring focus on agreed issues/ individuals/ units requires tight project management by SIPSP Team Leader(s). Decisions to respond flexibly needs to be made within the broad scope of SIPSP so as to help embed the learning and/or practices. Some questions to help guide decisions in this regard include:

- What is driving the request?
- How does the request fit within the broader scope and purpose of SIPSP?
- What leverage does this give SIPSP to deepen its reach and/or embed the programme across RSIPF?
- What resources are required and whether responding to the request detracts from the overall purpose and intent of SIPSP?

Answers to these questions can provide invaluable insights and ensure that the actions are in line with the overall scope and intent of SIPSP.

Shifts in community attitudes to RSIPF

Stakeholders, including NGOs noted a shift in community attitudes to RSIPF:

- More visible and responsive
- Strengthened their reputation through their response to incidents during elections
- Efforts to engage with the community.

In the past, you would only see police when there was a crime. But they now turn up at community events, and chat socially with people. People feel they can engage freely with them.

When we did a temperature check in the beginning of the Niu Futures programme, many more young people were at the 'hot' end suggesting their tense relationship with the police. Now it is the opposite.

Gaps and opportunities

Identify gaps and opportunities for the remaining period of the Programme

Extending reach of CPS and CP approach with middle management and the provinces

Although implementation of the CPS is in its early stages, the commitment from senior RSIPF and the support delivered by both SIPDP and the SIPSP have provided good foundation for moving forward with a crime prevention approach. While the larger SIPDP provides inputs across the functional areas of RSIPF, the smaller NZP SIPSP focuses more intensively on advisory support for implementation of the CPS itself. There is evidence to suggest that senior RSIPF view the concept of crime prevention positively and SIPSP has made a significant contribution to improvements in knowledge and understanding of crime prevention at RSIPF Executive and Leadership level. It is not clear how well it is understood at levels below that.

It may be timely to extend the reach of CPS and crime prevention approach into middle management and the provinces to consolidate the gains and ensure the crime prevention approach permeates all aspects of RSIPF operations. This is critical for the transformation of RSIPF and for improving community trust and confidence in police nationally.

There are also opportunities to include crime prevention in the Learning and Development (L&D) programme so as to embed the approach into the minds of new recruits, as well as the training offered at the supervisory level. The review of L&D curriculum is an important step in this regard.

Absence of governance mechanisms a gap

While there is strong institutional commitment to CPS [evidenced by references to CPS in RSIPF documentation including the RSIPF Strategic Direction 2017-2020; RSIPF Annual Business Plan, Capability Plan and provincial work plans], the extent to which structures associated with implementation of CPS are functioning appears to be rather limited. Within RSIPF for instance there are a number of structures such as the Joint Management Forum [focused on donor coordination]; National Management Team [RSIPF's own internal leadership team]; the National Crime Prevention Board [involving other government agencies and civil society]; RSIPF's Executive Steering Committee [involving senior decision-makers from each of the three organizations: RSIPF; NZP; MFAT] and a CPS working group. However due to the NGE operational commitments, these groups and committees have not met regularly and some were put on hold. The newly constituted Programme Management Committee which involves MFAT met for the first time in January 2019. Perhaps more importantly, there is lack of clarity about the roles and responsibilities of these different structures and how they relate to each other to bring about the desired transformation. Moving forward, RSIPF could consider finding ways to harness these structures and ensure alignment and coherence of the programme and maximise its value.

Strategic approach to capability development

The capability building and support offered by SIPSP comprises both structured [e.g. training workshops] and unstructured [e.g. role modelling; working alongside RSIPF staff] learning platforms. However, there is insufficient clarity about how the two platforms can work together or indeed use strategically to achieve desired outcomes. Capability building within a development context requires specialized skills and training: NZP are specialists in operational policing and there may be merit in providing additional training to equip those in SIPSP advisory roles to participate in capability development initiatives more broadly. Some rudimentary tools are in place for Advisors to assess capability improvements in RSIPF [i.e. the organizational growth scale and associated self-assessment for NZP advisors to support RMT reporting]. However, a number of factors have led to regular internal assessments falling over [i.e. gaps between the SPDA role who should be leading this process; lack of capacity within ISG to lead in the absence of SPDA/Team Leader ownership]. Plans are in place to address these issues in the next phase of the SIPSP implementation.

There is also merit in working with RSIPF to clarify the kind of changes in individual or leadership behaviours sought as a result of these learning opportunities and their desired outcomes from this investment in capability. Building monitoring and evaluation into the everyday practice of both RSIPF and SIPSP advisors appears to be an area that merits further attention and focus. It would help them to track their own progress and refine their approach and strategy if required. For instance, a new youth development adviser has been recently appointed in RSIPF to oversee the youth engagement work stream. The creation of the role in itself is seen as an outcome; what is less clear is how the person in this role will be supported to capture information systematically to demonstrate the value of their role and contribution. Encouraging RSIPF to think through these issues will be an important step to developing capability.

Taking a strategic approach to capability development would allow SIPSP to also focus on knowledge and skills transfer. However this is neither captured nor reported. It is important to address this gap as otherwise success of SIPSP will be treated as a one-off success or a series of small wins. It is also necessary to go beyond awareness-raising and training activities – while these are good first steps in bringing about change they are insufficient to bring about the system level change desired.

Demonstrating success is challenging due to lack of reporting

Reporting results achieved by SIPSP is a huge challenge for the programme. Key issues relate to reliability of RSIPF data and performance statistics and lack of access to broader assessments/reports produced by RSIPF internally that can demonstrate contribution of SIPSP to RSIPF. This makes it challenging to ensure a through robust assessment of progress. Building SIPSP advisors knowledge and understanding of M&E will allow them to seek out the information needed to demonstrate success.

Most current reporting appears to be qualitative and intuitive. While this is entirely appropriate, generating insights into *how* SIPSP works to bring about the desired shifts is

critical to the success of the model/approach and for decisions regarding scaling up the effort. The absence of robust results on these issues presents significant challenges for SIPSP including:

- How do advisors assess their own efforts in building capability?
- If and how SIPSP advisors disentangle the nature and type of support offered to individuals vis-a-vis the organization, and where current capability building efforts are being placed?
- In the absence of baseline information how does SIPSP demonstrate the contribution of the programme to RSIPF and Solomon Islands in any robust way? It is entirely feasible that in the absence of baseline data, it may be useful to consider media reporting of previous elections along with key measures linked to crime and incidence to stack up a strong argument for why the elections this year were safer. The extent of community engagements undertaken by SIPSP with RSIPF this time around [as opposed to previous elections] can then be reasonably used to 'attribute' this success to the SIPSP programme.

It is worth noting that the Results framework drafted for the programme does not lend itself to the inherently adaptive and flexible nature of SIPSP. It is necessary to consider more innovative approaches that are aligned to the features of the programme: adaptive, crime prevention focus; capability building. These issues have been recognised and initial work has begun to address these aspects. In order to achieve good quality, relevant data collection and reporting, certain basic elements need to be in place including:

- A clear articulation of the outcomes sought by SIPSP and how the Programme outputs can be expected to contribute to these outcomes.
- A set of indicators to measure success
- Using the evidence and data periodically to inform decision-making and integrate it into RSIPF Executive and Leadership learning
- Investing in UN biennial survey to explore questions specifically about community perceptions of RSIPF. Currently there are only two questions, but MFAT could consider expanding the questions to cover the SIPSP contribution to RSIPF.
- Building an evaluative focus across all SIPSP outputs: asking SIPSP advisors to identify the evidence they are using to determine the effectiveness of their own actions would be useful from an evaluative monitoring perspective.

It must be noted that the Knowledge, Attitude and Practices [KAP] survey conducted post stakeholder interviews, provides important baseline data for the Programme. A follow-up survey in the last six months of the programme would enable analysis of achievements and/or ongoing gaps.

Crime Prevention Committees

RSIPF reports as of February 2018 that 178 Crime Prevention Committees [CPC] have been established across 9 provinces and the Capital Honiara – however not all of these are operating effectively. There is little information to determine the number of CPCs that are currently meeting and working on crime prevention. There is also fundamental lack of clarity around the responsibilities of RSIPF in relation to CPCs and the ways in which they can work together. This is compounded by the lack of clarity around the mandate of CPCs. The evaluators heard that RSIPF anticipated the development of Terms of Reference and operating procedures for CPCs; but developments had not eventuated at the time of this mid-term review.

There also appears to be significant variability in the performance and operations of the CPCs: stakeholders commented that the Central province appeared to be performing well whereas CPCs in other provinces where rule of law is weak tend to be far less effective. In Auki, the CPCs are seen as effective and assuming responsibility for issues that they are well placed to deal with. For instance the evaluators heard that the CPC was drafting a community by-law for restrictions on late night hours to respond to loud music and related disturbances as these issues did not need a RSIPF response. This shows local ownership of community related issues and an attempt to respond to such issues locally. Similarly, the CPC has created a taskforce to address domestic violence issues: they run workshops to build awareness and disseminate information about the steps women can take to address the issue. The CPC would then escalate the issue and bring RSIPF in if the situation is not fully resolved.

Most stakeholders believe there is a place for CPCs in the fabric of the community. In the past the wantok system was in place and it was seen as a fair and transparent system. However there is a growing perception that Chiefs are no longer making decisions that benefit the wider community. In such instances the CPCs are seen as playing an important role and creating a more balanced local justice system. Despite these benefits, there are three main problems with CPCs:

- The members are volunteers: this makes the structure fragile as there is churn in membership and tasks get ignored when family pressures are high. Some CPCs see their role as contributing to the work of RSIPF: doing their work for them, and this raises questions about the lack of any compensation.
- They are seen as new structures that do not build on existing community structures. Their mandate is unclear as well. These findings corroborate the findings of the CPS evaluation [April 2018] that noted: *in the absence of clarity around the mandate of CPCs, it appears that the rollout of such a large number of CPCs was possibly premature and overambitious*. The report goes on to suggest that phasing out with stronger support might have been a more useful path.

- There is also some confusion about how to manage the relationship and work of CPS and CPCs and the Community Governance and Grievance Management (CGGM²) project, in particular the role of the Community Officers (COs). The incorporation of the COs into the provincial structure with a wage has amplified concerns that CPCs will expect remuneration as well.

Partnerships and networks with other agencies

SIPSP appears to operate as a stand-alone programme and partnerships with other agencies, where possible, is not sufficiently leveraged or understood. There is an urgent need to improve synergies by encouraging SIPSP advisors to work across sectors particularly if (a) it directly aligns with SIPSP programme objectives and activities; and (b) it is something that RSIPF as the partner agency wishes to pursue. Equally, with respect to the New Zealand High Commission, SIPSP advisors' awareness of cross sector activity that is taking place in Solomon Islands can be hugely beneficial to inform discussions with RSIPF around potential opportunities. While SIPSP primarily works in support of and in partnership with RSIPF, it may be useful for the Team Leader, at the minimum, to be attuned to wider NZ government interests and activities in Solomon Islands so as to find synergies where possible. For instance, if RSIPF wishes to drive crime prevention principles into schools, MFAT's education activities in SI can provide a conduit for pursuing these aspirations. In such an event, the activity aligns with SIPSP programme objectives and it could be something RSIPF may want to pursue.

Linkages between the World Bank Programme are also not sufficiently explored within SIPSP: collaboration between the CGGM and the current iteration of the CPS can support and potentially even accelerate the implementation of the CPS at the provincial level. However this has not happened. While RSIPF is represented at the Oversight Committee at Policy level, at an operational level, there is disconnect and lack of clarity. The CGGM has been undertaken in Renbel and Makira, and being rolled out to Malaita, Central and possibly Guadalcanal. The model builds on local structures and is a cost effective way [as the CO lives in the community] for managing community grievances through the appointment of a CO: paid position. At a Provincial level the CO linked in with Police and Provincial Government and horizontally linked to Community Governance Structures [Chiefs; Religious Leaders; Elders and Community Organizations]. CPCs established at a Provincial level and then rolled out to Ward level: in Renbel, the CO is chairing these committees.

In Makira, agreement reached between RSIPF that CPCs will only be rolled out to those Wards where there was no CO [to prevent double up]. In many communities the CO is the first responder. RSIPF cannot be everywhere; so the CO, since they are part of the everyday conversations in the community, can play an important role.

² The CGGM Project is a World Bank supported project implemented under the Ministry of Provincial Government and Institutional Strengthening (MPGIS) with the objective to strengthen local governance institutions for community grievance management capabilities and to enhance the effectiveness of linkages with Provincial Governments in targeted communities. The leading partner in financing and implementing the programme is the World Bank with DFAT also providing resources into the programme.

Managing transition in the Programme

While change is seen as inevitable, the turnover of five of the original eight SIPSP advisors emerged as an important issue and dominated a number of conversations with RSIPF staff. At an overt level, RSIPF went to great lengths to say they were comfortable with the high turnover of staff as they were used to it from the RAMSI period. They also clarified that a new team presented opportunities for infusing fresh ideas into programme activities. Regardless of this, there is an expectation of continuity from RSIPF's perspective and this was not met. For instance, the new Team Leader was not introduced to the RSIPF Executive and Leadership by the outgoing Team Leader and even within SIPSP, the incoming team was not fully briefed or formally introduced to the individuals they would be expected to work with. While there is an easing in period to allow SIPSP advisors to build relationships and rapport with RSIPF counterparts, there are opportunities to strengthen efficiencies around this process and manage the handover process in culturally appropriate ways. RSIPF is a formal organization and relationships are critical: SIPSP transition can be better aligned to these expectations. ISG have already taken steps to rectify this.

For many of the incoming team members, this was their first deployment in a developing country context. Combined with the shift in role from operational policing to capability development, the transition can be hard. ISG delivers a comprehensive Professional Development Training for all its advisors that cover topics relating to capability development; adviser role and responsibilities, and reporting to prepare their advisors for these roles. Nevertheless there is a time lag between when the advisors do their training and their deployment and knowledge and information gained can be lost in this period. This can be particularly challenging for SIPSP where the 'way we work is seen as NZ's biggest value add'. However *the way we work* is not codified: advisors' knowledge and reflections about what works and insights about how RSIPF learn are not systematically captured and/or shared with the incoming team. Tacit knowledge about RSIPF and the advisors' experience in working in the country are not recorded leaving every adviser to figure this out on their own. This is inefficient and places a huge burden on RSIPF to take on the responsibility to brief and update the new team. It is true that some time will need to be spent in building rapport with RSIPF counterparts; however the team could move more quickly if they could align their discussion and dialogue to meet the stated needs of the individual and the organization.

Relationships are central to working with RSIPF, and in the Pacific context the RSIPF itself has very formal hand over processes. While RSIPF does not expect SIPSP to mirror their extended, long drawn out processes, it is important to signal our acknowledgment of local cultural context and align our process to ensure our engagement is regarded positively. This is in keeping with the partnership principles set out in the Pacific Reset. RSIPF recognises that they have some responsibilities for developing these relationships and engaging meaningfully with the incoming advisors: this ownership is important for their own capability development.

The evaluation also identified the need to better integrate SIPSP into the suite of MFAT initiatives in Solomon Islands to create synergies but also improve coherence of our development effort. Opportunities for achieving this integration exist in the current structures [e.g. NZP advisors participate in the monthly NZ Inc meetings; a dedicated session for MFAT to cover their aid objectives as part of the pre-deployment professional development training] and they need to be strengthened and sustained. These efforts allows SIPSP to have more sustainable impact as MFAT Post can connect RSIPF to other SIG agencies and ensure the activities gain visibility and profile at the national level. Pre-deployment training that covers aspects of the Programme and how it fits into the wider NZ's vision and direction for Solomon Islands would help sustain these connections.

Sustainability

Assess the extent to which sustainability aspirations are being fulfilled and identify opportunities for strengthening sustainability

Financial sustainability emerged as the main issue for SIPSP sustainability particularly related to supporting RSIPF to advocate for itself at the government level and accessing resources to continue to invest in crime prevention. Shifting the focus from policy development to policy implementation is an important step towards ensuring sustainability moving forward. With regard to the Niu Futures Programme, having seen the benefits and value of the initiative, Honiara City Council is taking the initiative to take over the Programme: it is well aligned with their policies and priorities.

With respect to sustaining the capability built through SIPSP, the review findings provide some invaluable insights. SIPSP advisors appear to draw on a wide of resources in undertaking their capability development responsibilities within the scope of SIPSP:

- Knowledge located within themselves: professional experience; tacit, prior knowledge; cultural competency and responsiveness
- Knowledge that is intangible but located outside of oneself and derived from others: drawn from interactions with teams; agreed protocols and ways of working; RSIPF documents and policies; the adviser's own educational background
- Knowledge drawn from artefacts: SARA problem-solving model; research reports.

Given the breadth and scale of the investment in such capability building programmes by MFAT and NZP in the Pacific, it may be timely to consider codifying the practice of advisors and developing a theory of change framework so as to guide their work. This can contribute to sustainability of the practice and also enable transfer of learning across other police support programmes in the Pacific. It points to the ongoing need to grow the professional practice of advisors to ensure their practice:

- Leads to improvement
- Is underpinned by inquiry and research evidence
- Informed by collaborative relationships
- Influenced by and responsive to context and culture.
- Provides leadership in a range of contexts.

The SARA problem-solving approach fulfils sustainability aspirations as it enables the community to take ownership and resolve minor disputes without involving RSIPF. It is good particularly for remote islands to solve problems themselves. It may be worthwhile to train the COs in this approach and also integrate this within the training for new recruits.

Future Support

The evaluation findings clearly show that the remaining two years is not sufficient to fill the huge gaps left by RAMSI. The gaps in capability are deep and ongoing efforts are needed to lift capability in a number of areas. For instance, many new recruits have only completed primary school and have minimal digital literacy: expecting these recruits to fully understand, implement and monitor the implementation of CPS in their everyday life is ambitious. This suggests that the capability support to RSIPF is still valid and SIPSP activities that support RSIPF to implement CPS need to be continued, including:

- Community engagements;
- Increased engagement with Provincial structures and systems;
- Engagement with youth: they are a significant population with high unemployment and with access to alcohol and drugs. Through SIPSP there may be opportunities to integrate them into productive programmes; and
- Integrating gender and WPS in the Activity.

It is critical that the New Zealand brand and its unique way of operating is maintained through the new SIPSP team. NZ's contribution is valued and its approach is seen as being distinctly different from Australia. For instance, despite the size of their team and their resources, SIPSP enjoys a distinct position in the minds of RSIPF through their ability to work adaptively; willingness to be flexible; easy going attitude and cultural astuteness.

There is a clear need to further the reach of the Programme to Provinces: however, how this can occur is yet to be clarified, as there are significant logistics and other challenges associated with on-the-ground work in the Provinces. It is not feasible to have Advisors based in Provinces; however it is necessary to think about levelling the benefits out, as otherwise the issues of Honiara versus the provinces will continue to fester. Such an approach will also contribute to NZ's development and investment priorities in Solomon Islands particularly those relating to the promotion of tourism. Provinces that were specifically mentioned in the interviews include:

- Western Province: owing to its links with NZ's investment in tourism.
- Guadalcanal.
- Honiara [RSIPF refers to Honiara as a separate entity given its distinct needs].
- Central Province.

Crime Prevention is an approach which needs to permeate all aspects of the work being done by RSIPF. It cannot be the sole domain of the NCPD as this limits its potential. Integrating CPS and the prevention approach into Learning and Development and National Intelligence Department is the first step to ensure crime prevention extends to other areas of RSIPF operations.

Appendix 1: List of stakeholders

The table below lists the stakeholders that were consulted as part of the review process by their roles within the organisation rather than names, for reasons of confidentiality.

Organisation	Position
RSIPF	Commissioner Assistant Commissioners Members of the Senior Leadership Team Provincial Commanders Middle Management Staff
AFP	Officials responsible for SIPDP in country
DFAT	Representative based in Honiara
SIPSP	Team Leaders and Advisors [outgoing] Advisors [current]
SIG	Minister Officials from across government agencies
Other donors and NGOs	Representatives from a range of agencies operating in Honiara
MFAT	Staff at Wellington and Post
NZP	ISG representatives, including SIPSP advisors